

TRENDS IN FISHERIES *and* FISHERY RESOURCES

ASSOCIATED WITH THE
MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
FROM 1981 – 2000



RICHARD M. STARR • JASON M. COPE • LISA A. KERR



Published by the California Sea Grant College Program
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
www-csgc.ucsd.edu
2002

California Sea Grant is a statewide, multiuniversity program of marine research, education, and outreach activities, administered by the University of California. Sea Grant-sponsored research contributes to the growing body of knowledge about our coastal and ocean resources and, consequently, to the solution of many marine-related problems facing our society. Through its Marine Extension Program, Sea Grant transfers information and technology developed in research efforts to a wide community of interested parties and users in California and throughout the nation. Sea Grant also supports a broad range of educational programs so that our coastal and ocean resources can be understood and used judiciously by this and future generations.

The national network of Sea Grant programs is a unique partnership of public and private sectors, combining research, education, and outreach for public service. It is dedicated to meeting the changing environmental and economic needs in our coastal, ocean, and Great Lakes regions. A searchable database of publications from Sea Grant programs is available at the National Sea Grant Library: nsgd.gso.uri.edu.

This work is sponsored in part by a grant from the National Sea Grant College Program, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, under grant number NA06RG0142, project number A/P-1. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of any of those organizations.



TRENDS IN FISHERIES and FISHERY RESOURCES

ASSOCIATED WITH THE
MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
FROM 1981–2000

Richard M. Starr¹
Jason M. Cope²
Lisa A. Kerr²

GIS analysis and maps provided by Jamie Kum³



¹University of California Sea Grant Extension Program
8272 Moss Landing Road
Moss Landing, California 95053

²Moss Landing Marine Laboratories
8272 Moss Landing Road
Moss Landing, California 95053

³California Department of Fish and Game
20 Lower Ragsdale Drive
Monterey, California 93940

California Sea Grant College Program
University of California
La Jolla, California 92093-0232
www-csgc.ucsd.edu

Publication No. T-046
ISBN 1-888691-09-3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fisheries in Central California are part of this region's rich cultural and economic history. In the last decade, however, catches of many fishery resources have greatly declined, due both to decreases in fish populations and to new regulations enacted to conserve or rebuild fish stocks. In this book, we summarize the technical concepts and information that fishery scientists use to estimate the population sizes of harvested species. In addition to summarizing scientific information, we also provide a brief description of the types of fisheries operating in the region encompassed by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS), and a summary of fishery management operations.

Currently, more than 1,200 commercial vessels annually fish within the MBNMS boundaries. This represents a decline of about 40% in the number of commercial fishing vessels working in this region since the early 1980s. Although the number of vessels has declined, total catches have increased as the commercial fishing industry targeted abundant pelagic species such as Pacific sardine and squid. Catches in recreational fisheries in this region grew by more than 60% from the 1960s to the 1980s. Recreational fishing effort increased by 65% in that same time frame. Since the late 1980s, however, both recreational catch and effort have fluctuated, but slightly declined. Nevertheless, recreational harvest exceeds commercial harvest for many nearshore species.

Commercial landings of all species combined increased from 1981–2000. This trend is misleading, however, because it is due to the large increase in catches of small pelagic fishes and squid. The combined catch of all other species decreased by about 50% from the mid-1980s to the late 1990s. The decline in landings was directly related to reduced population sizes of many of the species inhabiting deep-water bottom habitats, caused by excessively high rates of fishing in the 1980s, when fishery scientists and resource managers overestimated the productivity of stocks of bottom fish. Catches of nonpelagic fishes increased for a short time in the 1990s as a result of increased fishing in nearshore habitats; however, by the end of the 1990s, abundances of nearshore species had also declined.

In the late 1990s, laws such as the federal Sustainable Fisheries Act, and California's Marine Life Management Act (MLMA) and Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) were passed that mandated more conservative management of marine resources. In response, federal resource managers reduced harvest rates on heavily fished species living in deep-water habitats. State resource managers also began to limit harvests of nearshore species. The full implementation of these new laws will likely result in more restrictive regulations that are intended to minimize the chance of overfishing, limit bycatch, preserve essential fish habitat, and in some cases rebuild depleted stocks.

In the short-term, these new regulations will probably result in a continued decline in the landings of many marine species harvested from MBNMS waters. Because many species with low population sizes co-occur with more abundant species, quotas for some healthy stocks will need to remain lower than necessary to protect stocks at risk. Also, because many of the fish species at risk are long-lived, grow slowly, and take a long time to reach maturity, it may take 10–20 years or more to see the results of current management regulations. The physical environment in the Monterey Bay region is very dynamic, however, and can have a strong influence on the population size of resident fish populations. There is some evidence that oceanographic conditions are changing back to a cooler, more productive environment in this region. If that

Photo credits: Greenspotted rockfish (cover); fishing boats and fishers; coastal scenes; yellowtail and yelloweye rockfishes (p. 41); rosy rockfishes (p. 53); baby squid (p. 68); and canary rockfishes (p. 74) by Richard M. Starr. Yellowtail rockfishes (p. 31) courtesy of Cordell Bank Expeditions, NOAA archives; Monterey Fishing Company (p. 116) by Georgia Ratcliffe.

bank rockfish has declined, but it is not known if a problem exists with this heavily fished species. Bocaccio, canary, cowcod, and widow rockfish have been declared to be overfished and are now managed under stock rebuilding plans. Stocks of lingcod, another important groundfish species, have also been overfished and are managed with a stock-rebuilding plan.

Low stock sizes of rockfish species have been attributed to poor recruitment and excessively high rates of fishing, caused by overly optimistic estimates of allowable catch in the 1980s and the introduction of new fishing gear and techniques that enabled trawl vessels to fish in rocky areas. Most of these deep-water rockfishes are slow growing, long-lived, and have experienced high exploitation rates. Managers are concerned about the capability of some of these species to recover from high harvest rates, especially because some are prone to long periods of poor recruitment. Recent evidence of successful recruitment of several heavily fished species, however, provides an indication that some species may recover more quickly.

Concern about the health of rockfish populations led to more restrictive regulations in both commercial and recreational fisheries. The regulations resulted in a consistent decline in rockfish catches starting in 1991, with landings greatly dropping in the mid-1990s. Though rockfish quotas are generally decreasing, bycatch issues are still a major concern. Rockfishes are captured at high levels in some fisheries, and mortality of deep-dwelling rockfishes is essentially 100% when fish are brought to the surface. Historically, the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) has used a dynamic model to estimate bycatch. The Council plans to use fishery observers in the near future, however, to provide a better estimate of bycatch. It is expected that gear restrictions and new gear and techniques will then be used to reduce bycatch.

More than 30 species are routinely harvested from soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats, and annual commercial landings from these habitats averaged 12 million lb/yr from 1981–2000. Species groups caught in these habitats include shrimp, prawns, rockfishes, thornyheads, sablefish, and flatfishes. Commercial catches in soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats in the MBNMS remained high between 1985 and 1996, with an average estimated take of 13.5 million lb/yr, but dropped to only 5.7 million lb in the year 2000, due primarily to regulation changes. Coastwide, many species in these habitats, such as thornyheads, sablefish, Dover sole, and other flatfishes, are considered to be fully exploited, but not overfished. Some of the rockfishes inhabiting soft bottom habitats show signs of depletion in Northern California, Oregon, and Washington waters, but the population status of most of the rockfishes in soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats in the MBNMS is not well known.

Commercial landings from open water habitats averaged 20.6 million lb/yr from 1981–2000. Population abundances of most species in these habitats are greatly determined by large-scale environmental phenomena that affect the success of spawning and recruitment. Landings of species from open water habitats have increased since the 1980s, especially for the group of fishes termed small coastal pelagics. The population of one of these species, the Pacific sardine, has been extensively managed for 30 years, and has dramatically increased in the last 20 years. In 1999, Pacific sardine biomass in United States waters was estimated to be about 3.8 billion lb, and total Pacific sardine landings for the directed fisheries off California and Baja California reached more than 253 million lb. These landings are the highest level in recent history, but still much smaller than annual Pacific sardine landings from 1930–50.

Another pelagic species, the Chinook salmon, is one the most important species in both commercial and recreational fisheries in the MBNMS. It has been intensively managed for more than 30 years. Resource management issues related to salmon abundance revolve prima-

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Fish populations, fisheries, and fishery management are typically characterized by constant change. The dynamic ocean and political environments often make trends difficult to identify and interpret. Many people helped to provide the information we presented. We would first like to thank the fishers and scientists who regularly spend many hours at sea and on the docks collecting these data. The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, the University of California Sea Grant College Program, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, and the California Department of Fish and Game all provided support for this project.

The data presented in this report came from many sources. Will Daspit, Jason Sawicki, and Wade Van Buskirk of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) provided most of the fishery data from the PacFIN and RecFIN databases. Mike Dalton of California State University Monterey Bay and Cindy Thomson of the National Marine Fisheries Service gave us economic information about Central California fisheries. Karin Forney of the National Marine Fisheries Service and Scott Benson of Moss Landing Marine Labs gave us information about sea birds and marine mammals. Jana Robertson of the California Department of Fish and Game provided information about the live-fish fishery, and Lisa Wertz gave us information about nearshore fishery regulations.

Many people reviewed the early drafts of this report. Paul Reilly and Deb Wilson-Vandenberg of the California Department of Fish and Game, Bill Leet of the UC Sea Grant Extension Program, and Richard Parrish and Steve Ralston of the National Marine Fisheries Service all provided helpful information about fishery data. Fishers from the major ports also helped us with fishery information. Dempsey Bosworth, Vicki Crow, Kathy Fosmark, Bill James, Duncan Maclean, Tom McCray, and Mike Ricketts were especially helpful. Kaitlin Gaffney of the Ocean Conservancy also provided an extremely helpful review. Erica Burton of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary gave us exceptionally thorough comments, as did Andrew DeVogelaere, Bill Douros, Holly Price, and other Sanctuary staff. Gregor Cailliet of Moss Landing Marine Laboratories reviewed the document and helped provide information about the life history of fishes.

The final document is much improved thanks to the editing of Beverly Haney. The layout design and production was by Joann Furse, and the photographs coordinated by Georgia Ratcliffe, both of the California Sea Grant College Program. Nancy Wright of the California Department of Fish and Game provided support for Jamie Kum to prepare the GIS maps. Graphics of fishing vessels and gear were provided by Ginny Goblirsch of the Oregon State University Sea Grant Extension Program and Lynn McMasters of Moss Landing Marine Laboratories.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	1
Historical Perspective	7
Status of Fisheries	11
Commercial Fisheries	11
Ports and Vessels	11
Gear Types	15
Target Species and Landings	19
Economic Value	24
Recreational Fisheries	25
Primary Target Species	29
Economic Value	29
Fisheries Management	31
Concepts	31
Stock Assessments	32
Regulatory Process	35
Pacific Fishery Management Council	35
National Marine Fisheries Service	36
California Department of Fish and Game	36
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	36
Fishing Organizations	37
Public Involvement	37
Key Fisheries Legislation	37
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act/ Sustainable Fisheries Act	37
Marine Life Management Act	38
Marine Life Protection Act	39
Current Management Issues	41
Maintenance of Economically Viable Fisheries	41
Overcapitalization	42
Catch Allocation	42
Multispecies Fisheries	42
Bycatch of Nontarget Species	43
Discard	44
Enforcement	44
Need for More Scientific Information	45
Cost Recovery	45
Alternative Management Strategies	46
Emerging Fisheries	47
Live/Premium Fish Fishery	47
Protected Species	48
Habitat Loss	49

Contents continued

Environmental Factors Affecting Fish Populations	51
Fishery Status of Selected Species	53
Nearshore Rocky Reef and Kelp Habitats	54
Invertebrates	56
Vertebrates	59
Nearshore Soft Bottom Habitats	68
Invertebrates	70
Vertebrates	72
Rocky Deep Shelf and Slope Habitats	74
Invertebrates	76
Vertebrates	77
Soft Bottom Deep Shelf and Slope Habitats	86
Invertebrates	89
Vertebrates	91
Open Water Habitats	102
Small Coastal Pelagics	105
Coastal Migrants	109
Pelagic Migrants	113
Pelagic Sharks	114
References	117
Glossary	131
Appendices	133
Index	156




INTRODUCTION

As world population grows, technology advances, and fishing power increases, more and more pressure is placed on populations of harvested species. In many parts of the world, increased fishing has led to dramatic declines of fish stocks, changes in ecological relationships, and subsequent collapses of fisheries. These fishery collapses have caused widespread social and economic problems in coastal communities. In the United States, fishers, resource managers, members of conservation organizations, and other interested parties have been trying to develop strategies to maintain valuable fisheries while ensuring that marine species are not overfished.

A challenge of maintaining sustainable resources is to evaluate the status of harvested species and subsequently set appropriate fishing rates. Unfortunately, determining the status of a particular fish population is difficult, and the information needed to assess a localized fishery is often not readily available. Often, fishery managers have little or no direct research-based information with which to assess the numbers of fish in a specific region and, therefore, rely upon information derived from the fishery to estimate population sizes.

Data collected from commercial and recreational fisheries enable scientists to develop indices of population sizes or trends in fish abundance. Fishery data used for an index may include the amount of fish caught and sold at the dock (termed landed catch or landings), the rate of catch of a species (expressed as catch per unit effort [CPUE]; e.g., number of fish caught per hour), the average weight of fish landed, the average length of fish caught, or other biological information such as the sex ratio or mean length of mature fish. In addition to single indices, fishery managers develop and use population models to infer the status of fish stocks.










Fig 2. Generalized bottom types of the northern portion of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

Bottom type interpolated from the following datasets:
 Kelp Canopy Survey, 1989 & 1999
 (California Department of Fish & Game)

Survey of Seafloor Rocks and Sediments of the Continental Shelf From Point Año Nuevo to Point San, California
 (United States Geological Survey)

The California Marine Benthic Habitat Map Series
 (Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Center for Habitat Studies & California State University of Monterey Bay, Seafloor Mapping Lab)





remain a strong focus in our community today. In addition to providing a summary of the status of fished populations, we briefly describe the types of commercial and recreational fisheries, and their economic values. We do not discuss the research and educational harvest of animals, aquaculture ventures, or many nonconsumptive uses of marine resources. Research and educational harvests are minimal; and although aquaculture and nonconsumptive uses are important, our objective was to focus on the commercial and recreational harvest of wild fishery resources.

Historical Perspective

The fishing industry has played a large role in the cultural and economic development of much of the central coast of California. In Monterey Bay, humans have been harvesting marine resources for over 7,500 years. The Costanoan Indians fished year-round in Monterey Bay, both from shore and from small rafts, using seines, dipnets, weirs, harpoons, and basketry traps. From midden deposits, we know that they harvested numerous types of shellfish, nearshore fishes, and marine birds and mammals.

Beginning in the early 1800s, nonindigenous peoples visited this area to hunt for marine mammals. Russian vessels, often carrying Alaskan Aleut hunters, harvested sea otters for their fur. Intense hunting continued throughout the 1800s until the early 1900s when the otter population was nearly extirpated. The federal government gave sea otters protected status in 1911. The harvesting of whales also began in the early 1800s. Shore whaling in California was started at Monterey Bay in 1854 by Portuguese immigrants. Hunters targeted gray and hump-back whales. Throughout this period, whaling stations were located along the entire coast of California, and several were within what is now designated as the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. By the 1920s, whale populations had declined and most shoreside processing facilities in this region had closed.

During the 1850s, local fisheries were established on the Monterey Peninsula. Chinese immigrants settled in Monterey and Pacific Grove and began harvesting large quantities of marine animals for drying and shipment back to China. Invertebrates, including abalone, urchins, and mussels were harvested from intertidal and nearshore habitats. Small skiffs were used to fish for sharks and marine fishes. The Chinese settlers were also responsible for the initiation of the squid fishery. They used torches and hand-held purse seines deployed from skiffs to attract and capture squid. These early small-scale fisheries represent the beginning of a rich, post-Native American tradition of commercial fishing in the Monterey Bay area.

Historically, the majority of fish caught in what is now the MBNMS were landed in Monterey. In the early 1870s, the lighthouse at Point Piños was built, and the Monterey and Salinas Valley Railroad were completed. Subsequently, warehouses and wharfs were built and Monterey became a major commercial fishing port. The port of Moss Landing was created in 1865 when Captain Moss built a wharf to house several sailing schooners. Development of the port, however, was slowed due to the unprotected coastline and limited land transportation. Early in this century, the Santa Cruz harbor was known as a favorite summer beach resort, as well as an important commercial fishing port. Morro Bay's port didn't develop until the early 1900s, when wharfs were built and catches could be trucked to the canneries of Monterey. Princeton, formerly known as Old Landing, and now commonly called Half Moon Bay or Pillar Point Harbor, was developed not with commercial fishing in mind, but as a port for farmers to ship produce to San Francisco.

During the early 1900s, fishing gained economic importance in the Monterey Bay region. Italian fishers came to Monterey Bay bringing their double-boat bottom seines, and later, large

With this sudden expansion of fleet size and catching capability, United States fisheries shifted to deeper waters, thus increasing effort on groundfish species groups such as rockfishes and flatfishes. During this growth period, rockfish landings from the Pacific coast of the United States increased from 42–70% of total landings. Flatfish landings also increased, and sablefish landings doubled. Similar trends were seen in the Monterey Bay area during this time. Traditional species such as squid and salmon remained important, but increasingly larger vessels began targeting other species as well. The period after the enactment of the FCMA represents the start of the modern fishery and increased fishery regulations. Now, United States vessels have a high degree of fishing capability, most stocks are fully utilized, and fishery management is complex and intense.

STATUS OF FISHERIES

Commercial Fisheries

Ports and Vessels

Today, most fish caught within the MBNMS are landed at one of five main ports: Princeton/Half Moon Bay, Santa Cruz, Moss Landing, Monterey Bay, or Morro Bay. More than 1,200 commercial vessels fish within the MBNMS annually, but not all vessels fish year-round. Many vessels switch gear types and target various species during different seasons or years, depending on abundance and demand for a given species. A large number of vessels also fish in other parts of the state or nation, and enter MBNMS waters to land and sell fish to local ports. In 1999, of the more than 1,200 vessels that landed fishery resources in Central California, approximately 89% landed their catch only in Central California, and the remaining 11% made landings in Central California and Northern or Southern California ports. The number of nonresident vessels fishing in MBNMS waters depends on species abundance, market price, and fish abundances in other locations. From 1981–2000, all five ports near the MBNMS experienced a downward trend in the average number of individual vessels fishing at each port (Fig. 5). This represents an overall decline of 40% in the last twenty years for all ports near the MBNMS. Such decreases in average number of fishing vessels may reflect increased restrictions on catches, limited entry programs, and various market changes. This trend is similar to the overall trend for the entire state of California.




Figure 5. Number of individual vessels landing marine species at ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000.

Table 1. Average total landings (million lb), average economic value (million USD, adjusted for inflation to year 2000 values), and principal species landed at ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000.

Fishing Port	Average Total Landings (million lb) 1981–2000	Average Economic Value (million \$)	Principal Species Landed
Princeton- Half Moon Bay	5.1	4.1	Rockfishes Chinook Salmon Market Squid Dungeness Crab Dover Sole
Santa Cruz	1.1	1.3	Chinook Salmon Market Squid Rockfishes Northern Anchovy Dungeness Crab
Moss Landing	18.7	4.7	Pacific Sardine Market Squid Rockfishes Albacore Dover Sole
Monterey	19.5	3.6	Market Squid Pacific Sardine Northern Anchovy Rockfishes Pacific Mackerel
Morro Bay	7.5	4.6	Dover Sole Rockfishes Thornyheads Albacore Sablefish

Fishers have changed gear types periodically to match fish abundance and availability, and regulation changes. For example, the number of vessels fishing troll gear in the MBNMS sharply declined from 1985 to 1993 as salmon abundance declined. During that time, there was a corresponding increase in the number of vessels fishing for other species with hook-and-line gear (Fig. 6). The increase in hook-and-line gear is a result of fishers switching from troll gear, limited entry in the trawl fishery (which resulted in an increase in the open access hook-and-line fishery), and also corresponds with the start of the live-fish fishery. Since 1993, however, the number of vessels fishing with hook-and-line gear declined, with a matching increase in troll gear, as salmon abundance increased and rockfish abundance decreased (Fig. 6).

There has been an overall decrease in vessels fishing with net gear in the MBNMS since 1985. This decrease in fishing of net gear is primarily related to increased restrictions on the use of gill and trammel nets in nearshore areas since 1980, culminating in a complete ban of gill and trammel net fishing in waters less than 30 fathoms deep in a large portion of the MBNMS after 1990. The number of vessels fishing with pot, trap, or longline gear has increased since the early 1980s, probably related to the emergence of the live-fish fishery, the displacement of net gear from the nearshore environment, and the increased abundance of crab and prawn populations. An increasing trend in the number of vessels using longline gear was evident in the 1980s and early 1990s, followed by a marked decrease since 1996. The recent decrease in use of longline gear may be the result of 1996 regulations imposed on the number of hooks allowed per vessel and general decreases in quotas. The composition of seine and trawl gear types remained relatively steady from 1981–2000 (Fig. 6).

The ports of Santa Cruz and Princeton/Half Moon Bay experienced relatively stable total landings from 1981–2000, whereas Morro Bay landings have generally declined over the past 15 years (Fig. 7). The ports of Monterey Bay and Moss Landing, however, had highly variable total landings over the past twenty years, caused primarily by fluctuations in squid, northern anchovy, and Pacific sardine landings. More than 70% of the commercial fish landings at these five harbors are comprised of market squid, Pacific sardines, rockfishes, Dover sole, northern anchovy, Chinook salmon, mackerel, albacore, and sablefish (Table 1). Landings at Monterey and Moss Landing are significantly higher than other ports associated with the MBNMS, primarily because of the large volume fisheries of market squid, northern anchovy, and in recent years, Pacific sardine, which predominate at these ports (Table 1). The port of Monterey has the highest landings within the MBNMS of market squid, northern anchovy, Pacific mackerel, jack mackerel, and is second in volume of Pacific sardine landings. Some vessels from local ports fish outside the MBNMS and then return home with their catches. This is especially common for Princeton/Half Moon Bay fishers who travel to fishing grounds north of the MBNMS boundary. High value species landed at ports near the MBNMS but which are caught outside sanctuary boundaries include salmon, sea urchin, albacore, and swordfish.




Figure 6. Number of vessels landing marine species at five major ports associated with the MBNMS by different gear types used in the commercial fishery from 1981–2000. Note that one vessel may use several gear types.




Figure 7. Total landings at each of the five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000.

Gear Types

Commercial fisheries can be grouped according to type of gear used and species caught. There are five primary types of gear used in the commercial fisheries that currently operate in the MBNMS; each type of gear most effectively catches a specific species group. The primary gear types used include pots or traps, trawl nets, hook-and-line gear, purse seines, and gill or set nets.

Pots or traps are fished in two ways. The most common method is to place a single pot at the end of a line that reaches to a surface buoy. Dungeness crab are captured with this method. Typical vessels in this fishery range from 10–20 meters in length, carry a crew of three people, and are rigged with a large, hydraulic winch. The fishers string a baited container in a 1.5-meter wide pot and leave it to soak for 1–3 days on soft bottoms that contain appropriate crab habitat (Fig. 9). At the end of the soak period, a vessel pulls the pot to the surface with the aid of the hydraulic winch. Legal animals are kept on board, nonlegal animals are returned to the water, and the pot is rebaited and sent back to the bottom. Vessels may fish several hundred pots at a time.

A second method of fishing pots is to attach a series of baited traps to a long ground line which is attached to a pair of buoys (Fig. 10). This method of fishing pots is used to catch spot prawn, sablefish, octopus, hagfish, and is a common method of capture in the live fish fishery. In the sablefish fishery, baited pots that are 2 meters long by 1 meter wide are either set out individually, or tied together in strings via a long ground line. They are also soaked for 1–3 days, and then retrieved. These vessels are typically 15–25 meters in length and equipped with




Figure 9. Commercial crab pot.




Figure 10. Longline gear used in sablefish trap and hook-and-line fishing operations.

both the stability during operation and the area capable of trapping fish. Midwater trawl vessels are typically larger than bottom trawl vessels in order to handle the larger nets and higher towing speeds. They range from 25–35 meters in length.

Four major types of hook-and-line gear are used in the Monterey Bay. The first of these, the longline or setline gear, is placed on the bottom. This gear consists of a line anchored at two ends with each end attached to a buoy at the surface (Fig. 10). A line with baited hooks or lures lies along the bottom between the anchors. Sablefish, rockfishes, and halibut are often caught with bottom longline gear. In the 1990s, a new type of setline fishing began in the nearshore areas for the live-fish market. In this fishery, termed tree or pipe fishing, a small boat is used to set numerous 2-meter long plastic pipes along the bottom in shallow water. Each pipe is outfitted with 4–5 baited hooks and commonly soaked for shorter time periods than traditional hook-and-line methods.

A third type of line fishing, trolling, is designed to catch fast-swimming fishes such as albacore and salmon. Usually, flashy lures and bait are used in this type of fishery and are trolled behind the moving vessel on heavily weighted fishing lines. The lines are mounted on outrigger poles to ensure separation, and are controlled by small electric or hydraulic winches or gurdies (Fig. 12). Trolling vessels fish at variable speeds and depths depending on target species.

Figure 12. Example of troll fishing gear configuration.

Target Species and Landings

More than 200 species of invertebrates and fishes were recorded in the commercial and recreational catches in this region from 1981–2000 (Appendix A). This species list was derived from a combination of the reported commercial landings, commercial live-fish fishery landings, and reported catches from recreational fishing vessels and angler interviews. Appendix A may include some species that were landed, but not caught in regional waters. It also only includes the larger invertebrate species that are commonly harvested in the recreational fishery. Undoubtedly, many more intertidal invertebrates are harvested in small numbers.

Commercial landing information is available for those species that were routinely caught and sold in this region from 1981–2000 (Appendix B). These data are derived primarily from records provided to CDFG by fish buyers, who often lump more than one species in the poundage reported for a group of fishes. This lumping of landed catch into broad groups or market categories can pose a problem for the evaluation of trends in species abundance. State and federal fishery biologists resolve the problem by routinely collecting biological information on market categories to the reported commercial landings to obtain estimates of the number and the species sold at the docks. Biologists obtain estimates of species composition of the landed catch by market categories. They then apply the ratios of species composition in the sampled weight of individual species caught. Appendix C is an example of the results of this procedure: it provides estimates of the commercial landings of individual rockfish species from 1978–2000. Note that estimates of total rockfish landings from Appendix C do not match the totals from Appendix B because the expansion procedures used by NMFS include rockfish landed and sampled in San Francisco as well as in other ports near the MBNMS.

Linear regression analysis was used to evaluate the trends in catch for species commercially landed in the ports associated with the MBNMS for the years 1981–2000. By fitting a best-fit straight line through the plot of landings over time, one can generally assess whether catch trends have statistically changed, and how they have changed (i.e. increased or decreased) over that time period. More than 90 species are frequently caught (more than 1,000 pounds/year or more than 1000 fish/year) in fisheries occurring in the MBNMS. Of these 90




Figure 14. Example of gill net fishing gear.

Table 2. Categorical trends of species commercially landed from 1981 to 2000 at ports associated with the MBNMS. Categories include increasing, decreasing, or highly variable landings (^=estimated landings). Effort for the CPUE regression/trends analysis was measured by total yearly trips within the MBNMS. Rockfish CPUE trends reflect trends from 1981–1995. NS represents no significant trend. Bold values indicate CPUE trends that differ from landing trends. Trend comments indicate regressions that hide a more recent opposing trend. See text for further explanation.

Species	Average landing (1,000 lb)	CPUE/trend	Rockfish CPUE trends pre-1996	Comments
Decreased Landings				
Total Rockfishes^	10176	down	down	
Shelf Rockfishes^	9862	down	down	
Chilipepper^	2933	down	NS	
Boccacio^	2555	down	down	
Sablefish	1601	down		
Yellowtail Rockfish^	507	down	NS	
Lingcod	379	down		
White Croaker	325	down		
Common Thresher Shark	169	down		
Sand Sole	42	down		
Speckled Rockfish^	33	down	NS	
Pacific Angel Shark	24	down		
Soupfin Shark	23	down		
Leopard Shark	8	down		
Widow Rockfish^	1268	down	down	
Bank Rockfish^	956	down	down	
English Sole	487	down		
Bluefin Tuna	33	down		
Bigeye Thresher Shark	18	down		
Monkeyface Prickleback	<1	down		
Jack Mackerel	1183	NS		
Pink Shrimp	431	NS		
Copper Rockfish^	24	down	up	
Smelt	11	down		
Pacific Hake	2	NS		

sis of all rockfish species and species groups in the period before heavy regulations on most rockfishes were implemented (Table 2). Many of the trends are similar to the ones seen for years 1981–2000, but there are some discrepancies. Most notable is the chilipepper, a species whose population seems stable according to stock assessments, but whose recent decline in landings reflects its close association with the strictly regulated catch of bocaccio.

Species	Average landing (1,000 lb)	CPUE/trend	Rockfish CPUE trends pre-1996	Comments
Cowcod^	37	NS	up	decrease after 1997
Mako Shark	36	NS		decrease after 1990
Surfperch	26	NS		decrease after 1998
Starry Flounder	26	NS		decrease after 1988
Gopher Rockfish^	24	NS	NS	decrease after 1992
Black-and-Yellow Rockfish^	24	NS	NS	decrease after 1998
Olive Rockfish^	21	NS	NS	decrease after 1996
Starry Rockfish^	20	NS	up	decrease after 1991
China Rockfish^	20	NS	NS	decrease after 1997
Black Rockfish^	19	NS	NS	decrease after 1998
Greenstriped Rockfish^	17	NS	NS	decrease after 1997
Redbanded rockfish^	13	NS	NS	
Rosy Rockfish^	11	NS	up	decrease after 1994
Stripetail Rockfish^	11	NS	NS	
Shortbelly Rockfish^	10	NS	NS	
Quillback Rockfish^	10	down	up	decrease after 1997
Greenblotched Rockfish^	9	down	up	decrease after 1998
Tiger Rockfish^	7	NS	NS	
Sharpchin Rockfish^	6	NS	NS	
Rock Sole	6	NS		
Kelp rockfish^	5	NS	up	decrease after 1993
Flag rockfish^	4	NS	NS	decrease after 1994
Octopi	4	NS		
Rougheye Rockfish^	3	NS	NS	
Bronzespotted Rockfish^	3	NS	NS	
Skipjack	3	NS		
Yellowfin Tuna	3	NS		
Rosethorn Rockfish^	2	NS	NS	
Chameleon Rockfish^	2	NS	up	
Pink Rockfish^	2	NS	NS	
Pacific Ocean Perch^	1	NS	NS	
Mexican Rockfish^	1	NS	NS	
Barracuda	1	NS		
California scorpionfish^	<1	NS		
Squarespot Rockfish^	<1	NS	NS	
Highly Variable				
Jack Mackerel	1183			
Pacific Bonito	40			
Grenadier	416			
Quillback Rockfish^	10			
Tiger Rockfish^	7			
Yellowfin Tuna	3			

Commercial fishing contributes both to the local and statewide economies. Although landings declined from 1981–2000, the average ex-vessel revenue per boat increased over the last 20 years (Fig 15). In 1999, commercial fishing in California accounted for \$146.6 million in revenue (value corrected for inflation to 2000 dollars) to fishers (i.e., the dockside price paid to fishers, termed ex-vessel value). Ports within the MBNMS accounted for \$15.7 million of that total (Fig. 15). Due to lack of complete economic data for the fishing industry, the ex-vessel value is the most commonly used measure of economic value for commercial fisheries. Ex-vessel value is an underestimate of the economic value for the commercial fishery, however, because it does not take into account income generated from businesses associated with operating and maintaining a fishing vessel and its crew. For example, fishers spend money for equipment, gasoline, gear maintenance, and crew members. These expenditures benefit a number of additional businesses including boat repair shops, marine supply stores, marinas, and the fuel industry. In an evaluation of the economic benefit to the community of the commercial fishing industry it was calculated that for every one dollar earned by the fishing industry approximately \$1.30 to \$1.90 is generated in the local economy. Average revenue per boat in Central California increased from \$20,800 to \$30,100 over the period of 1981–85 versus 1994–99.

Figure 1 is a line graph showing the annual revenue (in million dollars) for five locations from 1980 to 2000. The y-axis represents Revenue (million dollars) from 0 to 12. The x-axis represents Year from 1980 to 2000. The locations are Santa Cruz (diamonds), Monterey (squares), Moss Landing (triangles), Morro Bay (crosses), and Princeton (asterisks). Princeton consistently shows the highest revenue, peaking at approximately 10 million in 1997. Santa Cruz consistently shows the lowest revenue, generally below 3 million. Morro Bay and Monterey show intermediate revenue levels with significant fluctuations, including a major peak for Morro Bay in 1997.

Year	Santa Cruz	Monterey	Moss Landing	Morro Bay	Princeton
1981	0.5	5.0	5.2	3.2	1.5
1982	0.7	3.8	3.8	2.5	2.1
1983	0.4	3.2	4.8	3.2	2.0
1984	0.4	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.3
1985	0.5	4.0	3.2	5.6	2.5
1986	0.7	3.8	3.8	5.8	3.8
1987	1.0	4.2	4.2	6.2	4.2
1988	2.9	4.0	4.8	6.0	6.9
1989	1.8	4.4	3.2	5.2	4.7
1990	2.1	3.5	3.5	5.4	4.8
1991	1.2	3.3	3.0	4.0	4.4
1992	0.7	2.5	3.0	4.7	4.7
1993	0.8	3.0	4.2	4.7	4.0
1994	1.0	5.5	4.4	5.2	5.2
1995	1.7	4.2	6.2	6.2	6.2
1996	1.2	3.8	7.5	4.5	4.5
1997	1.0	4.8	10.0	4.8	6.0
1998	0.8	2.2	3.8	4.2	4.2
1999	1.1	1.6	5.6	3.5	3.8
2000	1.0	1.9	6.8	4.4	3.7

[illegible]

Although commercial fishing is economically valuable, it accounts for only a small portion of the total economy, both statewide and locally. Much larger contributors include the agriculture and tourism industries. Agriculture, primarily in the Salinas and Pajaro valleys, is one of the largest industries in the Monterey Bay area. In 2000, agriculture was worth almost \$3 billion to Monterey County (the third highest among California counties), \$490 million in San Luis Obispo County, and \$340 million to Santa Cruz County. These values represent wholesale prices alone, and can be expanded by a factor of 3–5 times when indirect expenses and personal income are incorporated.

Tourism is another big industry along the central coast. In Monterey County alone, tourism accounted for almost \$3 billion in combined direct and indirect impacts in 1999, ranking Monterey County tenth in California for tourist spending. In 1999, the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau estimated 18,400 jobs and \$291 million in personal income are generated by tourism in Monterey County. In Santa Cruz County, tourism provided over 5,000 jobs, and \$600 million in visitor spending and personal income. Included in the values for tourism, however, are the expenditures made by people who visit the area to recreationally fish, tour the harbors to see fishing boats, eat at seafood restaurants, or otherwise enjoy the cultural heritage provided by the fishing industry.

Recreational Fisheries

The recreational fishery includes a variety of fishing methods that are classified into six major modes: commercial passenger fishing vessel/charter (CPFV), private/rental boat (skiff), beach and bank, jetty and breakwater, pier and dock, and spear fishing. These modes reflect the variety of habitats used by species caught in the recreational fishery (Appendix D, E). Because of the spatially and temporally diffuse nature of these various fishing modes, the recreational fishery has traditionally been difficult to monitor and thus accurately assess its contribution to California's fisheries. The most comprehensive method used to collect recreational fishery data is through the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) conducted by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). The annual surveys include phone interviews and dockside surveys that collect data on recreational fishing catch, effort, and economic information. Telephone interviews are conducted within coastal counties to interview fishers at home to estimate angler trips, while intercept surveys of anglers at fishing sites estimate catch rates and species composition. These data have been collected since 1979, with the exception of 1990–92; a gap caused by lack of funding. Although this database covers a long time span, results from some years are highly variable and less reliable, making the information difficult to interpret. In addition, salmon catches, which are extremely important in the Monterey Bay area in some years, are not included in the survey. Another method of monitoring the recreational fishery comes from the California Department of Fish and Game CPFV logbooks that include information on number of anglers, location of fishing, and the type and number of fishes caught.

For major recreational species, Northern and Central California recreational catches make up almost half of the total recreational catch in California, comprising the majority of nearshore rockfishes, surfperches, greenlings and lingcod, flatfishes, salmonids, and sculpins caught in the state (Fig. 16). From the 1960s–80s, recreational fishing in Northern and Central California grew substantially; with annual average catch increasing from 3.9 million fish in 1958–61 to 6.5 million fish in 1981–86, and annual fishing effort increasing by 65%. Within the MBNMS, CPFV data reflect a decrease in fishing effort, along with a concomitant downward trend in catches since 1981 (Fig. 17).




Figure 16. Total examined recreational catch of species in Northern and Southern California from 1980–2000. Rockfishes are abbreviated as “RF.” “Tunas” category includes mackerel. “Greenling” category includes lingcod.




Figure 17. Total CPFV catch (solid line) and effort (dotted line) at five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000.

Results from the MRFSS indicate that shore fishing is the most common form of sport fishing in Northern and Central California (Table 3). This is to be expected, as fishing from shore is the most accessible and least expensive form of fishing. Each of the three modes of shore fishing (beach/bank, jetty/breakwater, and pier/dock) are primarily hook-and-line fisheries, and combined accounted for at least 40% of the annual catch and over half of the recreational fishing effort from 1981–2000 (Table 3). Since 1981, shore catch has slowly declined, while the effort, despite a large, inexplicable increase in 1988, has remained comparatively steady (Fig. 18). The beach/bank mode comprised over one-half of the annual shore catch and fishing effort. Numerous species are caught in the shore fishery, but the most frequently occurring are smelts and silversides, surfperch, and croakers.

Table 3. Average annual total catch, average effort, and primary species caught in Northern California for each of the major sportfishing modes from 1981–2000.

Fishing Mode	Avg. Catch (No. of fish) 1980–2000	Avg. Effort (No. Trips) 1980–2000	Primary Species
Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFV)	1.5 million	235,000	Rockfishes, lingcod, and mackerel
Private/Rental Boat (PRB)	2.0 million	944,000	Rockfishes, croaker, sanddabs, and lingcod
All Shore Fishing (Beach/Bank, Jetty/Breakwater, Pier/Dock)	2.9 million	1.3 million	Smelt, silversides, surfperch, croaker, and greenlings

*1990–92 not available for all; 1990–95 not available for the CPFV fishery




Figure 18. All shore fishing landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) within Central and Northern California from 1981–2000.






Figure 22. Total lingcod CPV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) within the MBNMS. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.



FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Concepts

The goal of fisheries management is to maintain healthy fish populations while providing social and economic benefits from fisheries. Management strategies are thus based upon a complex array of social, economic, and ecological concerns which must be addressed when decisions affecting a fishery are made. An implicit assumption of fishery management is that fishes represent renewable resources that can maintain population levels when subjected to limited harvesting on a continual basis. This assumption relies on the concept that fish populations have a surplus production that is available to be harvested. In theory, in an unfished population, the biomass (total weight) of fish in a habitat will approach a theoretical carrying capacity (maximum number of individuals that can be accommodated) for that habitat. The older fish will dominate the habitat and their presence prevents all but a small percentage of the young fish produced each year from surviving to reproduce. Following this logic, if some larger, older fish are removed from the habitat, there will be room for a greater number of younger, faster growing fish to take their places. These new fish thus represent a harvestable portion of the fish stock because they represent a spawning biomass above and beyond that needed to maintain stock levels. Although this theory is logical, the processes affecting adult mortality, adult growth and reproductive output, and juvenile survival are highly variable, and make equilibrium population size a concept and not a static number.




Table 4. Stock status of commercial species landed within the MBNMS.

Species	Last Assessed	Status of stock
Arrowtooth Flounder	1993	Stock increasing
Bank Rockfish	2000	No evidence of depletion
Blackgill Rockfish	1998	No evidence of depletion
Bocaccio Rockfish	1999	Overfished stock
Canary Rockfish	1999	Overfished stock
Chilipepper Rockfish	1998	No evidence of depletion
Cowcod	1999	Low abundance
Darkblotched Rockfish	2000	Stock status uncertain
Dover Sole	2001	No evidence of depletion
Lingcod	2000	Overfished stock
Petrale Sole	1999	Stock increasing
Pacific Whiting	2000	Stock at moderate abundance
Pacific Ocean Perch	2000	Stock at low abundance
Sablefish	2001	Stock status uncertain
Shortbelly Rockfish	1989	No evidence of depletion
Shortspine Thornyhead	2001	No evidence of depletion
Widow Rockfish	2000	Overfished stock
Yelloweye Rockfish	2001	Stock at low abundance
Yellowtail Rockfish	2000	Stock decreasing
Pacific Sardine	2001	Stock at high abundance
Pacific Mackerel	2001	Unfinished
Ocean Salmon	2001	Low abundance (California)

* stock status determined by Pacific Fishery Management Council

Stock Assessments

Fishery scientists determine the health of fish populations by conducting stock assessments. A current list (as of the end of 2001) of species with stock assessments is provided in Table 4. Stock assessments combine available biological data with information about fishing activities to assess trends in fish abundance. There are several approaches to gathering information for stock assessments. One of the primary methods involves examining annual records of catch and fishing effort and then standardizing them to a common measure. Fishery biologists divide the amount of fish caught and sold at the dock (landings) by the amount of fishing time expended in the fishing process. The resulting number is termed CPUE and is often used as an index of abundance.

As with all methods for assessing the status of a stock, reviewing catch records is not a perfect approach. A primary drawback to this approach is that it relies on indirect evidence of population size and is not a direct measurement of fish abundance. Catch records alone are

insufficient to define the health of a stock because catches can fluctuate for a variety of social and economic reasons that are independent of fish abundance. A less obvious problem of using catch records is the difficulty and expense of gathering reliable data on fishing effort.

Fishery scientists also use biological information in stock assessments. The age structure of a stock provides a historical as well as contemporary view of the stock. It shows information about the current status of the stock and gives clues to events in the past that have led to the changes in that status. The shape of the age frequency distribution can also provide evidence that a stock has been overfished, for instance, when a reduction in the number of fish results in fewer older year classes. Some other pieces of information that can be obtained from catch curves are: age at first entry into the fishery (recruitment), estimates of longevity, year-class strength, and estimates of total mortality. Obtaining an estimate of total mortality from catch curves is a critical component of many fishery stock assessments. Total mortality is the combination of mortality due to natural causes and mortality caused by fishing efforts.

The age at first reproduction and the size and age structure of a population are two important biological indicators of the health of fish stocks. For example, if the average length of a given age of fish decreases over time, managers assume that growth overfishing is evident. Growth overfishing occurs when fisheries catch most of the older fish or larger, faster growing fish at a given age. The result is that younger and slower growing fish are left to reproduce. After several generations, only younger and slower growing fish remain in the population. The result is a lowered mean length and weight per given age of fish, and a reduced value of the fishery.

Recruitment overfishing is of greater concern to fishery managers. For example, if most of the fish in a stock spawn for the first time when they are 10 years old, and many of the fish caught are less than 10 years old, then the potential exists to catch a large proportion of the stock before a majority of animals can spawn. This is a form of recruitment overfishing, which means more fish are removed from the stock than can replace themselves. When this type of recruitment overfishing is evident, managers often move to protect the smaller fish by imposing minimum size limits or mesh-size restrictions in an effort to conserve the spawning stock. Unfortunately, protecting small fish does not necessarily prevent another type of recruitment overfishing. Recruitment overfishing also occurs when the fishery harvests too many large, old fish. This reduces the production of larval fish because smaller fish produce fewer eggs than larger fish.

Once the status of a stock is known, fishery managers employ a variety of techniques to maintain the health of the stock. These include use of one or more of the following management strategies:

- Fishing gear restrictions or prohibitions,
- Fleetwide quotas on total fish taken per season,
- Seasons and/or area closures (e.g., refuges),
- Individual quotas on total fish taken (e.g., commercial IFQs, recreational bag limits),
- Size, species, or sex limits, or
- Restricting or limiting access to a fishery.

Once these strategies have been enacted in the form of statutes or regulations and are enforced in the respective fisheries, fishery scientists have a variety of tools at their disposal to assess whether a fishery has met or exceeded allowable biological catch or is presently underutilized. Models are also available to evaluate the performance of a fishery relative to some estimate of optimum economic yield. Most of these methods and models involve some

fairly sophisticated mathematical derivations based on mortality rates and age structure of the population. Unfortunately, even with the array of tools used by fisheries managers, many species have been overfished. There are many reasons for this, some of which are:

1. Difficulties in obtaining accurate landing information about species, especially for new or emerging fisheries. Most species sold at the dock are recorded as belonging to a market category. For instance, the “red” rockfish category recorded by fish buyers can contain species such as vermilion rockfish, starry rockfish, or canary rockfish, which have different life histories and stock sizes;
2. Difficulties in obtaining adequate biological data. Basic life history information, such as age and growth, mortality estimates, replacement rates are either lacking or difficult to estimate;
3. Absence of long-term data sets needed to effectively model or estimate the size of fish stocks. Unfortunately, few long-term data sets are available for fished populations. Much of what is known or suspected about Monterey Bay species is derived from relatively short-term data sets. In addition, many of those short-term data sets reside in a variety of locations and are not easily collected for analysis. Time lags between emergence of fisheries, the establishments of data sets, then formal evaluation of the data also limits effectiveness of models;
4. Difficulties in managing mixed fisheries, or fisheries in which more than one species is caught at the same time. In these cases, management options are more limited if the stock of one of the species caught is healthy while the other is depleted;
5. Spatial and temporal variation in fish abundance, leading to localized depletions;
6. Environmental changes that affect survival of year-classes;
7. Difficulties in estimating bycatch and discard of animals inadvertently caught while fishing for the target species;
8. Societal desire to maximize short-term economic gain to coastal communities;
9. Overcapitalization of the fleet (too much fishing power), causing the total allowable catch (TAC) to be exceeded before managers can close the fishery;
10. Enforcement problems, such as poaching.

Regulatory Process

In the United States, most fish stocks are a common property resource, meaning there is open access for utilization of the resource. Often in the case of common property resources, many harvesters tend to maximize their short-term benefits, without regard to long-term costs. When this occurs, each participant in the fishery has little incentive to conserve the resource. If they don't harvest their share or more, another fisher will simply harvest the resource. Historically, common property resources have thus been subject to inadvertent overexploitation, a phenomenon that has been called the "tragedy of the commons."

This situation, combined with the substantial social, economic, and ecological impact of fisheries, provides the rationale for fisheries management. Regulations pertaining to the commercial harvest of species are derived from a combination of federal statutes and state law. Fisheries for species that are migratory in nature, occur entirely in federal waters, or that have wide distributions are regulated by federal laws administered by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Commercial fisheries for many species taken within state waters are regulated by the California Fish and Game Commission, as mandated by the MLMA of 1999 (see Marine Life Management Act Section for more information). In cases where there is no state law or where state and federal laws overlap, federal statutes usually take precedence. In special cases, such as for some salmon species and for specific ecological reserves, local or tribal regulations provide guidance for fishery managers. An additional special regulatory process occurs when a stock of fish is harvested by more than one nation. In these cases, international fishery management councils may be established. Often, when just two countries are involved, fishery management will be determined through a treaty process. In some cases, the two nations do not agree on stock estimates or management strategies and the fishery is regulated by both (or neither) country.

Pacific Fishery Management Council

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act (FCMA) of 1976 created the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC). The PFMC is one of eight regional fishery management councils that were created to advise NMFS on fisheries management issues; it has responsibility for federal fisheries management on the West Coast of the United States. The voting members of the council include a representative from each state fishery management agency on the West Coast (including Idaho), a mandatory appointee from each state, at-large appointees from the states in the region, and the regional director of NMFS. The councils produce fishery management plans (FMPs) with public input, which describe the nature and problems of a fishery along with regulatory recommendations to conserve it. After approval by the Secretary of Commerce, regulations that implement management measures in the fishery management plans become federal law and are enforced by NMFS and state agencies.



National Marine Fisheries Service

The National Marine Fisheries Service is part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), an agency in the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is the federal agency with primary responsibility for implementing fisheries management strategies in the United States EEZ from 3 to 200 miles from shore. The National Marine Fisheries Service has a broad array of duties relating to marine resource management. A primary responsibility is to provide scientific information for use in fishery management plans. Researchers from NMFS conduct field surveys to gather basic biological data, publish scientific articles, and learn about the variables that influence survival at critical stages in the life history of a species. They collect information about critical habitats for a species as well. Additionally, NMFS scientists model population dynamics of species, using data from research cruises and fishery landings. The models are then used to develop stock assessments, which are delivered to the NMFS staff that supports the PFMC regulatory process. Once fishery management plans are enacted, and regulations promulgated, NMFS fishery enforcement officers work with the U.S. Coast Guard and coastal states to enforce regulations.

California Department of Fish and Game

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has primary management responsibility for species that occur entirely within the state's three-mile territorial sea, and also those that are not managed by the federal government. The California Department of Fish and Game has several important functions in the process of fishery management within the state. One of their primary duties is to regulate fishing activity through licensing of fishing vessels and fishers. The California Department of Fish and Game is responsible for the enforcement of existing statutes and regulations regarding fisheries within the state. The California Department of Fish and Game also collects a great deal of fishery data by monitoring regional fisheries, both aboard vessels and dockside. The data collected from these monitoring programs are used to make recommendations to the PFMC and State Fish and Game Commission, publish scientific articles, maintain long-running databases of catch statistics for all regions, and produce annual commercial and recreational fishing reports and provide information to the public.

Following preparation of a fishery management plan by PFMC and subsequent approval by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, the director of CDFG for the state of California has several options to conform state law or regulations to the fishery management plan. These options center on the ability of the director to either suspend existing laws and regulations that conflict with the fishery management plan, modify existing laws and regulations to conform with the fishery management plan, or enact new laws for a limited period (up to one year) to comply with the fishery management plan. In rare cases, the state will choose to enact regulations that do not comply with fishery management plans.

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Authorized by Congress in 1947, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission is one of three interstate commissions dedicated to resolving fishery issues. Representing California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Alaska, the PSMFC does not have regulatory or management authority; rather it serves as a forum for discussion, and works for coastwide consensus on management strategies. PSMFC also addresses issues that fall outside state or regional management council jurisdiction. PSMFC's goal is to promote and support policies and actions directed at the conservation, development, and management of fishery resources of mutual concern to member states through a coordinated regional approach to research, monitoring, and utilization. It plays an important role on the West Coast by being the primary agency responsible for collecting, storing, and providing fishery data from each state for coastwide analysis.

Fishing Organizations

Fishing organizations play an important role in fishery management. In addition to the information generated from fishery logbooks, many fishers work closely with researchers and fishery managers to design studies and collect information necessary to craft effective fishery regulations. Often, fishing organizations help by encouraging their members to collect and provide additional information for managers.

In addition to numerical data, fishers provide information on the practical aspects of fisheries. Often, state and federal fishery plans and regulations can have several different designs that meet similar management objectives. Individual fishers and fishing organizations provide resource managers with ideas for regulations to maximize economic returns or to improve the flexibility of fishing options. In this manner, input from fishers often helps make management actions more practical and enforceable.

Public Involvement

The state legislature, CDFG, NMFS, environmental organizations, and the general public make recommendations to PFMC about FMPs affecting federally managed species. Public hearings are required by law to be held in the area of the fishery under consideration after recommendation of a fishery management plan by PFMC to the Secretary of Commerce. It is the responsibility of the director of the Fish and Game Commission to arrange times and places for the public hearings as well as provide adequate notice to the public and appropriate policy committees in the state legislature.

Key Fisheries Legislation

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act/Sustainable Fisheries Act

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Public Law 94-265) was enacted by Congress in 1976. This law authorized the federal management of fishing from 3 to 200 miles offshore, an area denoted as the EEZ. The main objectives of this act were to provide sustainable fishery management, promote stock conservation, and eliminate foreign fishing activity within the EEZ. The FCMA set up eight regional fishery management councils to adopt and implement management plans in conjunction with NMFS. Each regional fishery management council consists of state, federal, and regional representatives with expertise in marine fisheries and the special concerns of the region. The interests of fishermen and the general public are also incorporated through individual participation in the regulatory process. The council is required to create a plan that aims to protect fish stocks and at the same time allocate fishery resources to maintain the sustainable harvest of a fishery by commercial and recreational fishing interests.



Table 5. Species included in the Nearshore Finfish Fishery Management Plan.

Common Name	Scientific Name
Black-and-Yellow Rockfish	<i>Sebastes chrysomelas</i>
Black Rockfish	<i>Sebastes melanops</i>
Blue Rockfish	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>
Brown Rockfish	<i>Sebastes auriculatus</i>
Cabezon	<i>Scorpaenichthys marmoratus</i>
Calico Rockfish	<i>Sebastes dalli</i>
California Scorpionfish	<i>Scorpaena guttata</i>
California Sheephead	<i>Semicossyphus pulcher</i>
China Rockfish	<i>Sebastes nebulosus</i>
Copper Rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus</i>
Gopher Rockfish	<i>Sebastes carnatus</i>
Grass Rockfish	<i>Sebastes rastrelliger</i>
Kelp Greenling	<i>Hexagrammos decagrammus</i>
Kelp Rockfish	<i>Sebastes atrovirens</i>
Monkeyface Prickleback	<i>Cebidichthys violaceus</i>
Olive Rockfish	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>
Quillback Rockfish	<i>Sebastes maliger</i>
Rock Greenling	<i>Hexagrammos lagocephalus</i>
Treefish	<i>Sebastes serripes</i>

management alternatives. Specifically, FMPs are to include detailed descriptions of each fishery, both biologically and historically, habitat requirements of fishes, and information on bycatch and discards within the fishery. Prevention of overfishing and the rebuilding of depressed stocks are primary concerns of each FMP, so status of each fishery will also be classified, setting standards to determine when a fishery is considered depressed or overfished. For a good description of the MLMA, see Weber and Heneman's 2000 book: *Guide to California's Marine Life Management Act*.

Currently, FMPs are being developed for five fisheries (market squid, nearshore finfish, white seabass, abalone, and Pacific Ocean shrimp), but the Department has recognized the nearshore finfish (Table 5) and white seabass fisheries as most in need of FMPs. Whereas the state's major white seabass fishery is in Southern California, fifteen of the nineteen species listed as nearshore finfish show significant catches in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. As a group, the nineteen species show a rise in catches in the MBNMS coincident with the rise of the Central California live-fish fishery that relies heavily upon nearshore fishes. Recreational catches, after a peak in 1997, have shown a decline within the Sanctuary (Fig. 17).

Marine Life Protection Act

The idea of setting aside specific areas of marine habitat for restricted purposes is long-standing, but the explicit use of marine protected areas (MPA) as an alternative management scheme for worldwide marine ecosystems has only been seriously considered since the late 1950s. California established its first MPA (the Point Lobos Marine Reserve) in 1960. In California, MPAs are considered a subset of Marine Managed Areas (MMAs) and are distinguished from

the latter by the inclusion of regulations concerning the harvest of marine organisms that are more restrictive than the general CDFG regulations. Since the 1950s, a total of 104 state and federal MMAs have been established in Californian waters, of which 52 are considered MPAs.

In February of 1999, the MLPA was added to the California Fish and Game Code to explicitly deal with the use of MPAs to conserve marine resources in California. Similar to the MLMA, the MLPA recognizes the educational, recreational, scientific, socioeconomic, and environmental importance of California's living marine resources, and the need to protect them from potentially destructive entities such as pollution, coastal development, and other destructive human activities. Along with the modification of current MPAs, a process of abolishing or establishing new MPAs is also required by the MLPA. The following is a list of six primary goals of the MLPA to be used as guidelines to formulate MPAs:

1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.
2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.
3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.
4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in California waters for their intrinsic value.
5. To ensure that California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.
6. To ensure that the state's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network.

The California Department of Fish and Game has begun a process to designate MPAs that fulfill the requirements of the MLPA. Constituent involvement and input is important in the plan preparation, with all final decisions and recommendations based on the best available scientific knowledge. The following components are to be included in the plan:

- Recommendations for the extent and type of habitat that should be included in MPAs.
- A list of species and groups of organisms that may benefit from MPAs—including their habitat and ecological requirements and dependent oceanographic conditions.
- An analysis of current MPAs, with recommendations on the adequate size, number, and siting of each MPA, and proposed alternatives to current networking of MPAs.
- Recommendations for monitoring and research within the proposed MPA network to assist in the adaptive management of the system.
- Recommendations for management and enforcement to ensure appropriate and effective protection of each area under designation.

Further information can be found by visiting the CDFG's website (www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa).

Current Management Issues

Maintenance of Economically Viable Fisheries

Commercial and recreational fisheries have provided economic benefits and an important cultural heritage to the Monterey Bay region. A current concern is the need to ensure that fisheries maintain economic viability so they can continue to provide social and economic benefits to this region. Fishery products are now shipped all over the globe. In most cases, fishery products purchased from a distant country cost less than comparable products from this region. Prices of fuel, insurance, and supplies needed to operate and maintain vessels have increased. These increased costs have caused some fishers to move or go out of business, and most fishers are attempting to harvest as much as they can to increase their revenues. Aquaculture has grown substantially in recent years, competing directly with the fishing industry by offering consumers an alternate source of seafood. Additionally, the fishing industry has seen a decline in subsidies, such as federal funding for dredging of ports, funding for weather buoys at sea, or low-interest loans for vessel construction and maintenance. One way to help maintain the economic viability of fisheries is for coastal communities to recognize the special needs of fishery and fish processing businesses. Future land use and fishery management decisions should account for the need for local fishers and processors to operate more effectively so they can compete in world markets. Increased harvest of underutilized species is another way that fisheries may adapt and maintain economic viability. Fishers can also increase or add value to existing target species through strategies such as export marketing, or selling live fish to local fish markets and restaurants. The fishing industry, coastal communities, and consumers will all benefit by long-term sustainable fisheries.



Overcapitalization

In the last 30 years, the rapid increase in electronic fish finding and catching technology, combined with an increased number and size of fishing vessels, has led to greater harvesting capability than fish populations are capable of supporting. The increase in global trading of fishery resources has exacerbated this problem. Most fishery scientists agree that the excess of fishing capacity is the primary cause for overfishing in the world, and that fleet overcapacity is the single most important factor threatening the long-term viability of harvested fish populations. Fishing capacity needs to be brought into line with harvest capability in most marine fisheries. In addition to biological problems, excess fishing capacity can pose social problems as well, such as conflicts for fishing space. The Monterey squid fishery is an example of social conflicts caused by a large number of boats fishing in a small area with no set catch quota.

On a global scale, fishery managers have been addressing the problem of overcapitalization by using a variety of management tools such as limited entry programs, harvest rotations, gear limitations, vessel buy-back strategies, and individual quota systems. The global experience to date indicates that one technique alone (e.g., limited entry) is not sufficient to limit overcapitalization.

Catch Allocation

When the harvest of a stock is restricted, fishers often find themselves competing for fish. In these cases, fishery managers attempt to protect fishery resources while equitably allocating the allowable catch. To do so, fishery biologists first determine the TAC for a stock based on the best available scientific information. Resource managers then allocate harvest to different sectors of the fishing industry in an attempt to maximize economic benefit to local communities while reducing the risk of overfishing. In an attempt to be fair, catch allocations are often partitioned on the basis of historical catch records. Ideally, the entire allocation for a fishery will not exceed the scientific estimate of total allowable catch. Unfortunately, this is not always the case because of political, social, and economic considerations.

One of the innovations regarding allocation that has achieved some success around the world is the implementation of individual fishery quotas or shares (IFQs or IFSs). Individual fishery quotas are similar to the ancient practice of “catch rights” in which a fisher is entitled to a certain proportion of the TAC. Some countries have found that the IFQ system improves economic performance, while reducing social conflicts and the potential for excess harvest associated with overcapitalized fisheries. Catch IFQs are usually implemented along with a limited entry system that places a cap on the number of vessels allowed in a fishery. After the initial allocation set up by the IFQ system, market demand guides actual fishing effort and economic return of participating fishers. Although IFQs have proven to be effective in some situations, they have received limited acceptance in the United States because many fishers believe IFQs concentrate fishing (and thus market) power in the hands of a few people.

Multispecies Fisheries

Many fishes and invertebrates occur together in time and space, and thus are often harvested together. In many multispecies fisheries, vessels harvest both abundant and depleted populations of fishes. In the groundfish fishery, for example, rockfishes, flatfishes, and roundfishes (e.g., lingcod, sablefish, or Pacific hake) are often caught together in a single trawl tow. The species in these groups each have different life history strategies and population abundances. Some of the species caught in multispecies trawl fisheries are long-lived, have low reproduction rates, and currently have low population sizes. Others are fast growing, highly productive, and are currently abundant. Managing trawl fisheries on a species-specific basis can thus result in excessive waste of abundant fishes or overharvest of depleted species.

The issue that resource managers face is how to maximize catches of abundant species while minimizing catches of species with low population sizes. In response to this issue, PFMC managers have enacted limited entry programs and set trip limits on species complexes, or co-occurring species groups. Many rockfish species, for example, are managed as part of the *Sebastes* complex with catches regulated by limited entry, trip limits, and cumulative catch limits by month. A problem with this management strategy is that it limits catches of abundant species; and limits the options of individual fishers. Many fishers have the capability to change gear type or target species in order to increase landings of species with high abundances or values, often reducing fishing pressure on low abundance species. With the limited entry system, a fisher may be prohibited from changing gear type to participate in a fishery for which an entry license is unavailable. Thus, fishers are sometimes forced to remain within a given fishery, even if fish abundances and landings are low.

Bycatch of Nontarget Species

The inadvertent catch (bycatch) of unwanted fish or invertebrates that are captured together with target species is a problem in some fisheries, especially those using bottom trawl gear. This potential waste or inefficient use of marine species may have large economic and ecological consequences. For example, the removal of an important food item (prey species) through bycatch may adversely affect another species, which eats that prey. In addition to the unknown ecological consequences of harvesting nontarget species, bycatch can be a problem when undersized commercial or sport fish species are collected. These small fishes may be of the same species for which the fisher is targeting, but have no economic value, or may be below the minimum size limit imposed by management agencies and therefore be illegal to catch. The bycatch of undersized species may increase fishing mortality estimates and thus decrease the amount of larger fish available for harvest.

Bycatch occurs in almost all fisheries. To minimize mortality caused by bycatch, managers implement tools such as minimum mesh size restrictions, season or area restrictions, and other management methods. A management method that has been suggested by some scientists is to implement individual bycatch quotas, whereby a vessel stops fishing after a level of bycatch is reached. Placing a limit on the bycatch of each vessel encourages skippers to fish in areas in which their catch is “cleaner” (has less bycatch). Some insightful fishers are also experimenting with new net configurations, inserts, or designs to reduce bycatch in trawl fisheries. Managers are also exploring new ways to gain insight into actual bycatch rates by issuing experimental fishery permits (EFP). These permits allow fishing under relaxed regulations in order to provide on-board observers opportunities to measure the actual amount of bycatch and discard (see below) occurring within a fishery.

One particularly notable example of high bycatch within the MBNMS is the commercial set gill net fishery. Set gill nets are an effective way to catch California halibut, but they have also contributed to mortality of sea birds, harbor porpoise, and sea otters. Karin Forney of the NMFS estimated that from 1991 to 2000, 16,000 common murrelets and 450 harbor porpoise accidentally died in the set gill net fishery. Evidence of continued high bycatch of birds prompted the CDFG in late 2000 to enact a series of emergency closures to move the set gill net fishery to waters deeper than sixty fathoms in Central California. There is a new regulation being proposed for permanent adoption that will restrict gill or trammel nets to ocean waters which are sixty fathoms or greater in depth at mean lower low water from Point Reyes to Point Arguello, essentially closing down the Central California halibut set gill net fishery in this area.

Discard

Discard is a specific type of bycatch, as denoted by the California Fish and Game Code as fish taken but not retained in a fishery. In almost all fisheries, some fish are discarded at sea. The numbers, types, and sizes of the species that are discarded are influenced by management regulations and market conditions. For example, some fishers discard undersized or lower-valued fish or invertebrates to meet size or sex regulations, remain within quotas, or make space for economically more valuable species. This occurs in all fisheries. For some species, mortality associated with discard is low and thus is not considered to be a problem. For other species such as rockfishes, however, mortality related to discard is very high. When unreported, these discards make fishing mortality more difficult to estimate, making stock assessments more uncertain and management decisions more challenging. Unreported discard is of special concern for highly regulated or protected species.

Many management techniques are used to lessen the problem of discard. One of the most common methods of lowering discards is the use of selective gear, such as traps or nets with larger mesh size. This method is most effective with stationary nets. As nets are pulled through the water, the net fills and effective mesh size decreases, thus lowering the selectivity of the net. Area or seasonal closures are successfully used for some species, but may simply redirect the mortality to different areas or fishes. In a few cases, managers have crafted regulations to favor fisheries that are more selective and result in fewer discards.

A more drastic measure is the total prohibition of discards, or enforcement of full use of catch. This technique is not currently in use because it would be difficult to enforce and greatly reduces profitability of fisheries. If fishers were prohibited from discarding any of their catch, average total value of landings would be reduced, trip lengths would be shortened, and additional equipment and production costs would be required to process the additional sizes and species that are not offset by the added value of the products. One of the most successful techniques for reducing fish discard is employed by experienced fishers who reduce discard by knowing when, where, and how to fish for target species.

Enforcement

Fishery management agencies have several ways to monitor fishing practices, quotas, and regulation compliance. One of the principal methods is the use of fishery logbooks, which are voluntary in some fisheries, and required in others. In fisheries with mandatory logbook programs, fishers are required to keep a log with information on when and where they fished, how long they fished, the gear they used, and the estimated catch by species during a given fishing trip. These data are then collected and used with landing data to evaluate trends in catch. Occasionally, management agencies institute observer programs to collect additional information at sea on abundance, size, and species composition of catches and discards.

All fish buyers are required to provide CDFG with records of the type and amount of product they purchase from fishers. These records are termed landing receipts or “pink tickets”; they are collected and summarized by CDFG, then collated on a coastwide basis by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. This record keeping system is the primary method by which management agencies determine if catch quotas are met or exceeded. This method is obviously contingent on fishers and buyers providing accurate information. State and federal fisheries enforcement officers and auditors periodically visit docks and processing plant offices to monitor catches and watch for violations of regulations. Fishery biologists also get some feeling for regulation compliance as they collect biological information at the dock.

The California Department of Fish and Game, NMFS, and U.S. Coast Guard enforcement officers work together to patrol fishing grounds, board fishing vessels, and check for violations

mortality of salmon and a decreased yield to the fishery. Increased take of hooked salmon by sea lions in both of these fisheries in 1998 may likely be a result of the 1997–98 El Niño, which caused major declines in the availability of common sea lion prey, such as squid, hake, and herring, in the Monterey Bay. Loss to commercial fisheries has also been estimated. Annual loss of revenue in Monterey Bay from sea lion/angler interaction in the commercial salmon fishery ranges from \$4,300 to \$10,800 per fisher, depending on the number of people fishing in Monterey Bay. Combining the other ports within the MBNMS, total annual losses may reach \$2 million or more. Similarly, there is a direct competition between sea otters and abalone fishers. In some locations, the combined harvest by sea otters and humans has severely depleted abalone populations.

Habitat Loss

Increased habitat loss from human activities is a problem of utmost concern to fishery managers and members of the fishing community. Of primary importance is the loss of essential fish habitat that is critical for certain life history stages of species, such as spawning or rearing. In order for fish stocks to remain healthy, they must have adequate spawning, rearing, and feeding habitat. Prey species also need adequate habitats and resources in which to complete their life cycles.

Habitats most threatened by human activities include estuaries and coastal wetlands, eelgrass and kelp beds, and rocky banks. Coastal wetlands and estuarine waters are among the most sensitive, most accessible, and therefore most altered of coastal habitats. They also contain valuable nursery areas for early life stages of many marine species. These important habitats are easily degraded by urban and agricultural development and runoff, and water diversion projects, all of which not only alter habitat, but also drastically reduce the water quality in these environments. Efforts are underway at many levels to reduce the amount of destruction and to restore valuable habitat resources off our coast, thereby enhancing our fisheries.

Fishing activity can negatively impact habitat complexity and in turn affect the species composition and diversity of an area. Fishing activity such as bottom trawling alters structural habitat, important to some species for the completion of their life cycles, and disturbs the benthic community. Since the advent of roller gear in the late 1970s, fishers have been able to drag nets over rougher terrain than before. Trawl nets towed over rocky bottoms alter both species composition and the physical structure of habitats through the direct removal of benthic fauna and structure making habitat more homogenous and less productive. There is compelling evidence that trawling over hard or complex bottom habitats is detrimental. There is less information about the effects of trawling over soft bottom habitats. Generally, trawling is now prohibited in California state waters (within 3 miles).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AFFECTING FISH POPULATIONS

From both a biological and economic viewpoint, a current description of local fisheries is only a snapshot in time of a larger picture. The physical environment in the Monterey Bay region is very dynamic and greatly influences the population sizes of resident fishes, as indicated by the fact that fish populations have fluctuated for centuries, long before fishing became a factor in stock abundance. For several marine species, population trends in the last 200 years are highly correlated with environmental factors. The dominant oceanographic feature in this area, the California Current, has fluctuated in strength and productivity every 10 years or so for the last 100 years. Zooplankton abundance in the California Current, for example, declined by more than 70% from 1950–91. Paleontological records suggest that larger scale environmental fluctuations have occurred at approximately 55 to 60 year intervals. As the environment has fluctuated, the dominant species inhabiting marine waters off MBNMS, and resulting ecological relationships have also changed. Correspondingly, in the last 100 years, the primary species or species groups, harvested by commercial fisheries have changed several times, as did the composition and character of the vessels used, and people participating in commercial fisheries.


The results of decadal, or longer, oceanographic shifts are evident in fish populations beyond the time of actual environmental change, producing long-term cycles of highs and lows in abundance. One such regime shift in the North Pacific is determined by the mean position and intensity of a seasonal low-pressure area known as the Aleutian Low. In the North Pacific, a clockwise-flowing Central Pacific gyre and a counterclockwise-flowing Alaskan gyre drive water masses. The boundary between these two circulation systems is called the Subarctic Current (or West Wind Drift) and is located at 45–50° N latitude. The Subarctic Current divides into two branches as it nears the coast of North America. One branch, the California Current, flows south, the other, the Alaska Current, flows north.

During years that the Aleutian Low intensifies, the location of the boundary between the Central Pacific gyre and the Alaskan gyre moves southward. In those years, the cooler, productive subarctic waters travel shoreward and northward with the Alaska Current. High primary production in the Alaska Current



FISHERY STATUS OF SELECTED SPECIES

More than 200 species are harvested from waters in the MBNMS. In an earlier chapter, we reported statistical trends for commercial landings of the most frequently caught species from 1981–2000. In this section, we describe the status of knowledge about fisheries and stocks for those species.



We grouped species that are caught in similar habitats to provide an estimate of the ecological changes occurring in each habitat type for the period 1981–2000 (Tables 8–12). Five major habitat types were used: 1) nearshore rocky reef and kelp, 2) nearshore soft bottom, 3) deep rocky shelf and slope, 4) deep soft bottom shelf and slope, and 5) open water habitats. Nearshore habitats were defined to be in water depths less than 70 m (Fig. 1). Rocky habitats included mixed soft and hard bottoms.

We grouped species into habitat categories based on known habitat associations and known depth distributions of each species. Some fish utilize a variety of habitats and have a wide depth distribution. In those cases, we placed the reported catch of that species into the habitat category in which it is typically caught. In some cases (e.g., lingcod), the species was caught in a variety of habitats with a variety of gear types. In those cases, we evenly distributed the reported catch into each habitat category.

We sub-divided species in open water habitats into three ecological sub-groups (small coastal pelagics, coastal migrants, and pelagic migrants), based on the life history characteristics of fishes harvested in that habitat. For all habitats, we reported total catches of all species, and also separately reported catches of invertebrates, vertebrates, and selected other taxonomic guilds. For each species, we summarize the fishery trends, relevant life history information, and stock status (if known).

Graphs of reported catches and ex-vessel value are provided; each graph also contains indications of relevant management actions and periods of recorded El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) events. This information is included to help identify factors besides fishing that may contribute to the rise and fall of catches. Management actions are labeled on each graph. A “G” on a graph, for example, indicates the start of a new commercial gear regulation. A “P” represents introduction of a new commercial permit requirement, such as a limited entry permit system. A “Q” indicates a management action related to a commercial fishery quota, and is usually a reduction in quota. An “S” indicates the implementation of a commercial size limit. Likewise, for the recreational graphs, “f” represents a fishing regulation, “g” a gear regulation, and “s/b” size or bag limit implementation. Appendices F and G include further details about regulations that are highlighted on the graphs.

Nearshore Rocky Reef and Kelp Habitats

Nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats are primarily located north and south of Monterey Bay, on the open coast in the MBNMS (Figures 2-4). These habitats usually contain nearly flat to high relief rock bottoms that are covered with kelp or other algae. Often, patches of sand, shell, or sandy mud surround the rocky areas. Nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats are almost exclusively fished using hook-and-line gear, pots or traps, or spears, because trawling and gill netting are prohibited near the California coast. In 1992, commercial fishing with set lines, vertical fish lines, and troll lines within 1 nautical mile of shore (except for halibut and salmon) was also banned. These nearshore habitats therefore have not been as commercially productive as the deeper habitats, comprising less than 2% of the total commercial landings at ports near the MBNMS from 1981–2000 (Table 7). However, nearshore rocky areas became more important in the 1990s as fishing effort greatly increased in these habitats. Annual commercial landings

of fishes from shallow rocky habitats averaged about 730,000 lb/yr from 1991–98, almost twice that of the annual landings in the 1980s. The large peak in landings in 1989 (Fig. 23) is attributable to an intense spike in red sea urchin catch (Fig. 24). Vertebrate landings from these habitats increased in the early 1990s because of increased participation in the open access hook-and-line and live-fish fisheries (Fig. 25). Subsequent declines in landings later in the decade reflected the decrease in fishing effort caused by increased regulations on nearshore rockfishes, cabezon, greenlings, and other species included in the nearshore fishery management plan (see MLMA section for list). Rock crab, red abalone, red sea urchin, lingcod, cabezon, and rockfishes comprise the majority of landings from nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats (Table 7). Most of these species were heavily fished in the 1990s, resulting in reduced species abundances. Now, fewer sea urchin are caught, red abalone fisheries are closed, and quotas of most nearshore fishes are low.



Table 7. Primary species landed in commercial fisheries in the MBNMS that were caught in nearshore rocky reef habitats, and the percentage that each species contributed to the landings from this habitat group and the total commercial landings in the MBNMS. Landings from nearshore rocky reef habitats period equaled 18.253 million pounds from 1981–2000. Total landings in all of the MBNMS equaled 1.14 billion pounds from 1981–2000.

Guild	Common Name	Scientific Name	% habitat	% total
Invertebrates				
Crustaceans	Rock crab	<i>Cancer</i> spp.	19.9	0.3
Mollusks	Abalone, red	<i>Haliotis rufescens</i>	7.5	0.1
	Octopus	<i>Octopus</i> spp.	0.5	< 0.1
Echinoderms	Urchin, red sea	<i>Strongylocentrotus franciscanus</i>	10.1	0.2
Vertebrates				
Hexagrammids	Kelp greenling	<i>Hexagrammos decagrammus</i>	0.2	< 0.1
	Lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	13.8	0.2
Scorpaenids	Black rockfish	<i>Sebastes melanops</i>	2.1	< 0.1
	Black-and-yellow rockfish	<i>Sebastes chrysomelas</i>	1.5	< 0.1
	Blue rockfish	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>	7.2	0.1
	Brown rockfish	<i>Sebastes auriculatus</i>	6.2	0.1
	China rockfish	<i>Sebastes nebulosus</i>	2.0	< 0.1
	Copper rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus (vexillaris)</i>	1.3	< 0.1
	Flag rockfish	<i>Sebastes rubrivinctus</i>	0.2	< 0.1
	Gopher rockfish	<i>Sebastes carnatus</i>	4.6	0.1
	Grass rockfish	<i>Sebastes rastrelliger</i>	2.3	< 0.1
	Kelp rockfish	<i>Sebastes atrovirens</i>	0.5	< 0.1
	Olive rockfish	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>	2.3	< 0.1
	Quillback rockfish	<i>Sebastes maliger</i>	0.3	< 0.1
	Rosy rockfish	<i>Sebastes rosaceus</i>	0.9	< 0.1
	Vermilion rockfish	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>	7.6	0.1
Cottids	Cabazon	<i>Scorpaenichthys marmoratus</i>	6.0	0.1
Labrids	California Sheephead	<i>Semicossyphus pulcher</i>	0.1	< 0.1
Other species	Surfperch spp.	Embiotocidae	2.9	< 0.1




Figure 23. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of all species within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 24. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of invertebrates within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 25. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of fishes within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Invertebrates

Rock Crab (*Cancer productus*, *C. antennarius*, and *C. anthonyi*)

Three species of rock crab (red, brown, and yellow) are harvested off California. These species are not separated in the landing statistics, so specific catches of individual rock crab species are difficult to distinguish. Rock crab is harvested using traps, and either landed alive for retail sale by fresh fish markets, or landed whole and sold as crab claws. The most common traps used in the rock crab commercial fishery are rectangular with 2 x 2 inch welded wire mesh. Traps are set and buoyed in 25–75 m of water in both open sandy areas and nearshore rocky habitats. Traps are usually retrieved 2–4 days after being set.

Rock crab landings have been reported since 1930, but landings were low until 1950. The rock crab fishery grew steadily through the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, with California landings peaking in 1986 at over 2.1 million lb. Historically, the majority of landings in the rock crab fishery have come from Southern California. In the 1980s, the fishery expanded

into areas north of Point Conception. Today, however, Southern California catches still account for more than 90% of total landings in the state. Low rock crab catches north of Morro Bay result from the combination of lower fishing effort and preferential harvest of Dungeness crab, rather than low availability of the species. Rock crab landings from ports near the MBNMS increased from 1981–92, then steadily decreased until present. Over the past twenty years, rock crab landings have averaged more than 181,000 lb/yr (Fig. 26). Rock crab catches represent 20% of the landings from nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats in the MBNMS from 1981–2000 (Table 7).

The commercial rock crab fishery is managed by the CDFG. A minimum harvest size for rock crab is set at a carapace width of 4.25 inches for all three rock crab species. The recreational fishery is regulated by a minimum size limit of 4.0 in and a bag limit of 35 per day. Rock crab traps are also required to have open rings with a diameter of 3.5 inches to allow for the escape of smaller individuals.

Little information is available on the population status of rock crab. Catch rates are known to have decreased in areas with extended high fishing pressure. Rock crab populations are probably more greatly affected, however, by variable larval survival and recruitment resulting from environmental factors.




Figure 26. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of rock crab within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Red Abalone (*Haliotis rufescens*)

Commercial diving for red abalone began in California in the late 1800s. During the 1940s, the coastline between Monterey and Point Conception produced commercial landings of about 720,000 red abalone annually. Historically, these Monterey area landings were the majority of the California commercial catch. In the 1950s, divers became more efficient at harvesting abalone with the advent of the “hookah” system. This system provides air to the diver through 90–150 m of hose connected to a full-face mask, and allows for longer dive times and a more thorough inspection of crevices. A large recreational fishery for abalone also developed throughout California in the 1950s. Between 1965 and 1985, the number of recreational divers, “shore pickers,” and free divers targeting abalone increased four-fold.

After 1970, commercial landings of abalone declined drastically, largely as a result of reduced populations caused by increased fishing pressure and an expansion of sea otter populations. With the decline of red abalone stocks, California fishers began targeting other abalone species, such as pink, black, green, and white. By the early 1980s, catches of these other species from Southern California waters comprised over three-fourths of the California abalone catch.

Red abalone catches in the MBNMS averaged 80,000 lb/yr from 1981–97, with an increasing trend in landings from 1981–87 and a subsequent decrease in catch from 1987–97 (Fig. 27). The decreasing trend in landings indicated a decreased abundance of red abalone stocks, and contributed to the decision to close this fishery in 1997. Currently, all commercial take of red abalone is prohibited in California. The recreational fishery is restricted to the coastline north of a line drawn through the center of the mouth of San Francisco Bay; no take of red abalone is permitted south of this line. Red abalone stocks throughout Central and Southern California became over-utilized because of a combination of increased harvest efficiency




Figure 27. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of red abalone within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

and market demand in the commercial fishery, and continued fishing effort by the recreational fishery. In addition, oceanographic changes, such as warm waters associated with El Niño events, can stress the abalone population. Predation by sea otters also placed additional pressure on red abalone stocks in Central California. Finally, all abalone populations in the southern half of California have been stressed by a bacterium, causing “withering foot syndrome.” The disease has been spreading northward and may pose a problem for abalone in the MBNMS.

Red Sea Urchin (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*)

Sea urchins, taken primarily for their gonads, are harvested using hookah gear similar to that used in the abalone fishery. The red sea urchin is the main urchin species currently harvested off the West Coast of North America. The fishery developed in Southern California in the early 1970s when sea urchin gonads were exported to Japan. Fishery managers also encouraged the fishery as a way to reduce fishing pressure on abalones and to reduce grazing by urchins on valuable kelp beds.

The sea urchin fishery grew steadily through the 1970s with landings reaching 40 million lb in 1987. By 1996, the sea urchin fishery was the most valuable fishery in California. Prior to 1985, the bulk of the landings came from the Northern Channel Islands and off the Southern California coast. Continued high fishing pressure, as well as El Niño conditions between 1982 and 1984, led to lowered catches in the southern half of the state. Total California landings were maintained during this time by the expansion of the sea urchin fishery into Northern California. From 1985 to 1988, Northern California landings increased from 1.9–30.4 million lb. Extremely high landings were evident in 1989; this peak in landings has been attributed to an increased export demand and high monetary exchange at the time. Commercial landings throughout California in 1999 to-

taled 14 million lb and were worth more than 13 million dollars, making this fishery third highest in overall earnings. Although the sea urchin fishery has remained productive and lucrative since the late 1980s, total landings and catch per unit effort (CPUE) have declined, especially in Central and Northern California. Red sea urchin landings at ports near the MBNMS averaged 97,000 lb/yr from 1981–2000; however since 1995, landings have been below 27,000 lb/yr (Fig. 28). Recent declines have been attributed to a reduction in permits issued, declines in kelp abundance as a result of El Niño warm water conditions, reported abundance of illegal size and low quality sea urchins, bad weather in Northern California; and some shift in fishing effort from California to Alaska.

In addition to fishing pressure, larval survival has a large impact on the status of sea urchin populations. Annual recruitment is greatly dependent on the density of adults and fate of larvae as ocean currents carry them either offshore or into suitable nearshore habitats for settlement. Ocean conditions in the Southern California Bight appear to be especially favorable for relatively consistent recruitment. Recruitment in North-




Figure 28. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of sea urchin within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

ern California, however, is less predictable, and urchin populations tend to exhibit cyclical patterns of rapid increases followed by rapid declines. Predation by sea otters also placed additional pressure on red sea urchin stocks in Central California. Surveys by CDFG biologists indicate that in Northern California, red sea urchin are currently about one-third as abundant as they were prior to the onset of the commercial fishery.

The sea urchin fishery is managed by the CDFG through the use of a limited entry system, seasonal closures, and size limits. The sea urchin fishing season extends through most of the year, with certain days of the week closed during specific months. Urchins harvested in Southern and Northern California must have shell diameters larger than 3.25 and 3.5 in, respectively.

Vertebrates

Nearshore Rockfishes (*Sebastes* species)

Rockfishes are a dominant and ecologically important component of nearshore rocky reefs and kelp forests, with about 15 species commonly taken in the nearshore habitats of the MBNMS. They range from solitary, territorial, substrate-associated individuals to mid-water

schooling species. Limited studies of their movements reach the general conclusion that many nearshore rockfishes do not migrate long distances and depend on their larval and pelagic juvenile stages for dispersal. This may limit these species' ability to repopulate depleted reefs. These traits, along with late ages of maturity and long lives (Appendix H), make rockfishes particularly susceptible to overfishing.

Subsistence fishing for nearshore rockfishes has existed for millennia in the Monterey Bay area, with records of rockfish otoliths prevalent in excavated middens around the bay. Recreational fishing for nearshore rockfishes has been recorded since 1875. Increased fishing pressure in the 1960s caused a shift from nearshore rockfishes to some of the deeper species, though pressure has recently shifted back to the nearshore with the decline of offshore species and the increase in the live-fish fishery. Commercial landings fluctuated at levels below 400,000 lb in the 1980s, then increased sharply in the early 1990s, when the live-fish fishery expanded to Central California (Fig. 29). Annual commercial landings of fishes from shallow rocky habitats averaged about




Figure 29. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of rockfishes within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 30. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of blue rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

utable to misidentification of yellowtail rockfish (see concomitant decrease in reported yellowtail rockfish landings in Fig. 77– p. 85. Also, general trends in decreased nearshore catches after 1998 are attributable to reduced fishing effort, caused by more restrictive regulations implemented because of concerns about possible overuse of these nearshore species (Figs. 25 and 29).




Figure 32. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of black-and-yellow rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 34. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of China rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

average of below 1,000 lb per month. These regulations are reflected in the large drop in catches of nearshore rockfishes in 1999 and 2000. To date, the only nearshore rockfish stock to be assessed is the black rockfish, mostly because of its importance in Oregon fisheries. Copper, flag, quillback, and vermilion rockfishes are important components of nearshore rocky habitats; these species are




Figure 36. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of gopher within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 38. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of kelp rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

to get into the potentially treacherous shallow rocky reefs and surf zones. Though traditional commercial fishery pressure is relatively low in the nearshore, a combination of high recreational fishing and the intense growth of the live-fish fishery in the past decade may have put unsustainable fishing pressure on these species. As recognition of this concern and the importance of rockfish to the nearshore envi-

to get into the potentially treacherous shallow rocky reefs and surf zones. Though traditional commercial fishery pressure is relatively low in the nearshore, a combination of high recreational fishing and the intense growth of the live-fish fishery in the past decade may have put unsustainable fishing pressure on these species. As recognition of this concern and the importance of rockfish to the nearshore envi-





Figure 40. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of quillback rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.



ronment, 13 of the 19 designated vulnerable nearshore fishes included in the MLMA Nearshore Fishery Management Plan (FMP) are rockfishes.

Recreational catches of nearshore rockfishes, as reflected in the CPFV landings (Fig. 21), declined during the 1990s, along with a slight but consistent drop in CPUE (Fig. 42). In 1999, size limits were imposed for most nearshore rockfishes, and in 2000, additional gear regulations and area closures brought both catch and effort down.

Recreational catches of nearshore rockfishes, as reflected in the CPFV landings (Fig. 21), declined during the 1990s, along with a slight but consistent drop in CPUE (Fig. 42). In 1999, size limits were imposed for most nearshore rockfishes, and in 2000, additional gear regulations and area closures brought both catch and effort down.




Figure 42. Recreational catch per unit effort from 1981–2000 of total rockfish within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

mean size may be due to successful recruitment and a corresponding increase in the numbers of small fish available to anglers. The overall trend of decreasing lengths though, along with a decrease in average weight, is suspected for the other nearshore species as well (e.g., mean lengths of olive rockfish declined 9% in the same period). Future management of the nearshore rockfishes by the California Department of Fish and Game will address these recreational fishery trends, as well as the commercial trends, in an attempt to promote sustainable nearshore fisheries.

rockfish in the MBNMS seems to be relatively stable, but potentially stressed. One notable trend is a decrease in average total length of blue rockfish. From 1960–94, blue rockfish lengths decreased nearly 7%. This decrease in

Kelp Greenling (*Hexagrammos decagrammus*)

Prior to 1988, there was very little commercial fishing effort for kelp greenling. The commercial fishery increased as the kelp greenling




Figure 43. Reported recreational landings of blue rockfish in Central and Northern California from 1981–2000. No RecFIN data are available for years 1990–1992. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 44. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of kelp greenling within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Kelp greenling is primarily caught in the recreational fishery, most often by private skiff anglers and divers. Recreational landings in Northern and Central California have declined since the early 1980s (Fig. 45). This decline may indicate a reduced population size of kelp greenling. Current CDFG recreational regulations include a size and bag limit for this species (Appendix G).

Lingcod is an important commercial species and comprises a substantial portion of the recreational landings in Northern and Central California. The majority of the commercial catch of lingcod has come from the net and trawl fisheries, but they are also taken in small numbers in the live-fish fishery. Commercial landings at ports near the MBNMS averaged 379,000 lb/yr from 1981–2000, however the catch has fluctuated greatly in the last 19 years, presumably due to the influx of periodic strong year-classes into the fishery (Fig. 46). This cyclical trend has also been evident coastwide since the onset of the fishery in the early 1900s (Fig. 47). Another indication of episodic recruitment is that mean lengths of both males and females decreased by approximately 10 cm between 1978–83 and 1992–93. Commercial landings at ports associated with the MBNMS of this species have declined steadily since 1993. This decline is most likely attributable to major regulation changes implemented in response to depressed lingcod stocks.

Kelp Greenling

ENSO ENSO ENSO ENSO

Landing (1,000 fish)

Year

s,b

Figure 1 is a dual-axis line graph showing the relationship between Lingcod landings and price from 1980 to 2000. The x-axis represents the year, ranging from 1980 to 2000. The left y-axis represents landings in thousands of pounds (1,000 lb), ranging from 0 to 900. The right y-axis represents price per pound in dollars (\$), ranging from 0 to 1.6. The solid line represents landings, and the dashed line represents price. The graph shows several peaks and troughs in landings, with notable peaks around 1982 (labeled G), 1989 (labeled G), and 1993 (labeled Q). The price generally increases over time, with a significant peak around 2000. ENSO events are marked at the top of the graph.

[illegible]

age of 143,000 lingcod were caught annually in the recreational fishery in Central and Northern California. The number of fish landed recreationally has decreased gradually since 1989. The decline in recreational landings in Northern California of lingcod may be a result of lowered size and bag limits, along with a decrease in fishing effort since the 1980s (Fig. 22). Recreational regulations include monthly restrictions, a two-hook limit, a bag limit of two, and a current minimum size of twenty-four inches total length.

Lingcod stocks along the West Coast have been heavily utilized. NMFS models suggest that from Northern Oregon to Southern British Columbia, lingcod stocks are overfished. In Southern Oregon and California, the commercial catch is predominately young fish, and 50% of the females are immature, leading to concerns about population status in this area as well. The 2000 PFMC lingcod stock assessment states that estimated lingcod biomass has increased from very low stock sizes in the mid-1990s to 36% and 49% of 1980s levels for the northern and southern stocks, respectively. Stocks remain low compared to historical levels. The high productivity of the lingcod may provide a means by

which the stocks can increase in the future. Lingcod fisheries are regulated in California by both state and federal agencies. For additional information see Leet et al. *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* (2001).

Cabazon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*)

Cabazon are highly sought by divers and recreational anglers. They do not make up a large portion of CPFV catches but are generally one of the larger fishes caught by anglers, with an average weight of about 4.4 lb. Cabazon are harvested in the commercial fishery primarily by hook-and-line and trap fishers. Commercial landings of cabazon in this region averaged 55,000 lb/yr from 1981–2000. Commercial landings increased substantially in 1994–95 (Fig. 48), due primarily to an increase in the nearshore live-fish fishery. They are caught mostly in the southern portion of the Sanctuary (near Morro Bay) in traps, which allow fishers to fish during bad weather.

Cabazon is one of the nineteen finfish species that will be managed under the Nearshore FMP. The cabazon was chosen based on the need for management and con-




Figure 47. Reported commercial landings of lingcod in California from 1916–1999.




Figure 48. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of cabazon within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

fishery would exceed its OY of 63,608 pounds. Recreational landings of cabezon have been highly variable since 1980 (Fig. 49), although landings from 1995–2000 have been consistently low. This may be related to a decreasing trend in effort since the 1980s. Sport catch of cabezon is regulated by size and bag limits under the general finfish provisions of the California Fish and Game Code (Appendix G).

The commercial fishery for surfperch is much smaller than the recreational fishery. Larger aggregating species, such as barred and redbtail surfperch, typically provide the bulk of the commercial surfperch landings in Northern and Central California. Commercial landings averaged 26,000 lb/yr from 1981–98 (Fig. 50). However, landings at ports near the MBNMS in 1999–2000 averaged less than 9,000 lb/yr. Limits imposed on hook-and-line gear in 1996 may have contributed to recent declines in catch. The current price per pound




Figure 50. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of surfperch within nearshore rocky reef and kelp habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

of surfperch is more than doubled that in 1980. This price increase can be attributed to take of surfperch in the live-fish fishery. Currently, there is no regulation of commercial landings of surfperch.

Surfperch are easily caught by both boat and shore based anglers and therefore constitute a significant portion of the recreational fishery. The majority of surfperch are landed by hook-and-line gear. Divers with pole spears and spear guns also frequently catch surfperch. Recreational landings in Northern and Central California have averaged 661,000 lb/yr from 1980–2000 (Fig. 51). The majority of this catch, however, is attributable to Northern California ports. Important species in sport fishery catches include barred, striped, redbtail, walleye, rubberlip, pile, and shiner surfperch. The majority of these catches occurred in shore based fisheries. Historical catch data show that between 1958–61 and 1981–86, surfperch average weight declined. Recreational surfperch catches in Northern and Central California have also declined from approximately 1.3 million lb in 1980 to 200,000 lb in 2000. These declines are attributed primarily to reductions in catches of barred and redbtail surfperch. Environmental variation, lower fecundity of smaller fish, habitat degradation, and increased fishing pressure may be contributing factors to the steady declines in surfperch populations. Current recreational limits on surfperch catches include a minimum size limit of 10 inches for redbtail surfperch, and daily recreational bag limits of five surfperch for all species, with the exception for shiner surfperch (a total of 20 shiner surfperch may be taken and possessed).





Figure 51. Reported recreational landings of surfperches in Central and Northern California from 1981–2000. No RecFIN data are available for years 1990–1992.

Nearshore Soft Bottom Habitats



Nearshore soft bottom habitats are primarily located in Monterey Bay and in the northern portion of the MBNMS, although these habitats are also numerous just south of the sanctuary boundaries (Fig. 2–4). Nearshore soft bottom habitats are home to many fishes and invertebrates. The long-time exclusion of trawlers and more recent ban of gill nets in this environment has led to a limited and highly regulated fishing effort in this area. Currently, there are a small number of commercial fisheries directed in these habitats. Commercial landings in nearshore soft bottom habitats comprised 25% of all landings at ports near the MBNMS from 1981–2000 (Table 8), although landings have fluctuated greatly since the early 1980s. Total landings from nearshore soft bottom habitats averaged 17.3 million lb/yr from 1981–2000. Market squid is the main constituent of the nearshore soft

bottom fishery, contributing more than 97% of the total landings from these habitats (Table 8). The trends of overall commercial landings in this habitat thus mirror those of the market squid and decreases in landings can be attributed mainly to El Niño effects on this species and to regulations imposed on the fishery in the late 1990s (Fig. 52).

Commercial landings of fishes within nearshore soft bottom habitats have declined over the past twenty years since highs in the 1980s (Fig. 53). Species in this category include the leopard shark, Pacific angel shark, and white seabass, but the primary component of the catch is white croaker. Common gear currently used in this environment includes various line gears (hook-and-line and trolling) and purse seines. The recreational fishery in this habitat takes the same species as does the commercial fishery, in addition to a large number of surfperch and nearshore flatfish.

Table 8. Primary species landed in commercial fisheries in the MBNMS that were caught in nearshore soft bottom habitats, and the percentage that each species contributed to the landings from this habitat group and total landings in the MBNMS. Landings from soft bottom habitats during the period equaled 286.422 million pounds from 1981–2000. Total landings in all of the MBNMS equaled 1.14 billion pounds from 1981–2000.

Guild	Common Name	Scientific Name	% habitat	% total
Invertebrates				
	Market Squid	<i>Loligo opalescens</i>	97.5	24.4
Vertebrates				
Elasmobranchs	Leopard shark	<i>Triakis semifasciata</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Pacific angel shark	<i>Squatina californica</i>	0.2	< 0.1
Sciaenids	White croaker	<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>	2.3	0.6
	White Seabass	<i>Atractoscion nobilis</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1




Figure 52. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of all species within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 53. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of fishes within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Invertebrates

Market Squid (*Loligo opalescens*)



Historically, the market squid fishery has been important throughout California. In 1863, Chinese settlers on the Monterey Peninsula established a small fishery using multiple skiffs with torches and hand-held seines to capture squid. The lampara net, a much more effective gear, was introduced by Italian immigrants in 1905, increasing catches to 40,000 lb/haul. In 1946, California landings increased to 38 million lb because of increased demand in both the local and foreign markets (Fig. 54). Monterey catches dominated California landings prior to 1961; since that time, landings in Southern California have been greater. Squid are marketed for human consumption (fresh, frozen, or canned) or sold as fresh/live bait. Currently, most of the catch is exported.

Purse seining within Monterey Bay (from Pt. Piños to Sand City) was outlawed in 1953 because of its possible disruption of egg cases. In 1959, the use of lights to concentrate squid

schools also became illegal, effectively excluding the brail and pump systems. Fishers requested this ban to prevent processors from directly luring squid to docks for harvest by dip nets and because they felt lights disrupted spawning activity. Thus, fishers had to rely on scouts and the use of lampara nets to catch the squid. In 1987, lights were again legalized and a modified purse seine with no bottom chain was first used in the bay. By 1989, the use of the modified purse seine was legalized throughout the bay, and by 1990 all lampara net use ceased. Today, market squid is the top commercial fishery in California by pounds landed and by value. Commercial landings of market squid for all of California in 1999 totaled nearly 200 million lb and were worth nearly 35 million dollars.

From 1981–82, squid catches within the MBNMS were relatively high, with annual landings totaling more than 20 million lb (Fig. 55), but landings decreased drastically to a low of 1 million lb in 1984, a result of the 1982–83 El Niño conditions. From 1985–88, annual landings stabilized at approximately 10 million lb, then increased. In 1994, landings reached the highest level since 1946. The fishery for market squid was the largest and most profitable fishery in the Monterey Bay area in 1994. A total of 35.8 million lb of squid




Figure 54. Reported commercial landings of market squid in California from 1916–1999.




Figure 55. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of market squid within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

worth over \$5.2 million was landed at the ports near the MBNMS during 1994. Moss Landing and Monterey accounted for 30% and 57% of this catch, respectively. Landings dropped drastically in 1995, again related to the El Niño years of 1992–93, followed by an upward trend until 1997. The El Niño conditions of 1997–98 caused a complete collapse of the squid fishery in Monterey for almost two years.

The commercial squid fishery is thought to annually harvest a large portion of adult spawning aggregates in small areas such as Cannery Row. Total squid landings have historically exhibited large fluctuations, rather than decreasing trends, despite this intense fishing pressure (Fig. 54). This fluctuation, and the occurrence of squid spawning in unfished areas along the open coast, has led many fishery biologists to believe that the market squid population size is more a function of environmental variables than fishing pressure. However, the record harvests in the 1990s combined with the importance of squid

as prey items for many species, caused some biologists to suggest a more precautionary approach to squid fishery management.

Historically, regulations pertaining to the harvest of squid were minimal and were related more to fishery conflicts and social concerns than to resource protection. Prior to 1998, the squid fishery was largely unregulated. The large harvests of squid prompted some concerned fishers to request new legislation to restrict the number of boats in the fishery, in an attempt to reduce the risk of overfishing, maintain economic viability of the fishery, and limit negative effects of fishing gear on squid eggs. In 1998, a three-year moratorium was enacted that restricted the number of vessels in the fishery, established a permit fee to fund research, and gave CDFG regulatory control of the fishery during the moratorium. In 1999, the PFMC began to manage the fishery under the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. This species is monitored by the PFMC and managed via annual status reviews and management regulations, such as

gear and areas restrictions. A squid fishery management plan is near completion. Currently, there is no estimate of the abundance or status of this population.

Vertebrates

Nearshore Sharks

In the early 1980s, processors began carefully dressing and marketing shark products, resulting in an increased demand for shark meat as a food item. This led to the rapid increase in, and demise of, the Pacific angel shark fishery in 1989. The gill net ban in 1990 also lowered fishing effort on nearshore shark species in California. Presently, there are no large-scale directed commercial fishing operations in Monterey Bay for nearshore shark species. Almost all current landings of sharks occur as incidental catches from other fisheries. However, there is a small-scale commercial harvest of leopard shark in the live-fish fishery. Unfortunately, the unknown number of fish that are landed under the market category shark/unspecified confounds estimates of the commercial catch of sharks.

Commercial landings of nearshore soft bottom sharks in Central California have decreased since 1987 (Fig. 56). This decline can be mainly attributed to regulatory changes that have affected the nearshore fishery. The main gear used to catch nearshore sharks was net gear. The restrictions in the 1980s, and eventual banning of gill netting in nearshore areas, was the major contributor to the decline in leopard shark and Pacific angel shark landings in Central California. Nearshore sharks are also targeted as popular game fish and are landed by recreational anglers throughout California. The recreational landings of nearshore sharks (made up almost exclusively of leopard sharks) in Northern California fluctuated in the 1980s, but generally stayed above 500 fish/yr until 1993. Since that time landings have declined to less than 500 fish/yr (Fig. 57). This decreasing trend in the 1990s is most likely related to the implementation of minimum size limits, gear restrictions, and may reflect current low abundance due to past overfishing. The commercial and recreational landing of the leopard shark and Pacific angel




Figure 56. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of nearshore sharks within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 57. Reported CPFV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of nearshore sharks within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

shark, are managed under the general provisions of the California Fish and Game Code, most often by size and gear regulations. No population estimates exist for these two species.

White Croaker (*Genyonemus lineatus*)



Statewide, the white croaker is frequently caught in recreational fisheries and is an important constituent of the commercial catch as well. The white croaker is not landed commercially in great numbers in Monterey Bay and is often sold as bait fish. After the Vietnam War, many Vietnamese fishers immigrated to the Monterey Bay area and were encouraged to fish for white croaker.

These fishers have since gradually moved on to other, more profitable fisheries. In addition, the 1990 ban of gill nets in nearshore waters lowered fishing pressure on the white croaker. As a result, white croaker landings have dramatically declined at ports near the MBNMS in the last 10 years, despite the increase in biomass estimated by NMFS (Fig. 58). The fishery is managed exclusively by CDFG.

The majority of white croaker sport catch is from Southern California; the average recreational catch by the CPFV fishery in MBNMS from 1981–2000 was 489 fish/year. Recreational landings of white croaker peaked in 1985, declined until 1995, and then increased to the present. Catch per angler also increased in the late 1990s, indicating a possible increase in abundance. (Fig. 59). The general provisions for finfish in the California Fish and Game Code regulate the recreational catch of white croaker.




Figure 58. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of white croaker within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 59. Reported CPFV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of white croaker within nearshore soft bottom habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Rocky Deep Shelf and Slope Habitats



Rocky deep shelf and slope habitats occur on the edges of submarine canyons, and on the shelf in a few other areas in the MBNMS (Fig. 2–4). These habitats are usually characterized by high relief rock pinnacles, boulders, or walls. Mud substrates often are interspersed in or around rocky outcrops. Rocky deep shelf and slope habitats are challenging environments to fish, especially within the Monterey Bay. The submarine canyons, with shear walls and high relief rocky cliffs, make bottom trawling extremely difficult and thus may provide areas of natural refuge for many species. Despite the difficult fishing, this habitat group is important to both commercial and recreational fisheries, producing high average landings. Commercial landings in the rocky deep shelf and slope habitats comprised 15% of the total landings at ports near the

MBNMS over the past 20 years (Table 9). Annual commercial landings from these habitats averaged 8.6 million lb/yr from 1981–2000. The most successful commercial fishing methods in deep rocky habitats include midwater trawling, gill netting, hook-and-line fishing (mostly for rockfishes), and trap fishing (mostly for spot prawn). Semi-pelagic rockfishes are the primary component of catches in these habitats; they comprise 95% of the total landings from rocky deep shelf and slope habitats (Table 9). The trend in overall catch from rocky deep shelf and slope habitats reflects the general declining population trend of many rockfishes (Fig. 60 and Fig. 61), the reasons for which are discussed below. Recreational effort in these habitats has fluctuated widely because of the switch in recreational fishing effort between rockfish and salmon fishing.

Table 9. Primary species landed in commercial fisheries in the MBNMS that were caught in deep rocky shelf and slope habitats, and the percentage that each species contributed to the landings from this habitat group and total landings in the MBNMS. Landings from deep rocky shelf and slope habitats during the period equaled 171.112 million pounds from 1981–2000. Total landings in all of the MBNMS equaled 1.14 billion pounds from 1981–2000.

Guild	Common Name	Scientific Name	% habitat	% total
Invertebrates				
	Spot Prawn	<i>Pandalus platyceros</i>	0.6	0.1
Vertebrates				
Hexagrammids	Lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	1.5	0.2
Scorpaenids	Rockfishes			
<i>Demersal</i>	Bronzespotted rockfish	<i>Sebastes gilli</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Copper (whitebelly) rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus (vexillaris)</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Flag rockfish	<i>Sebastes rubrivinctus</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Greenblotched rockfish	<i>Sebastes rosenblatti</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Greenspotted rockfish	<i>Sebastes chlorostictus</i>	0.9	0.1
	Rosethorn rockfish	<i>Sebastes helvomaculatus</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Quillback rockfish	<i>Sebastes maliger</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Speckled rockfish	<i>Sebastes ovalis</i>	0.3	< 0.1
	Starry rockfish	<i>Sebastes constellatus</i>	0.2	< 0.1
	Tiger rockfish	<i>Sebastes nirgocinctus</i>	0.0	< 0.1
	Vermilion rockfish	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>	0.8	0.1
	Yelloweye rockfish	<i>Sebastes ruberrimus</i>	0.6	0.1
<i>Semi-pelagic</i>				
	Bank rockfish	<i>Sebastes rufus</i>	11.7	1.8
	Bocaccio	<i>Sebastes paucispinis</i>	27.1	4.1
	Canary rockfish	<i>Sebastes pinniger</i>	1.2	0.2
	Chilipepper	<i>Sebastes goodei</i>	33.5	5.0
	Shortbelly rockfish	<i>Sebastes jordani</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Pacific Ocean Perch	<i>Sebastes alutus</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Widow rockfish	<i>Sebastes entomelas</i>	15.1	2.3
	Yellowtail rockfish	<i>Sebastes flavidus</i>	5.9	0.9




Figure 60. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of all species within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 61. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of fishes within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Invertebrates

Spot Prawn (*Pandalus platyceros*)

Spot prawns have been harvested in California waters since 1921. In the early years, California landings were less than 2,000 lb/yr and primarily taken incidentally in octopus traps. Landings rose considerably in the 1970s, when fishers in Santa Barbara initiated a trawl fishery that specifically targeted spot prawn (Fig. 62). Total California landings reached a peak of 371,000 lb in 1981, of which more than 60,000 lb, worth over \$161,000, were harvested from MBNMS waters. In 1982–83, catches dropped considerably, and by 1984 the CDFG ordered a temporary closure of the spot prawn trawl fishery. A similar closure of the trawl fishery for prawns in 1986 prompted an increased interest in the trap fishery, and created a new sales market. Fishers were able to sell live prawns to restaurants for \$5.00–\$6.50/lb, an increase over the \$3.50/lb they received for trawl-caught prawns. With this increase in ex-vessel price and demand for live prawns, trawl fishers began fitting their boats with live wells. Commercial landings throughout California of spot prawn in 1999 totaled more than 600,000 lb and were worth more than 4 million dollars, making it one of the top earning fisheries despite the low landing volumes.




Figure 62. Reported commercial landings of spot prawn in California from 1920–1999.

Although the majority of spot prawn landed within the MBNMS in the early 1990s were taken by traps, trawls now take almost all the catch of spot prawn from the MBNMS. Trawl vessels accounted for 82% of the 1996 landings. Spot prawn landings have increased dramatically since 1992, with a peak of 372,000 lb landed in the MBNMS in 1998 (Fig. 63). This increasing trend is related to increasing demand and increasing landed value.




Figure 63. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of spot prawn within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

The spot prawn fishery is presently open to all trawl and trap vessels, but is slated to become a limited entry program for trap vessels in early 2002. Additional regulations for trawlers include seasonal closures, minimum mesh size, and incidental catch limits. Trap fishing is also regulated by seasonal closures and by the number of allowable traps per boat. Traps are required to be less than 6 ft around with openings of less than 5 inches and must have a destructive device to prevent them from capturing animals if lost from the buoy. In 2000, the California Fish and Game Commission adopted regulations that established January 1, 1999 as a control date for entry into the restricted access program spot prawn trap fishery and spot/ridgeback prawn trawl fishery. In addition, a one year regulation (2000 to 2001) was enacted

requiring an on-board observer program for the spot prawn trawl and trap fisheries. Currently, no population estimates exist for this species. For additional information see Leet et al. *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* (2001).

Vertebrates

Rocky Deep Shelf and Slope Rockfishes

Rocky deep shelf and slope habitats include commercial and recreational fisheries for some of the most important species in Central California. Rockfish species harvested from these habitats (such as bocaccio, chilipepper, widow rockfish, yelloweye, and yellowtail rockfish) comprise 98% of the total commercial catch within these habitats in the MBNMS. In the recreational fishery, almost 50% of the catch from 1959 to 1994 was taken within these habitats, and eight of the ten most numerous species taken in the CPFV fishery utilize these habitats. Also important ecologically, the fishes in deep rocky habitats form two major associations: 1) demersal rockfishes that inhabit the cracks and crevices of rocky structures, and 2) semi-pelagic species that form schools over rocky peaks and pinnacles. The semi-pelagic species are the

most accessible to trawlers and make up 95% of the total catch from these habitats.

Rockfishes have been harvested in commercial fisheries in California since the mid-1800s. California landings greatly increased in the 1970s as more American vessels entered the groundfish trawl fishery after passage of the FCMA (Fig. 64). Between 1980 and 1992, trawling effort declined while the use of gill nets to catch rockfishes increased. Overall, rockfish catches for the MBNMS in rocky deep shelf and slope habitats have declined over the past twenty years (Fig. 65).

Historically, rockfishes have been marketed under a variety of names such as rockcod, snapper, or red snapper. The grouping of species into market categories makes trends in abundance difficult to delineate from catch data. To provide some idea of population trends, fishery scientists record the species composition of samples of fish that are sold at the docks by market category, and then attempt to evaluate indices of abundance by partitioning catches by species, depth, and life history characteristics. These indices have been particularly useful to understand changes in rockfish populations in rocky deep shelf and slope habitats.




Figure 64. Reported commercial landings for all rockfishes in California from 1916–1991.




Figure 65. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of rockfishes within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Table 10. Rockfish species exhibiting significant declines in mean length, for three periods of time from 1959–94. Overall percent change in length is also included.

Species	Period of Decreasing Mean Length			% overall change
	1959–94	1977–94	1987–94	1959–94
Chilipepper	**	**		–27.3
Olive Rockfish	**	**		–8.9
Bocaccio	*	*		–12.3
Greenstriped Rockfish	*	*		–4.3
Yellowtail Rockfish	*	*		–12.1
Widow Rockfish	*			–11.4
Blue Rockfish		**		–6.8
Rosy Rockfish		**		–1.9
Greenspotted Rockfish		**	*	–4.1
Canary Rockfish			**	–1.4

*Regression Significant ($0.01 < p < 0.05$)

**Regression Significant ($p < 0.01$)

Note: Data provided by Janet Mason; see also Mason (1998)

In 1983, the first coastwide limit on catches of all rockfishes was implemented, but it was not until the 1990s that catch regulations consistently decreased the commercial take, with additional regulations aimed specifically at a few of the rocky deep shelf and slope species. Regulations included weekly or monthly trip limits and geographically varying management schemes. These regulations promoted the consistent decline in rockfish catches starting in 1991 and continued to lower landings in the mid-1990s (Fig. 65). In 2000, general recreational bag limits for rockfishes decreased from 15 to 10 individuals (see individual species for species-specific limits), with the use of no more than 2 hooks per line.

Though regulations on rockfish landings are becoming stricter, bycatch issues are still a major concern. Mortality of deep-dwelling rockfishes is essentially 100% when fish are brought to the surface, and rockfishes are

captured at high levels in some fisheries. The PFMC has used working estimates of rockfish bycatch for harvest modeling and management purposes of 15% to 30% of total catches in all fisheries, but actual bycatch rates are not well understood, and may be higher than suspected. This increases uncertainty in harvest limitations set to manage already dangerously low populations.

Demersal Rockfishes

Demersal rockfish catch was steady in the MBNMS in 1980s, but increased sharply in the 1990s with the introduction of roller gear to the Central Californian trawl fishery (Fig. 66). All rockfishes within this habitat group caught within the MBNMS are under restrictions set for the *Sebastes* complex. Those limits decreased drastically in the mid to late 1990s, as indicated by the drop in catches after 1996. In addition to relatively small levels of commercial landings in rocky deep shelf and slope habitats, copper, flag, quillback and vermillion

rockfishes are caught commercially in the nearshore environment. Overall landing trends for these species within the MBNMS are discussed in the Nearshore Rocky Reef and Kelp habitats section.





Figure 66. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of demersal rockfishes within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Greenspotted Rockfish (*Sebastes chlorostictus*)



The greenspotted rockfish is abundant from Monterey south into the Southern California Bight. Greenspotted rockfish are an important component of the recreational fishery within the MBNMS, comprising 3% of the total CPFV catches from 1959 to 1994 in Monterey. Northern and Central California CPFV catch per unit effort (CPUE) for this species peaked in the mid-1980s with fluctuating CPUE since that time (Fig. 67). Greenspotted rockfish are relatively less important in the commercial

fishery, with 65% of the combined commercial and CPFV catch (by weight) being attributed to the CPFV fishery. This heavy take by the recreational fishery declined in the 1990s because sport fishers turned back to the nearshore habitats for fish. Average total length of greenspotted rockfish landed in the sport fishery has declined over 4% since 1960. Commercial take from 1980 to 2000 averaged just over 74,000 lb/yr and was generally low in the 1980s (Fig. 68). By the 1990s, roller gear trawling within the MBNMS had increased landings of greenspotted rockfish.

Greenspotted rockfish are currently managed under the *Sebastes* complex group. There is no stock assessment of this species and no special recreational regulations.




Figure 67. Reported recreational catch per unit effort from 1981–2000 of greenspotted rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. California from 1981–2000. No RecFIN data are available for years 1990–1992. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Semi-pelagic Rockfishes

Semi-pelagic rockfishes make up the majority of catches within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats, and landings reflect the same general declining trends as the overall habitat group (Fig. 69). These declines are due in most part to a combination of overfished populations, poor recruitment, and intense regulation. Semi-pelagic rockfishes showed




Figure 68. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of greenspotted rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

declining trends sooner than demersal rockfishes because they were easier to catch until the advent of roller gear. Catches in the 1990s were low primarily because of severe quota limitations for these species.




Figure 69. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of semi-pelagic rockfishes within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Bank Rockfish (*Sebastes rufus*)

Bank rockfish are commercially caught using gill nets or otter trawls equipped with roller gear; small amounts are harvested with hook-and-line gear. In 1987, Monterey gill net landings of bank rockfish doubled when California regulations forced gill net fishing operations deeper than the 100-fathom isobath. The commercial landings of bank rockfish in the MBNMS averaged over 1.1 million lb/yr from 1980–95. Catches steadily declined, however, from 1988–2000 (Fig. 70), and catches in 2000 were estimated to be only about 95,000 lb (Appendix C). Some of this decline may have resulted from gill net fishers changing over to longline gear, enabling them to fish within state waters, but it is primarily the effect of increased regulation of the *Sebastes* complex.

NMFS population surveys conducted every 3 years between 1977 and 1995 indicate that more than 90% of the bank rockfish population occurs off Central and Northern California. A bank rockfish stock assessment prepared in 2000 indicated that stock level is at 30 to 40% of the unfished population. There was also a significant decline in mean length of bank





Figure 70. Reported commercial landings from (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) 1981–2000 of bank rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

(Appendix F). For additional information see Leet et al. *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* (2001).


Canary Rockfish (*Sebastes pinniger*)



Canary rockfish are a major component of the Pacific Northwest groundfish fishery; populations are centered off the Washington/British Columbia coast. Canary rockfish are caught both in trawls and by hook-and-line gear. In Central California, canary rockfish contribute only a small portion to commercial landings in rocky deep shelf and slope habitats. Catches in the past twenty years are highly variable, with moderate increases in the 1990s attributable to increased fishing effort for canary rockfish below Fort

Bragg (Fig. 72). The average estimated catch from 1981–2000 was 102,000 lb/yr, with a high of more than 298,000 lb in 1996. Declining catches in subsequent years are a reflection of the intense regulations placed upon the *Sebastes* complex (under which the canary rockfish was managed in the MBNMS). In 1999, specific coastwide regulations were implemented for the canary rockfish by the PFMC. A steady decline in recruitment since 1991 may also have contributed to declining catches. Recruitment was lower than average in the late 1970s to early 1980s, returned to average and slightly above average in the mid-1980s to 1990, but has since steadily declined. Recreational catches of canary rockfish off Northern and Central California have also declined over the past 20 years (Fig. 73).

A 1999 stock assessment for canary rockfish concluded that the population was less than 10% (maybe as low as 5.5%) of unfished levels, indicating the stock is currently overfished.



Chilipepper (*Sebastes goodei*)

Chilipepper are a very important component of the commercial trawl and sport fisheries in Central California. Commercial landings at ports near the MBNMS regularly fluctuated around an average of about 3 million lb/yr from 1980–98, but a sharp decline in catches followed in 1999 and 2000 (Fig. 74). Abundance estimates from catch data, age composition data, and length data all indicate that the stock size of chilipepper is increasing. Historical fluctuations of chilipepper catches have been mainly caused by environmental changes and/or effort switches over to salmon, but the current extreme decline in catches can be




Figure 73. Reported recreational landings of canary rockfish in Central and Northern California from 1981–2000. California from 1981–2000. No RecFIN data are available for years 1990–1992. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

take of this species. Biologists have recommended against bottom trawling for this species because of the hazard to young fish of other commercially important species.




Figure 75. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of shortbelly rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Widow Rockfish (*Sebastes entomelas*)

Widow rockfish are the third most frequently caught scorpaenid in California commercial fisheries, with landings less than that of chilipepper and thornyheads. They are also a significant component of the sport landings. Commercial landings at ports near the MBNMS averaged 1.3 million lb/yr from 1981–2000 (Fig. 76). Widow rockfish landings peaked in 1982 at 7.3 million lb/yr when the trawl fishery began targeting the species. Landings have been much lower since then because of decreased population sizes and increased regulations. The widow rockfish stock coastwide is estimated to be about 18% the biomass in 1980. This stock is overfished and is expected to take a long time to recover despite current low harvest levels, partly because recruitment has decreased. Since the mid-1970s, this species has shown a decline in both spawning output and biomass.

[illegible]

This species is managed by the PFMC. Quotas and gear regulations such as mesh size are some of the measures used to regulate this fishery.





Figure 76. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of widow rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Yellowtail Rockfish (*Sebastes flavidus*)



Yellowtail rockfish are landed commercially in both the trawl and hook-and-line fisheries. They also make up a considerable component of sport landings. Coastwide, yellowtail rockfish landings increased from 2.6 million lb in 1967 to 21.2 million lb in 1983, then declined after trip limits were implemented. From 1990–99, coastwide landings averaged 13 million lb/yr. Because yellowtail rockfish are centered off Northern California and Oregon, landings of this species in the MBNMS contribute a small portion of California landings.

Commercial landings at ports near the MBNMS averaged 506,000 lb/yr from 1980–2000, but have been less than 310,000 lb/yr since 1992 (Fig. 77). A large reduction of yellowtail rockfish catches in 1991, and a corresponding huge spike in reported catch of olive rockfish (Fig. 40) landings might be due to confusion identifying the two species.

Population estimates for yellowtail rockfish are highly variable, making conclusions concerning trends difficult. Despite this high variability, the coastwide trend in abundance appears downward, consistent with a low levels of recruitment from 1995 to 1998. A recent stock assessment indicates that despite recent declines in biomass, the yellowtail rockfish stock is currently at over 50% of the target biomass and seems healthy.

The yellowtail rockfish fishery is currently managed by the PFMC as two stocks separated at Cape Mendocino, California, though a three stock structure has been suggested. The PFMC currently does not specifically limit the catch of yellowtail rockfish in the southern stock; they are managed as a part of the *Sebastes* complex.





Figure 77. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of yellowtail rockfish within rocky deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Soft Bottom Deep Shelf and Slope Habitats



Soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats are the most prevalent habitats throughout the MBNMS. They contain mud and silty sediments and contain a large number of invertebrate species. More than 30 species are routinely harvested from soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats; and annual commercial landings from these habitats averaged 12 million lb/yr from 1981–2000 (Table 11). Bottom trawling, traps, and nets are the primary fishing gear used in this habitat. Commercial landings from these habitats comprised 21% of the total landings at ports near the MBNMS in the past 20 years. Commercial catches in these habitats

remained high between 1985 and 1996, with an average estimated take of 13.5 million lb/yr, but dropped to only 5.7 million lb in 2000 (Fig. 78). A combination of regulations (for rockfishes, thornyheads, flatfishes) and environmental conditions (affecting Pacific Ocean shrimp and Dungeness crab recruitment) led to the recent decline in catch of species in this habitat group. The total landings of invertebrates in these habitats have been highly variable over the past twenty years (Fig. 79). This is due to the variable landings of Pacific Ocean shrimp and Dungeness crab since 1981, attributed mainly to environmental factors, and the spike in spot prawn landings in the

Table 11. Primary species landed in commercial fisheries in the MBNMS that were caught in soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats, and the percentage that each species contributed to the landings from this habitat group and total landings in the MBNMS. Landings from soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats during the period equaled 238.499 million pounds from 1981–2000. Total landings in all of the MBNMS equaled 1.14 billion pounds from 1981–2000.

Guild	Common Name	Scientific Name	% habitat	% total
Invertebrates	Pacific ocean shrimp	<i>Pandalus jordani</i>	2.7	0.6
	Spot Prawn	<i>Pandalus platyceros</i>	0.4	0.1
	Dungeness crab	<i>Cancer magister</i>	3.8	0.8
Vertebrates				
Anoplopomids	Sablefish	<i>Anoplopoma fimbria</i>	13.4	2.8
Hexagrammids	Lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	1.1	0.2
Scorpaenids	Aurora rockfish	<i>Sebastes aurora</i>	0.7	0.1
	Blackgill rockfish	<i>Sebastes melanostomus</i>	2.7	0.6
	Cowcod	<i>Sebastes levis</i>	0.3	0.1
	Darkblotched rockfish	<i>Sebastes crameri</i>	0.8	0.2
	Greenstriped rockfish	<i>Sebastes elongatus</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Redbanded rockfish	<i>Sebastes babcocki</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Sharpchin rockfish	<i>Sebastes zacentrus</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Splitnose rockfish	<i>Sebastes diploproa</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Stripetail rockfish	<i>Sebastes saxicola</i>	5.5	1.1
	Thornyheads	<i>Sebastolobus</i> spp.	15.4	3.2
Flatfishes	Butter sole	<i>Isopsetta isolepis</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	California halibut	<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>	1.9	0.4
	Dover sole	<i>Microstomus pacificus</i>	30.5	6.3
	English sole	<i>Parophrys vetulus</i>	4.1	0.9
	Petrable sole	<i>Eopsetta jordani</i>	3.6	0.7
	Rex sole	<i>Errex zachirus</i>	3.0	0.6
	Rock sole	<i>Lepidopsetta bilineata</i>	0.1	0.0
	Sanddabs	<i>Citharichthys</i> spp.	5.6	1.2
	Sand sole	<i>Psettichthys melanostictus</i>	0.4	0.1
	Starry flounder	<i>Platichthys stellatus</i>	0.2	< 0.1
Sharks	Leopard shark	<i>Triakis semifasciata</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Pacific angel shark	<i>Squatina californica</i>	0.2	< 0.1
	Soupin shark	<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i>	0.2	< 0.1
	Skates	<i>Raja</i> spp., <i>Bathyraja</i> spp.	0.9	0.2
Other species	Pacific grenadier	<i>Coryphaenoides acrolepis</i>	1.9	0.4




Figure 78. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of all species within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 79. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of invertebrate species within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

late 1990s due to demand. Vertebrates contributed the majority of landings from these habitats from 1981–2000; primary species groups caught were flatfishes (49% of total), thornyheads (15% of total), sablefish (13% of total), and rockfishes (10% of total). The recent decline in landings is primarily due to smaller quotas, but may reflect actual population declines in some species (Fig. 80 and 81). Coastwide, many species in these habitats, such as thornyheads, Dover sole, and other flatfishes, are considered to be fully exploited, but not overfished. Sablefish populations declined in the early 1990s, but the current status of stock is uncertain. Some of the soft bottom rockfishes show signs of depletion in Northern California, Oregon, and Washington, but the population status of most of the rockfishes in soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats in the MBNMS is not well known.




Figure 80. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of fishes within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.




Figure 81. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of scorpaenids within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Invertebrates

Pacific Ocean Shrimp (*Pandalus jordani*)

The Pacific ocean shrimp fishery comprises the majority of shrimp harvest along the Pacific coast of the United States. Pacific ocean shrimp are harvested within discontinuous areas between British Columbia and Central California, but the majority of the catches occur between Washington and Northern California. The Pacific ocean shrimp fishery began in the 1950s after the discovery of populations large enough for commercial harvest. Between 1952 and 1974, Pacific ocean shrimp were harvested by commercial vessels towing a single bottom trawl. Beginning in 1974, vessels began towing nets from each side of the boat, and catches substantially increased. Annual landings were high through the 1970s, averaging 5.7 million lb in California alone (Fig. 82). Landings in the MBNMS have fluctuated greatly over the past twenty years (Fig. 83). During 1983, El Niño conditions caused landings to drop considerably, and many vessels left the fishery. Pacific Ocean shrimp populations quickly recovered, however, and landings peaked in 1986 with 799,000 lb landed. However, a similar drop in landings occurred with the onset of El Niño conditions in 1987–88. Pacific ocean shrimp landings recovered in 1994 and increased in 1995 to a total of 746,000 lb, followed by another drop in landings. Only a small portion of this variability is attributable to fishing effort. More influential factors are variations in juvenile survival and recruitment caused by environmental conditions during larval stages.

Pacific ocean shrimp are regulated by the CDFG. Pacific ocean shrimp may be harvested only between April 15 and October 31, and in water depths of 90 m or greater. In order to protect <1 and 1 yr old shrimp, net mesh size must be at least 1 3/8 inches, and shrimp count per pound must be 170 or less. In addition, fishing is only allowed when catch rates are above 350 lb/hr, to protect shrimp when population levels are low. There has been a




Figure 82. Reported commercial landings of Pacific ocean shrimp in California from 1952–1999.




Figure 83. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Pacific ocean shrimp within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

low of 541,000 in 1996, then dropped to 311,000 lb in 1999–2000.

A number of factors are thought to influence the Dungeness crab fishery. These include: ocean climate change, nemertean worm infestation of eggs, larval mortality, and chemical pollution of juvenile habitat. Some fishers are also concerned that trawling during the molting season is causing a decline in the fishery. Total crab landings for the coast, however, exhibit large cyclical fluctuations, rather than a steadily decreasing trend, despite the fact that commercial fishers are thought to harvest over 80% of legal-sized male crabs each year. This leads most fishery biologists to believe that coastwide, the Dungeness crab population abundance is more a function of environmental variables than fishing pressure. Dungeness crab research conducted in Washington and California supports this hypothesis.

Historically, the Dungeness crab fishery has been heavily regulated. It is presently a limited entry fishery. In the Monterey Bay area, Dungeness crab can be taken from November 15 through June 30. All traps are required to have a destruct device (e.g., twine that rots after a set amount of time) to pre-

The Dungeness crab fishery within the MBNMS comprises only a small portion of total California landings. From 1980–87, reported catch ranged from 129,000 to 344,000 lb (Fig. 85). From 1987–88, landings at ports near the MBNMS rose to nearly 1 million lb, with additional landings from MBNMS waters occurring in San Francisco. From 1989–93, landings dropped again, averaging 320,500 lb. Catches from 1994–98 fluctuated, ranging between a high of 996,000 lb in 1995 and a





Figure 85. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Dungeness crab within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

vent ghost fishing should the trap be lost. Traps must be emptied within 96 hr of deployment, and crabs must be harvested in prime condition. Each trap buoy must display identification and permit number. The legal size of crab is 6.25 in, and only 1% of the total catch can be between 5.75 and 6.25 in. Trawlers and draggers are allowed no more than 500 lb/boat as incidental catch. The recreational season is open from the Saturday preceding the second Tuesday in November until June 30, and there is a catch limit of ten crabs per person in California and a six crabs per person each day when fishing aboard CPFVs in the Monterey Bay. Currently, no FMP or stock assessments exist for this species on the West Coast, however, available information suggests this population is healthy.

Vertebrates

Sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*)



Sablefish are taken in the trap fishery, the longline fishery, and by bottom trawlers as part of the groundfish fishery. The United States commercial fishery began as early as 1905 as incidental catch by halibut fishers. During World War II, demand increased greatly with the need for sablefish livers to manufacture vitamin A. In 1958, Pacific coast landings had increased to 21 million lb, and all harvesting was by Canadian and United States fishers. In the 1960s, however, Russian and Japanese factory vessels began fishing for sablefish. Sablefish removals from California waters peaked in 1972 with 144.2 million lb caught, primarily by Japanese vessels. Only about 20% of the catch was landed in California ports (Fig. 86). In 1976, the FCMA re-

turned the California sablefish fishery back to domestic fishers, and California became the dominant Pacific coast state for sablefish landings. Commercial landings of sablefish in California through 1999 totaled 4.3 million pounds and were worth over 4 million dollars. Monterey is one of the main ports for sablefish landings in California. The depth distribution of sablefish makes them a relatively rare catch in the recreational fishery.

Sablefish landings at ports near the MBNMS showed a decreasing trend from 1980 to 1994, increased from 1995 to 1996, reached a level of more than 2 million lb in 1996, and then declined from 1997 to the present. (Fig. 87). This decline in catch prior to 1995 has been attributed to reduced populations caused by fishing and poor recruitment in the late 1980s. The reduced landings since the mid-1990s were caused by reduced quotas that reflect a lower population size of sablefish and Dover sole, a species that is often caught with sablefish. Because market demand of sablefish is high, the value of sablefish in the marketplace has not dropped as quickly as the catch. However, most sablefish are exported and price is greatly dependent upon variable foreign markets.




Figure 86. Reported commercial landings of sablefish in California from 1916–1999.

fish abundance. This stock is currently estimated to be at 37% of its unfished biomass level, indicating that sablefish populations are fully utilized.

Blackgill rockfish were targeted with hook-and-line gear in the 1970s and fished with gill nets in the 1980s. Currently, blackgill rockfish, along with bank and splitnose rockfishes, are caught primarily by trawlers. Within the MBNMS, recorded catches of blackgill rockfish fluctuated greatly from 1981–2000, possibly because of changes in fishing location or in gear used. Some of the higher catches in the 1980s were associated with bycatch from the sablefish longline fishery. Recently, fishers have targeted blackgill rockfish. Gradual declines in the late 1990s are concurrent with implementation of stricter *Sebastes* limits (Fig. 88).

The PFMC currently does not specifically limit the catch of blackgill rockfish; it is managed as a part of the *Sebastes* complex. A 1998 stock assessment indicated that current populations were 40 to 54% of unfished levels and that there was no evidence that the stock is depleted.




Figure 88. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of blackgill rockfish within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.




Figure 89. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of darkblotched rockfish within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Darkblotched Rockfish (*Sebastes cramerii*)

Darkblotched rockfish are caught primarily in deep water by trawlers. Recorded catches of darkblotched rockfish in the MBNMS averaged about 93,000 lb/yr from 1980 to 2000, although catches fluctuated widely (Fig. 89). These fluctuations are probably due to changes in fishing location or changes in gear used, rather than true reflections of changes in population sizes. There is currently insufficient data about darkblotched rockfish to enable fishery scientists to assess the stock with any certainty. The life history traits of old age and slow growth (Appendix H) indicate that harvest rates should only be 4–6% of the stock. Declining trends in mean size and abundance suggest that current harvest rates are near these equilibrium rates. The PFMC currently does not specifically limit the catch of darkblotched rockfish; it is managed as a part of the *Sebastes* complex.

Splitnose Rockfish (*Sebastes diploproa*)

Splitnose rockfish are caught primarily with trawl nets equipped with roller gear. Before 1990, there was no market for splitnose, but increasing regulation on the live-fish fishery created a market for some of the deeper

rockfishes, including splitnose. Recorded catches of splitnose rockfish in the MBNMS averaged about 636,000 lb/yr from 1981–2000 (Fig. 90). Stock declines in recent years reflect the heavy regulations imposed on the *Sebastes* complex, under which the splitnose rockfish is managed by the PFMC. A preliminary stock evaluation for splitnose rockfish conducted in 1994, using four different types of surveys, showed no coastwide evidence of a declining population. Also, there was no evidence of a decline in mean lengths of splitnose rockfish from 1978–88.





Figure 90. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of splitnose rockfish within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Thornyheads (*Sebastolobus altivelis* and *S. alascanus*)



declined and that spawning abundance had increased.

California Halibut (*Paralichthys californicus*)



Halibut are an important species in both the commercial and recreational fisheries in California. Catches of halibut are highest during the spring and summer in Central California. They are currently fished commercially using trawl, gill net, and hook-and-line gear. Fishers began using set nets to catch halibut in the 1880s. Trawls have been used since 1930, and accounted for the largest catches of halibut prior to 1969. In 1970, trawl area and season closures resulted in a change to set nets as the primary gear used to catch halibut. In 1990, the California Marine Resources Protection Act restricted gill netting to areas further than 30 fathoms from shore. The measure had a dramatic effect on halibut landings, reflected by a 32% drop in catches in Southern California between 1993 and 1994. In 1994, trawls were again the most productive method of catching California halibut, followed by hook-and-line and gill net gear.

Total commercial catch of halibut in Central California remained stable from 1981–1995 (Fig. 92). Landings of California halibut have shown an increasing trend since then, with a slight drop in catch in 2000. This increase was probably due to an increasing population of California halibut. The value of halibut landed has generally been increasing since 1980, reaching as high as \$2.43 per pound in 1994. Since 1997, however, ex-vessel values have fluctuated greatly because of Mexican-caught halibut flooding the market in July.

Landings for both species caught in the MBNMS from 1981–2000 averaged 1.76 million lb/yr, the majority of which are shortspine thornyheads (Fig. 91). A recent stock assessment concluded, however, that the shortspine thornyhead population has not




Figure 91. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of thornyheads within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

California halibut are caught recreationally from CPFVs, private boats, and from shore. Private boats exert the most pressure on the halibut population, accounting for 75% of the recreational halibut fishing effort from 1980–87. Halibut catch from private boats is difficult to monitor, however, so trends from the private recreational fishery are not well documented. Historically, recreational halibut catches in the CPFV fishery in California fluctuated greatly. A high catch of 143,500 fish occurred in 1948. Starting in 1949, annual catches declined sharply through 1957 until a bag limit of two fish with a 22-inch minimum length was placed on fishers. Catches and regulations continued to fluctuate until the fishery declined drastically in 1971, when a five fish, 22-inch size limit was established. Between 1981–94, the number of halibut caught annually by CPFVs in the Monterey Bay area remained relatively stable (Fig. 93). CPFV landings peaked in 1995–1996 when California halibut catches averaged 13,355 fish/yr. A decline in landings followed from 1997–2000; however catches are still higher than in the 1980s and early 1990s. This is most likely a result of increased population size, but may also be due to a northward shift

in the halibut population, possibly related to El Niño conditions in the early 1990s. In 1997, a total of 451,000 of California halibut were caught throughout California, approximately 73% of which was caught in Southern California.

The commercial halibut fishery is regulated using a number of methods. Gill and trammel nets are subject to depth, area, and season closures throughout the state. A minimum cod end mesh size of 7.5 inches is enforced for trawls and minimum gill net mesh size for California halibut is 8.5 inches, to allow escapement of undersized fishes. A minimum size limit for the commercial fishery is set at 22 inches. Possession of halibut as incidental catch by gill net, trammel net or trawl net is limited to 4 fish. The recreational fishery is regulated with a 22-inch size limit and catch limit of five fish south of Point Sur and 3 fish north of Point Sur. A fishery independent survey conducted in the early 1990s estimated biomass of 2.3 million lb of halibut off the coast of California and 700,000 lb of halibut in Central California. For additional information see Leet et al. *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* (2001).




Figure 92. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of California halibut within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.





Figure 93. Reported CPFV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of California halibut within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Dover Sole (*Microstomus pacificus*)



Dover sole are one of the dominant fishes of the California commercial groundfish fishery. They are harvested by bottom trawlers and marketed as filets. Because many flatfish are caught together in the trawl fishery, effort data for individual species are not available. Commercial fishing effort for all trawl caught flatfishes, however, remained constant from 1980–95. Commercial landings throughout California in 1999 totaled 8.4 million lb and were worth nearly 3 million dollars. Historically, the port of Eureka lands the greatest amount of Dover sole, followed by Fort Bragg, Crescent City, San Francisco and Monterey. Dover sole landings at ports near the MBNMS greatly increased in the early 1980s, reaching a high of 8 million lb in 1985 (Fig. 94). Catches in the 1990s declined because of increased regulation, lower re-

cruitment, and reduced market demand. This caused trawlers to redirect their efforts towards the more economically valuable thornyheads and sablefish.

A 1995 stock assessment suggested that the Dover sole populations were depressed along most of the Pacific coast. Off Oregon and Washington in the late 1970s, harvest rates were appropriate for the Dover sole abundance. However, in the 1980s and 1990s, abundance declined as catches increased, indicating a possibility of overfishing. From Cape Mendocino to Southern Oregon, stock assessments indicated that biomass was low as a result of reduced recruitment. Female spawning biomass was estimated to be only 18% of its unfished level. The low abundance estimate prompted a reduction in harvest guidelines. Recent stock assessments for the Monterey management area indicate that Dover sole biomass in this region may be above the management target level. Dover sole landings on the West Coast for the last five years have been below the recommended Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC), and NMFS survey biomass estimates have been stable since 1980.

Dover sole are managed as part of PFMC's Dover–Thornyhead–Sablefish complex. Cumulative landing limits and trip limits are used to regulate catches of this fishery. The PFMC has implemented license limitations of the complex, creating two fishing fleets: the permitted limited entry fleet and the nonpermitted open access fleet, which has more restricted harvest guidelines.

English Sole (*Parophrys vetulus*)

English sole have been harvested commercially since the 1880s as part of the California commercial groundfish fishery, but there are very few recreational landings of English sole. The majority of commercial landings are by trawl gear over deep sandy habitat. Over the last 10 years, annual landings of English sole in California have averaged 1.2 million lb, with most fish caught between San Francisco and Eureka. This is a decline since the 1980s




Figure 94. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Dover sole within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

when landings averaged 2.7 million lb. Annual English sole landings at ports near the MBNMS fluctuated between 300,000 and 1 million lb from 1981–2000 (Fig. 95). A slightly decreasing trend in both MBNMS and total California landings is evident since 1991. This is due to decreased market demand and a switch in effort towards thornyheads and sablefish.

NMFS surveys suggest that the English sole population off Oregon and Washington greatly increased from 1977–92. The increase resulted from a high recruitment during that time. High recruitment levels, combined with early age at maturity, suggest that English sole could safely withstand higher catch rates in the short term. There is no recent stock assessment for English sole in the Monterey management area, but NMFS survey indices suggest that population abundance in this region was level from 1983–95. A 1997 survey by NMFS replicated the survey completed in 1995 and found increases in the overall average CPUE estimates of English sole. Currently, English sole are managed by the PFMC through gear regulations such as trawl net mesh size.




Figure 95. Reported commercial landings from (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) 1981–2000 of English sole within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Petrale Sole (*Eopsetta jordani*)



Petrale sole are the most highly prized food fish of the small flatfishes. Recreational anglers occasionally catch petrale sole during deepwater rockfish trips. They are also a large part of the commercial trawl fishery from California to the Gulf of Alaska. Coastwide, the petrale sole population has undergone substantial fluctuations. For the management areas off Oregon and Washington, NMFS and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife trawl surveys indicated a two-fold decline in biomass from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, followed by a general increase in biomass through 1992. Current stock assessments indicate that biomass is increasing and current landings of petrale sole in California are sustainable.

Small-scale fluctuations in petrale sole abundance have also been evident from an evaluation of catches in the Monterey Bay area. At ports near the MBNMS, annual petrale sole landings were highly variable, fluctuating between 182,000 and 750,000 lb from 1980–2000 (Fig. 96). Year class strengths of petrale sole are strongly correlated with oceanographic events, and explains the high variability in landings.

The PFMC manages petrale sole through gear regulations that include restrictions on trawl net mesh size. The PFMC has also established ABC levels for the annual harvests of petrale sole in the waters off the West Coast, though no trip limits exist. The ABC levels for the Eureka, Monterey, and Conception regions were first set in 1983 and have not been changed since their establishment. A 2001 stock assessment reported that stock biomass is increasing and that current harvest levels are sustainable. The 2001 ABC was set at 1.76 million lb for the Monterey management area.




Figure 96. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of petrale sole within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.





Figure 97. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Rex sole within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Rex Sole (*Errex zachirus*)




Rex sole are rarely taken by recreational fishers, but are a large part of the flatfish trawl fishery from California to the Bering Sea. Commercial landings for rex sole within the MBNMS are highly variable (Fig. 97).

The coastwide biomass of rex sole was estimated to be 6.6–8.8 million lb in the late 1970s to early 1980s. Biomass estimates in the mid-1980s to mid-1990s then increased almost four-fold to 24.3–30.9 million lb. The biomass estimates of the rex sole population in the Monterey management area followed a similar trend. Biomass in this region was estimated at approximately 1.9 million lb during the 1970s and early 1980s, with biomass peaking at approximately 4.7 million lb in 1983. The high abundance of rex sole is reflected in the increase in commercial landings from 1980–88. Commercial landings of rex sole within the MBNMS are highly variable,

rising in the 1980s and showing an overall decline during the 1990s, with a peak in 1995. Rex sole are managed through gear regulations including trawl net mesh size. In PFMC stock assessments, rex sole are lumped into an “other flatfish” category.

Sanddabs (*Citharichthys* spp.)



Sanddabs are important species in the commercial trawl and longline fisheries. Commercial sanddab landings consist of three species, the Pacific sanddab (*Citharichthys sordidus*), speckled sanddab (*Citharichthys stigmaeus*) and the longfin sanddab (*Citharichthys xanthostigma*), with the Pacific sanddab composing the majority of landings. Commercial landings within the MBNMS have increased since 1981 (Fig. 98) and nearly all commercial landings of sanddabs are taken in trawl gear. This is a very stable and most likely underutilized resource throughout their range. Pacific sanddab are sold fresh and




Figure 98. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of sanddabs within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.





Figure 99. Reported CPFV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of sanddabs within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

whole in markets and restaurants. Sanddab are also often taken by anglers aboard CPFV and private vessels, and used for both consumption and as baitfish. Recreational landings by CPFV are highly variable for sanddabs (Fig. 99), although effort has remained relatively stable. The PFMC currently manages the Pacific sanddab, and there are no quotas or size limits for the commercial or recreational take of sanddabs. No population estimates exist for these species, however, commercial catch rates indicate a healthy population.

Starry Flounder (*Platichthys stellatus*)



The starry flounder is taken in both the commercial and recreational fishery, although it is seldom the target of the commercial fishery because it is low in value compared to the petrale sole and California halibut. Currently, starry flounder are nearly all caught in

the commercial trawl fishery; however in the 1980s, they were also caught by gill nets and trammel nets. Landings in ports near the MBNMS have declined since a high of 80,000 lb in 1985 (Fig. 100). Since the starry flounder is a nearshore species, the decline in landings through the 1990s can be attributed to the banning of gill and trammel net gear from nearshore waters. Landing data for this species, however, may not be accurate since a large portion may be reported in the unspeci-









Figure 100. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of starry flounder within soft bottom deep shelf and slope habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

Recreational anglers fish for starry flounder from piers, boats, and shore. Recreational landings at ports in Northern and Central California have declined since highs in the 1980s of 57,000 fish. Landings since 1993 have averaged 6,000 fish/yr (Fig. 101). The starry flounder is managed by the state. Currently there are no commercial or recreational size or number limits on the take of starry flounder.

Once discarded as a junk fish, innovative fishers in the 1980s and 1990s attempted to develop a new fishery for the grenadier. The mild, light meat of this species makes it a desirable market fish. These fish are abundant on the continental slope and are caught primarily with longline and trawl gear. The landings of grenadier at ports associated with MBNMS rose through the mid-1990s, peaking in 1996 with nearly 2 million lb landed, but have since decreased to considerably lower levels (Fig. 102). Currently there are no restrictions on landings, season, or vessels in this emerging fishery, but there is concern for this species because of the rapid expansion of the fishery and the identification as this species as slow growing.





Open Water Habitats



Open water species dwell within the water column, away from the protection and shelter of bottom habitats. The species living in open water habitats can be divided into three sub-groups (guilds) termed small coastal pelagics, coastal migrants, and pelagic migrants. The small coastal pelagics guild is a management unit of the PFMC and includes Pacific mackerel, jack mackerel, Pacific sardine, and northern anchovy. These fishes live most of their life cycle in waters close to the continents, taking advantage of the high productivity of coastal waters. The coastal migrants guild is characterized by mobile, nonresidential, neritic species such as Chinook and Coho salmon, spiny dogfish, smelt, Pacific bonito, Pacific hake, Pacific herring, and yellowtail. We created this category to include species that do not fit in the PFMC management categories of small coastal pelagics or highly migratory species. The pelagic migrants guild, also a management unit of the PFMC, includes tunas, swordfish, and thresher and mako

sharks. These species spend much of their life cycle in the open ocean and are known to make extensive migrations across the open ocean, occasionally entering the coastal zone.

Commercial landings from open water habitats averaged 20.6 million lb/yr from 1981–2000, and comprised 36% of the total landings at ports near the MBNMS in the last 20 years. Coastal pelagic fishes accounted for 76% of the landings from open water habitats (Table 12). Population abundances of most open water species are greatly determined by large-scale environmental phenomena, such as decadal-scale shifts in major currents that affect the success of spawning and recruitment. However, high fishing pressure at a time of changing environmental conditions can also influence population sizes. Many of these pelagic species are targeted by large fishing fleets with large fishing capacity. The high fishing capacity of large vessels and fleets can quickly reduce populations of schooling fishes, because the catchability of the fish does not diminish at the same rate as does population size. Some spe-

Table 12. Primary species landed in commercial fisheries in the MBNMS that were caught in open water habitats, and the percentage that each species contributed to the landings from this habitat group and total landings in the MBNMS. Landings from open water habitats during the period equaled 412.72 million pounds from 1981–2000. Total landings in all of the MBNMS equaled 1.14 billion pounds from 1981–2000.

Guild	Common Name	Scientific Name	% habitat	% total
Small Coastal Pelagics				
Vertebrates				
	Chub (Pacific) mackerel	<i>Scomber japonicus</i>	10.4	3.7
	Jack mackerel	<i>Trachurus symmetricus</i>	5.7	2.1
	Northern anchovy	<i>Engraulis mordax</i>	20.8	7.5
	Pacific sardine	<i>Sardinops sagax</i>	39.2	14.2
Coastal Migrants				
Vertebrates				
Anadromous	Chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	10.7	3.9
	Coho salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	0.1	< 0.1
Elasmobranchs	Spiny dogfish	<i>Squalus acanthias</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
Other species	Smelt	<i>Osmeridae, Atherinidae</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Pacific bonito	<i>Sarda chiliensis</i>	0.2	0.1
	Pacific hake	<i>Meluccius productus</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Pacific herring	<i>Clupea pallasii</i>	0.7	0.3
	Yellowtail	<i>Seriola lalandi</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
Pelagic Migrants				
Vertebrates				
Elasmobranchs	Shortfin mako shark	<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	0.2	0.1
	Bigeye Thresher Shark	<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Common Thresher Shark	<i>Alopias vulpinus</i>	0.8	0.3
Scombrids	Albacore	<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>	7.4	2.7
	Bluefin tuna	<i>Thunnus thynnus</i>	0.1	< 0.1
	Skipjack tuna	<i>Euthynnus pelamis</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
	Yellowfin tuna	<i>Thunnus albacares</i>	< 0.1	< 0.1
Other species	Swordfish	<i>Xiphias gladius</i>	3.4	1.2




Figure 103. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of all species within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.

The overall trend in landings from species occupying open water habitats has increased since the 1980s (Fig. 103). The majority of landings from these habitats are from the small coastal pelagics group, for which population abundances are often heavily influenced by environmental factors (Fig. 104). The recent upward trend in landings for this group is largely caused by the reopening of the Pacific sardine fishery that boomed in the late 1990s. The landings of the coastal migrants group have been highly variable over the past twenty years (Fig. 105). Chinook salmon is the predominate species in this group; salmon catches have fluctuated based on abundance and regulations. The pelagic migrants group has shown a decline in land-

Coastal Migrants

Landings (1,000,000 lb)

Year

ENSO ENSO ENSO ENSO

Year	Landings (1,000,000 lb)
1980	1.5
1981	2.4
1982	2.4
1983	1.5
1984	1.3
1985	1.1
1986	2.8
1987	2.2
1988	4.2
1989	2.3
1990	2.5
1991	2.0
1992	1.0
1993	1.8
1994	2.2
1995	4.9
1996	3.8
1997	4.2
1998	1.3
1999	2.5
2000	3.5

Small Coastal Pelagics

Landings (1,000,000 lb)

Year

ENSO ENSO ENSO ENSO

Year	Landings (1,000,000 lb)
1980	13
1981	11
1982	10
1983	12
1984	23
1985	4
1986	5
1987	3
1988	2
1989	1
1990	10
1991	8
1992	9
1993	5
1994	10
1995	18
1996	28
1997	45
1998	28
1999	41
2000	39

Pelagic Migrants

Landings (1,000,000 lb)

Year

ENSO ENSO ENSO ENSO

Year	Landings (1,000,000 lb)
1980	5.0
1981	1.0
1982	7.5
1983	2.8
1984	4.4
1985	3.2
1986	3.2
1987	3.2
1988	2.5
1989	1.8
1990	1.5
1991	1.2
1992	1.0
1993	1.2
1994	0.8
1995	1.2
1996	1.2
1997	3.7
1998	1.2
1999	2.5
2000	2.2

104

Small Coastal Pelagics

Pacific Mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*)

Prior to 1928, Pacific mackerel were sold primarily as a fresh fish item and market demand was low. In the late 1920s, processors began canning Pacific mackerel. With this increased market demand, sardine fishers started using seine nets to catch mackerel. Off-season albacore fishers also began targeting mackerel by herding them into a concentrated frenzy and using large dip nets to scoop the mackerel out of the water. Currently, seine nets account for nearly all the commercial fishing effort for Pacific mackerel. Pacific mackerel also are commonly caught as bycatch in trawl and hook-and-line fisheries.

The California fishery peaked in 1925 at 146 million lb, followed by several decades of fluctuating decline (Fig. 107). In 1953, the fishery seemed defunct, but was rejuvenated for several years after a good recruitment year. After a series of poor recruitment years in the 1960s, a moratorium was placed on mackerel fishing in 1970. The populations recovered and fishing began again in 1976 under a quota-based management system, with California-based seine vessels accounting for nearly all of the commercial fishing effort for Pacific mackerel in United States waters.

California landings of Pacific mackerel declined from 1990–1996, followed by higher landings in the years 1997, 1998, and 2000. Decline in landings is thought to be a result of low population size caused by poor recruitment and a decrease in effort by seine fishers, who have shown increased participation in the more lucrative winter squid and summer tuna fisheries. Peaks in landings may be associated with the warm water conditions associated with El Niño events that contributed to good recruitment years for mackerel.

Less than 5% of the California catch of Pacific mackerel is taken from MBNMS waters. At ports near the MBNMS, annual landings fluctuated greatly from 1981–2000, varying from highs of more than 7 million lb




Figure 107. Reported commercial landings of Pacific mackerel in California from 1916–1999.

in 1984 and 1997 to a low of 6000 lb in 1999 (Fig. 108). This high variability is most likely related to the effect of environmental conditions on recruitment and distribution of the Pacific mackerel. Pacific mackerel landings represent 10% of the landings from open water habitats (Table 12).

Pacific mackerel have been managed by NMFS since 1999 under the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. This plan established a process for setting annual ABCs and harvest guide-






Figure 108. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Pacific mackerel within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Pacific mackerel is also commonly caught in recreational fisheries, with tuna and mackerel species dominating recreational landings throughout California in 1997. There is currently no limit on the recreational catch of Pacific mackerel. Recreational CPFV landings within the MBNMS have declined since a high of nearly 60,000 fish in 1984, along with a slight decreasing trend in fishing effort. Peaks in recreational landings occurred in 1984, 1990, 1992, and 1997, concomitant with peaks seen in commercial landings, most likely attributable to environmental conditions (specifically El Niño) that promoted strong year classes (Fig. 109). Pacific mackerel are also caught in great numbers incidentally in the rockfish and salmon fisheries from piers and breakwaters.

Jack mackerel is a pelagic schooling fish with a distinct distribution. Juveniles occur inshore off of Southern California and Baja California, and adults are found further north and offshore. Commercial landings of jack mackerel in most years are below 500,000 lb, with the exception of a rise in 1983 and peak in 1984 of 12 million lb (Fig. 110). Price has varied over the years inversely with peaks in landings. Because it is not as valuable as the Pacific sardine or Pacific mackerel in the commercial fishery, variations in landings of jack mackerel are often associated with a fleet's ability to catch the more profitable species. The increase in landings in certain years may also be due to an influx of warm water associated with El Niño conditions. Jack mackerel are also caught recreationally, primarily from CPFV boats and piers.

The jack mackerel is currently managed under the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. Under the plan, jack mackerel are designated a “monitored species,” meaning the stocks are monitored through commercial landings and do not require intensive harvest management. The plan also established a limited entry program for coastal pelagic finfish. Currently



there is no harvest quota or estimate of biomass for the jack mackerel.

Northern Anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*)



Northern anchovy are harvested using lampara nets and purse seines, and sold fresh frozen or as bait. Northern anchovy are harvested as part of the “wetfish” fishery that also targets Pacific mackerel, jack mackerel, Pacific bonito, market squid, sardine, and tunas. Anchovy are often targeted when large catches of these other, more lucrative, species are not available. The anchovy fishery was small until the collapse of the Pacific sardine fishery in 1952. After a brief period of high catches, low anchovy marketability caused landings to decline in 1954. California catches remained at low levels through 1964, with anchovy landings fluctuating greatly since that time (Fig. 111). Catch fluctuations are

due to variable market conditions and to environmental factors that greatly influence the population size.

Anchovy harvest in the MBNMS peaked in 1981 with landings of 10 million lb, then declined to a low of 700,000 lb in 1983 (Fig. 112). From 1985–89, landings averaged 1.9 million lb/yr, rose to about 5 million lb/yr in 1990–91, then returned to an average of 2.3 million lb/yr from 1992–95. Landings rose again in 1996 and 1997 to approximately 8 million lb/yr, followed by lower landings in 1998 and 1999, and the highest landings in the past twenty years, 14 million lb, in 2000. Landings of northern anchovy accounted for 21% of the total landings from open water habitats in the MBNMS in the last 20 years (Table 12). Total commercial landings in 2000 throughout California were nearly 26 million lb, with ports associated with the MBNMS comprising over 55 % of this catch. Price per pound for northern anchovy has been highly variable over the past twenty years, with increases in price corresponding with low catch years.

The northern anchovy has long been considered a boom-and-bust species. Anchovy abundances were probably higher in the 19th




Figure 111. Reported commercial landings of northern anchovy in California from 1916–1999.





Figure 112. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of northern anchovy within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Northern anchovy stocks cross the United States–Mexico border, and at one time this fishery was managed jointly between the

Sardine fisheries have been an important marine resource within California since the early 1900s (Fig. 113). During the peak harvest periods in the 1930s and 1940s, sardine were used for fishmeal, soap oil, paint mixer, vitamins, glycerin, and shortening. The decline in stock biomass caused many of the canneries to close by the 1960s. In 1974, a moratorium limited the take to incidental catch totaling no more than 110,000 lb/yr. These regulations remained in place through 1981 to allow the population to recover. Catches between 1975–86 remained less than



5,000 lb/yr. In 1986, CDFG allowed the first targeted sardine fishery since the 1974 closure, and landings at ports near the MBNMS began to increase. Landings gradually rose from 1986 to a total of over 37 million lb in 1999 (Fig. 114). A new canning line developed in 1994, allowing fishers to target smaller sardine and was one of the reasons landings peaked in 1999. Landings of Pacific sardine comprise 14% of the total landings of all species from 1981–2000 in the MBNMS. In 1999, Pacific sardine was added to the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP, which implemented harvest limits based on stock assessments and established a limited entry fishery. Ex-vessel price per pound has remained consistently low throughout recent years due to the increasing trend in sardine landings.

The Pacific sardine has long been considered a boom-and-bust species. Fluctuations in population size are apparent as far back as 200 AD. Twelve main occurrences, separated by 20–200 yr, have been documented, with the highest population existing 1,000 years ago. This fluctuation in population size suggests that species interactions and environmental factors play a large role in the pattern seen in the fishery.

Prior to 1967, Pacific sardine were managed by seasonal closures and catch limits of whole fish for reduction. From 1967–85, the fishery was limited to incidental catch. Small, directed fisheries have been allowed since 1986 with specific catch quotas. At this time, a joint research effort exists with the United States and Mexico to assess spawning biomass. In 1999, Pacific sardine biomass in United States waters was estimated to be about 3.5 billion lb and total Pacific sardine landings for the directed fisheries off California and Baja California reached more than 253 million lb, the highest level in recent history. Stock biomass and recruitment is estimated to be high in the 2001 stock assessment conducted by PFMC, and current harvest is less than the quota.

Currently, the Pacific sardine is managed by the PFMC under the Coastal Pelagic Species FMP. Pacific sardine is designated “actively managed species,” meaning harvest limits are based on current assessments of stock biomass. Under the plan, a limited entry program was established. The 2001 harvest limit for the Pacific sardine was set at 297 million lb based on a biomass estimate of 2.6 billion lb. This species has increased in abundance since the 1980s; the age-1 plus population was estimated at 3.8 billion lb in 1998 and 1999 in California waters. Although the population of Pacific sardine has rapidly expanded in the past twenty years, it is still well below biomass estimates from the 1930s.

Coastal Migrants



Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)



Most of the Chinook salmon caught in the Monterey Bay region originated in the Sacramento River or its tributaries. In the Sacramento River system, there are four distinct runs of Chinook salmon that are named after the time they enter fresh water: fall, late-fall, winter, and spring. The Sacramento River fall and late fall runs are more robust than the other two runs, which are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Sacramento River winter run Chinook salmon abundance dropped from more than 100,000 fish in 1979 to a historic low of 191 fish in 1991, and that run received federal protection under the ESA in 1994. The Red Bluff dam and irrigation districts that diverted water from this run altered essential spawning habitat, and played a major role in this run’s decline. Since 1996, when the spawning population was estimated to be 800 individuals, the size of the

winter run has dramatically increased, reaching around 11,000 individuals by 2001. Much of this increase is due to improved river flow conditions in the watershed. Spring run Chinook salmon were once the most abundant salmon in California prior to state and federal dam systems, with up to 1 million fish returning to spawn in each of the Central Valley and Klamath/Trinity watersheds. Today, the number of spring run Chinook returning to these river systems has declined relative to historic abundances. Population estimates of spring run Chinook in 1999 were low enough to cause them to be listed as threatened under the ESA. It is these weaker salmon runs that greatly affect fishery management and water policy throughout the state of California.

joined the summer fishery. In 1980, a moratorium was placed on the issuance of permits to new participants in the ocean commercial salmon fishery in order to increase individual profits and reduce overall fishery impacts. A limited-entry program was implemented in 1983. Despite these regulations, the overall landings of Chinook increased from 1980–88. However, a dramatic decrease in landings was seen from 1988 to the early 1990s, due in large part to the drought conditions in California. Since this time there has been a sharp increase and subsequent decrease in landings. In 2000, more than 3.3 million lb of salmon were landed at ports near the MBNMS (Fig. 115). Overall, the trend in Chinook salmon landings is variable and is directly related to stock size and available seasons and quotas. Recent landings of Chinook salmon have been high, largely attributed to the relatively robust fall run of the Sacramento River, rather than populations of winter and spring run Chinook salmon which are severely depressed. Alteration or loss of spawning grounds of several runs through water diversion has dramatically affected population abundance and contributed significantly to the current declines.



California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report (2001).

Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)


Coho salmon are smaller than Chinook salmon and spawn more frequently in coastal streams and rivers. In contrast to the many Chinook runs, there is now only one race of Coho salmon in California. The abundance of

Coho salmon between the Oregon border and Monterey Bay was once estimated at over 500,000 fish. Today, this population has declined to less than 15,000 wild fish. Because of this drastic decline, Southern Oregon and Northern and Central California Coho salmon stocks have been listed as “threatened” under the ESA.

Coho salmon wild fish populations have steadily declined since the 1950s and 1960s. These declines are due primarily to habitat destruction, water diversion, the effects of hatchery practices, and fishing. The limited evidence available indicates that these low numbers of natural populations are not self-sustaining and Coho populations are in danger of extinction. Landings of Coho salmon reflect the current severe fishery restrictions for this species. Excluding the anomalously high catches in 1991, Coho landings at ports near the MBNMS averaged less than 20,000 lb/yr from 1980–92 (Fig. 117). The PFMC regulates Coho fisheries. The retention of Coho salmon in the commercial and sport fishery has been prohibited since 1994. For additional information see Leet et al.

California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report (2001).

Pacific Hake (*Merluccius productus*)



Pacific hake is one of the most abundant groundfish populations in the California current system. This species is caught almost exclusively in midwater trawls, in water depths of 100–500 m. Historically, foreign vessels dominated the Pacific hake fishery off the West Coast of the United States. The fishery was started in 1966 by Soviet trawlers, which caught more than 302 million lb. By 1976, more than 523 million lb were harvested by vessels from several foreign nations. After






Figure 117. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of Coho salmon within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

In recent years, catches of Pacific hake have been largely influenced by annual recruitment. Higher catches occur 3–4 years following strong recruitment years. Very large year-classes of Pacific hake were produced in 1980 and 1984, leading to high catches in Central California throughout most of the 1980s. Most of the landings were delivered into San Francisco ports, however, and are not reflected in the landings for ports near the MBNMS (Fig. 118). Coastwide recruitment was average or low between 1987 and 1992,

The fishery is managed using quotas, geographic and seasonal restrictions, mesh size, and incidental catch levels. The effectiveness of management plans has been limited because there is currently no agreement between the United States and Canada on how to divide the predicted ABC between the two countries. In 1997, the PFMFC set a United States harvest guideline of 80% of the predicted ABC for the stock. Since the end of joint venture fishing in 1989, the total United States and Canadian reported catch has met or exceeded the ABC by 10–15% each year. The 2000 stock assessment for Pacific hake revealed that the stock is at moderate abundance, with mature female biomass at 37% of the unfished stock.



Pelagic Migrants

Albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*)

Albacore make large transoceanic migrations. They spawn in subtropical waters and pass by our coast as young fish from June to January. Albacore were first reported in the sport fishery off Santa Catalina Island at the turn of the century. As the size, speed, and technology of boats has increased, so have albacore landings. Fishing gear, however, has changed very little. Because juvenile albacore travel in loose knit schools at the surface, commercial harvesting is most effectively accomplished by trolling with lures or baited hook-and-line. Commercial vessels landing albacore in the MBNMS only fish seasonally and switch gears or target species to participate in other fisheries, such as the salmon fishery. At ports near the MBNMS, there has been a decline in total landings and fishing effort since the mid-1980s (Fig. 119). A series of gear restrictions, lower ex-vessel prices in this area, and a shift in albacore distribution to areas far from MBNMS ports is responsible for this decline in landings. Albacore fishing is now also popular in the recreational CPFV and private skiff fishery (Fig. 120), with significant landing increases occurring in the late 1990s.




Figure 120. Reported CPFV landings (solid line) and effort (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of albacore within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix G for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.

Historically, there has been a tremendous fluctuation in albacore landings due to changes in nearshore distribution and availability (Fig. 121). This variability is caused by environmental factors such as winds, location of cool sea surface temperatures, and intense storms that displace albacore offshore. During El Niño years, albacore may appear off Oregon and Washington without ever entering California waters. Albacore catch is greatest when surface temperatures are 18.3–19.7° C.

Albacore exhibit substantial yearly fluctuations in year class strength. This fact, coupled with the highly migratory lifestyle of the species, makes albacore stock status difficult to determine. Stock assessments based on catch rates from fisheries showed a slight decreasing trend in abundance between 1980 and 1990. In more recent years, however, abundance estimates have increased, possibly due to the strong year-class of 1989 and cessation of high seas drift gill net fishery by foreign vessels.

Albacore has been designated as a highly migratory species and will be managed under the PFCs Highly Migratory Species fishery management plan, which is currently under development. To date there is no limit on sport catch of albacore. Current information sug-





Figure 121. Reported commercial landings of albacore in California from 1916–1999.

Swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*)



due to the 1985 limitations imposed on the use of driftnet gear, a gear that provided a more cost efficient and successful method to catch swordfish and other large pelagic fishes. Harpoon, hook-and-line, and limited driftnet fisheries still exist for the swordfish, but effort, and therefore catch, are substantially reduced. In recent years, concerns about possible bycatch in this fishery have led to regulations that shifted fishing effort to areas outside of the MBNMS.

Pelagic Sharks

Shark fisheries first boomed in the 1930–40s during World War II because of the high demand for liver oil. Populations quickly declined in the early 1950s and the fisheries collapsed. An increased demand for shark meat as a food item began in the late 1970s and early 1980s, leading to targeting of species of pelagic sharks, such as the common thresher shark. This species was heavily targeted for about ten years, until declines in population became evident from the reduced harvest. This decline prompted the commercial fishery to switch to targeting of another pelagic species, the shortfin mako. The devel-




Figure 122. Reported commercial landings (solid line) and ex-vessel prices (dotted line) from 1981–2000 of swordfish within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS. See Appendix F for specific yearly meanings of each regulatory symbol.





Figure 123. Reported commercial landings from 1981–2000 of pelagic sharks within open water habitats at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS.



REFERENCES

- Allen, M.A. and T.J. Hassler. 1986. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) — Chinook salmon. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 26 pp.
- Amos, D. 1980. Single vessel midwater trawling: A basic guide to the theory, selection and operation of single vessel midwater trawls. University of Rhode Island, Marine Bulletin 43.
- Amos, D. 1985. Trawl fisherman's gear technology manual. University of Alaska Sea Grant Report 85-10. 80 pp.
- Armstrong, D.A. 1990. Shells and warmth: The advantage of estuarine recruitment to the juvenile Dungeness crab and implications for the fishery. Bulletin of Marine Science 46(1):244-251.
- Arora, H.L. 1951. An investigation of the California sanddab, *Citharichthys sordidus* (Girard). California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 37:3-42.
- Ault, J.S. 1985. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest)—Black, green and red abalones. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 19 pp.
- Auster, P.J., R.W. Langton. 1999. The effects of fishing on fish habitat. American Fisheries Society Symposium. 22: 150-187.
- Auster, P.J., R.J. Malatesta, R.W. Langton, L. Watling, P.C. Valentine, C.L.S. Donaldson, E.W. Langton, A.N. Shepard, and I.G. Babb. 1996. The impacts of mobile fishing gear on seafloor habitats in the Gulf of Maine (northwest Atlantic): implications for conservation of fish populations. Rev. Fish. Sci. 4:185-202.
- Bailey, K.M., R.C. Rancis, and P.R. Stevens. 1982. The life history and fishery of Pacific whiting, *Merluccius productus*. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fishery Investigations, Report 23:81-98.
- Bargmann, G.G. 1982. The biology and fisheries for lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) in Puget Sound. Washington Department of Fish, Technical Report 66. 69 pp.
- Barnes, J.T. and D.H. Hanan. 1995. Status of the Pacific mackerel resource and fishery, 1994 and 1995. California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resources Division, Admin. Report 95-4. 20 pp.
- Barnes, J.T., A.D. MacCall, L.D. Jacobson, and P. Wolf. 1992. Recent population trends and estimates for the Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations, Report 33:60-75.
- Barnes, J.T, M. Yaremko, and T. Bishop. 1996. Status of the Pacific mackerel resource during 1996 and management recommendations for the fishery. California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resources Division, unpublished report. 32 pp.
- Baumgartner, T.R., A. Soutar, and V. Ferreira-Bartrina. 1992. Reconstruction of the history of Pacific sardine and northern anchovy populations over the past two millennia from sediments of the Santa Barbara Basin, California. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 33:24-40.
- Beamish, R.J. 1993. Climate and exceptional fish production off the west coast of North America. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 50:2270-2291.
- Boehlert, G.W., W.H. Barss, and P.B. Lamberson. 1982. Fecundity of the widow rockfish, *Sebastes entomelas*, off the coast of Oregon. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 80:881-884.
- Botsford, L.W. and R.C. Hobbs. 1995. Recent advances in the understanding of cyclic behavior of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*) populations. Proceedings of a symposium of shellfish life histories and shellfishery models, June 25-29, 1990, Moncton, New Brunswick. International consortium for the exploration of the sea, marine science symposium 199.

Botsford, L.W. and J.F. Quinn. 1996. Spatial management of the Northern California red sea urchin fishery. California Sea Grant Biennial Report of Completed Projects 1992–94. pp 103–110.

Botsford, L.W., S.R. Wing and J.G. Brittanacher. 1993. Rotating spatial harvest of a benthic invertebrate, the red sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*. Alaska Sea Grant College Program. International symposium on the management of exploited fish. pp. 409–428.

Boyd, R.O. and C.M. Dewees. 1992. Putting theory into practice: Individual transferable quotas in New Zealand's fisheries. Society of Natural Resources 5:179–198.

Burton, E. J., J. M. Cope, L. A. Kerr, and G. M. Cailliet. 2000. Biological characteristics of nearshore fishes of California: A review of existing knowledge and proposed additional studies for the Pacific Ocean interjurisdictional fisheries management plan coordination and development. Report submitted to the Pacific State Marine Fisheries Commission. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/lifehistories/report_final.html

Caddy, J.F. (ed). 1989. Marine invertebrate fisheries: Their assessment and management. John Wiley and Sons, Inc, New York, NY. 752 pp.

Cailliet, G.M. 1992. Demography of the Central California population of the leopard shark (*Triakis semifasciata*). Australia Journal of Marine and Freshwater Resources 43:183–193.

Cailliet, G.M., A.H. Andrews, E.J. Burton, D.L. Watters, D.E. Kline, and L.A. Ferry-Graham. 2001. Age determination and validation studies of marine fishes: do deep-dwellers live longer? *Experimental Gerontology* (Proceedings of the Symposium on Organisms with Slow Aging). 36:739–764.

Cailliet, G.M. and D.W. Bedford. 1983. The biology of three pelagic sharks from California waters, and their emerging fisheries: A review. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 24:57–69.

Cailliet, G.M., D.B. Holts, and D. Bedford. 1991. A review of the commercial fisheries for sharks on the west coast of the United States. In: Proceedings of an international workshop on the conservation of . Sydney, Australia. pp. 13–29.

Cailliet, G.M., L.K. Martin, J.T. Harvey, D. Kusher, and B.A. Welden. 1983. Preliminary studies on the age and growth of Blue, *Prionace glauca*, Common Thresher, *Alopias vulpinus*, and Shortfin Mako, *Isurus oxyrinchus*, sharks from California waters. In: Proceedings of an international workshop on age determination of oceanic pelagic fishes: Tunas, billfishes, sharks. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Tech Rept 8:179–188.

Cailliet, G.M., E.K. Osada, and M. Moser. 1988. Ecological studies of sablefish in Monterey Bay. California Department of Fish and Game 74(3):132–153.

California Agricultural Statistics Service. 2001. Agriculture Statistical Review. P.O. Box 1258, Sacramento, CA 95812. <ftp://www.nass.usda.gov/pub/nass/ca/AgStats/2000-ovw.pdf>

California Department of Fish and Game. 1996. California sport fishing regulations. Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1996. Digest of California commercial fish laws and licensing requirements. Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1997. California Sport Fishing Regulations. Department of Fish & Game, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.

California Department of Fish and Game. 1999. Fish and Game Code 1999. Fish

- and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2001. Draft: Nearshore Fishery Management Plan. California Fish and Game Commission. 20 Lower Ragsdale Drive, Suite 100. Monterey, CA 93940
- California State Lands Commission. 1994. California comprehensive offshore resource study. Vol I.
- Carretta, J.V. 2001. Preliminary estimates of cetacean mortality in California gillnet fisheries for 2000. Paper SC/53/SM9 presented to the International Whaling Commission (unpublished). 21 p.
- Carroll, J.C. 1982. Seasonal abundance, size composition, and growth of rock crab, *Cancer antennarius* Stimpson, off Central California. *Journal of Crustacean Biology* 2(4):549-561.
- Carroll, J.C. and R.N. Winn. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) — Brown rock crab, red rock crab and yellow crab. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 82(11.117). 16 pp.
- Cass, A.J., R.J. Beamish and G.A. McFarlane. 1990. Lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*). Canadian Special Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 109. 35 pp.
- Cox, K.W. 1960. Review of the abalone of California. California Department of Fish and Game 46:381-406.
- Dahlstrom, W.A. 1970. Synopsis of biological data on the ocean shrimp *Pandalus jordani* Rathbun, 1902. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Fisheries Report, 57(4):1377-1416.
- Dark, T.A. (ed.). 1985. Pacific whiting: the resource, industry, and management history. *Marine Fisheries Review* 47(2):1-98.
- Deweese, C.M. 1980. University of California Sea Grant, Marine Advisory Program. Leaflet 21155.
- Deweese, C.M. and L.T. Davies. 1992. Sea urchins, abalone and kelp: their biology, enhancement and management. California Sea Grant College Program, Summary of an international conference. 55 pp.
- Deweese, C.M. and R.J. Price. 1982. Overview of the squid fishery on the Pacific coast of the United States. In: Proceedings of the international squid symposium, Aug 9-12, 1981, Boston, Massachusetts. pp 197-212.
- Deweese, C.M. and E. Ueber. 1990. Effects of different fishery management schemes on bycatch, joint catch, and discards. Summary of a national workshop sponsored by the California Sea Grant College System and National Marine Fisheries Service. Sea Grant College Report T-CSGCP-019.
- Dorn, M. et al. 2000. Status of the coastal Pacific whiting resource in 1996. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115-0070.
- ECOSCAN. 1989. California coastal kelp resources - Summer 1989. Report and maps prepared under contract to the California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resources Division, Sacramento, CA.
- Eitner, S. L., R. J. Anima, A. J. Stevenson, and F. L. Wong. 2000. Polygon coverage MBGEOLSE for Seafloor rocks and sediments of the continental shelf from Monterey Bay to Point Sur, California: USGS Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-2345, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA.
- Engel, J. and R. Kvitek. 1998. Effects of Otter Trawling on a Benthic Community in Monterey Bay. *Conservation Biology*. vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 1204-1214.
- Eschmeyer, W.N. and E.S. Herald. 1983. A field guide to Pacific coast fishes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 336 pp.

Feinberg, L. and T. Morgan. 1980. California's salmon resource: Its biology, use and management. Sea Grant Report Series No. 3. California Sea Grant College Program No. 72.

Ferguson, A. and G.M. Cailliet. 1990. Sharks and rays of the Pacific coast. Monterey Bay Aquarium Foundation, Monterey, California. 64 pp.

Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 Fact Sheet. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 1992. Review of the state of world fishery resources, Part I. The marine resources. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations Fisheries Circular No. 710, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 1993. Marine fisheries and the law of the sea: A decade of change. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Fisheries Circular No. 853, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Marine Resources Service, Fishery Resources Division. 1995. Review of the state of the world fishery resources: Marine fisheries. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Fisheries Circular No. 884. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. 105 pp.

Forney, K. A., S. R. Benson, and G. A. Cameron. 2001. Central California gillnet effort and bycatch of sensitive species, 1990–1998. Proceedings—Seabird Bycatch: Trends, Roadblocks, and Solutions. University of Alaska Sea Grant, pp. 141–160.

Forrester, C.R. 1969. Life history information on some groundfish species. Fisheries Board of Canada, Technical Report 105:1–17.

Fowler, S. 1993. Fish for the future: A citizen's guide to federal marine fisheries management. Center for Marine Conservation, Washington D.C. 142 pp.

Fox, D.S. and R.M. Starr. 1996. Comparison of research and fishery catch data. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 53(12):2681–2694

Fraday, T., (ed.). 1981. Proceedings of the international pandalid shrimp symposium. University of Alaska Sea Grant Report 81–3. 35 pp.

Friedlander, A.M., G. W. Boehlert, M. E. Field, J. E. Mason, J. V. Gardner, and P. Dartnell. 1999. Sidescan-sonar mapping of benthic trawl marks on the shelf and slope off Eureka California. Fishery Bulletin (97) pp 786-801.

Fritzsche, R.A. and T.J. Hassler. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) — Pile perch, striped seaperch, and rubberlip seaperch. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 82(11.103). 15 pp.

Godfrey, H. 1965. Coho salmon in offshore waters. International North Pacific Fisheries Commission Bulletin 16:1–39.

Gordon, B.L. 1996. Monterey Bay area: Natural history and cultural imprints. 3rd ed. Boxwood Press, Pacific Grove, CA. 375 pp.

Gotshall, D. 1987. Marine animals of Baja California: A Guide to Common Fishes and Invertebrates. Sea Challenges, Monterey, CA. 113 pp.

Greene, H., J. J. Bizzarro, T. L. Vallier, E. Sandoval (Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Center for Habitat Studies). 2001. California Nearshore Marine Habitats: Mapping and Characterization, Series 1 Volume 3 data, Central Region Monterey Peninsula.

Greene, H., J. J. Bizzarro, T. L. Vallier, E. Sandoval (Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Center for Habitat Studies). 2001. California Nearshore Marine Habitats: Mapping and Characterization, Series 1, Volume 5 data, Geology of the Continental Shelf., MLML, Center for Habitat Studies, MLML, CA.

Gulland, J.A. (ed.). 1988. Fish population dynamics: Implications for management. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 218 pp.

- Gunderson, D.R. 1984. The great widow rockfish hunt of 1980–82. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 4:465–468.
- Hagerman, F.B. 1952. The biology of the Dover sole. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 85. 48 pp.
- Hall, M.A. 1996. On bycatches. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 6(3): 319–352.
- Hallacher, L.E. and D.A. Roberts. 1985. Differential utilization of space and food by the inshore rockfishes (Scorpaenidae: *Sebastes*) of Carmel Bay, California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 12(2):91–110.
- Hancock, D.A. and J.P. Beumer. 1996. Proceedings: Second world fisheries congress, Brisbane, Australia.
- Hannah, R.W. 1993. Influence of environmental variation and spawning stock levels on recruitment of ocean shrimp (*Pandalus jordani*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 50(3):612–622.
- Hart, J.L. 1973. Pacific Fishes of Canada. Fisheries Research Board of Canada Bulletin No. 180.
- Hassler, T.J. 1987. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) — Coho salmon. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 19 pp.
- Haugen, C.W. (ed.). 1990. The California halibut, *Paralichthys californicus*, resource and fisheries. California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin 174.
- Hayward, T.L., D.R. Cayan, P.J.S. Franks, P.E. Smith, R. tion. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 36:19–39.
- Healy, M.C. 1994. Variation in the life history characteristics of Chinook salmon and its relevance to conservation of the Sacramento winter run of Chinook salmon. *Conservation Biology* 8(3):876–877.
- Hedrick, P.W., D. Hedgecock, and Hamelberg. 1995. Effective population size of winter-run Chinook salmon. *Conservation Biology* 9(3):615–624.
- Hightower, J.E. 1990. Multispecies harvesting policies for Washington–Oregon–California rockfish trawl fisheries. *U.S. Fishery Bulletin* 88(4):645–656.
- Hilborn, R and J. L. Valero. 2001. Status of the Sablefish Resource off the U.S. Pacific Coast in 2001. Pacific Fishery Management Council draft report.
- Hollowed, A.B., K.M. Bailey, and W.S. Wooster. 1987. Patterns in recruitment of marine fishes in the Northeast Pacific Ocean. *Biological Oceanography* 5:99–131.
- Hollowed, A.B. and W.S. Wooster. 1992. Variability of winter ocean conditions and strong year-classes of Northeast Pacific groundfish. *International Consortium for the Exploration of the Sea, Marine Science Symposia* 195:433–444.
- Holts, D. 1985. Recreational albacore, *Thunnus alalunga*, fishery by U.S. West Coast commercial passenger fishing vessels. *Marine Fisheries Review* 47(3):48–53.
- Horton, H.F. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Northwest) — Dover and rock sole. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 17 pp.
- Hosie, M.J. 1976. The rex sole. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Information Report 76–2:1–5.
- Hosie, M.J. and H.F. Horton. 1977. Biology of the rex sole, *Glyptocephalus zachirus*, in waters off Oregon. *U.S. Fisheries Bulletin* 75:51–60.
- Hunter, J.R., B.J. Macewicz, and C.A. Kimbrell. 1989. Fecundity and other aspects of the reproduction of sablefish, *Anoplopoma fimbria*, in Central California waters. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 30:61–72.

- Ianelli, J.N., R. Lauth, and L.D. Jacobson. 1994. Status of the thornyhead (*Sebastolobus* sp.) resource in 1994. National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center. 58 pp.
- Ianelli, J. N., M. Wilkins, and S. Harley. 2000. Status and future prospects for the Pacific Ocean perch resources in waters off Washington and Oregon as assessed in 2000. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Jacobson, L.D., E.S. Konno and J.P. Perterra. 1994. Status of Pacific mackerel and trends in biomass, 1978–1993. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 35:36–39.
- Jagiello, T., D. Wilson-Vandenberg, J. Sneva, S. Rosenfield, and F. Wallace. 2000. Assessment of lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) for the Pacific Fishery Management Council in 2000. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Karpov, K.A., D.P. Albin, and W.H. Van Buskirk. 1995. The marine recreational fishery in Northern and Central California, a historical comparison (1958–86), status of stocks (1980–86), and effects of changes in the California current. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin No. 176. 192 pp.
- Kato, S. and J.E. Hardwick. 1975. The California squid fishery. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Fisheries Report 170 (Suppl.). 150 pp.
- Kato, S. and S.C. Schroeter. 1985. Biology of the red sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*, and its fishery in California. Marine Fisheries Review 47(3):1–20.
- Kemp, M.K. 1986. Cannery Row: The history of old Ocean View Avenue. The History Company, Monterey, CA. 125 pp.
- Ketchen, K.S. and C.R. Forrester. 1966. Population dynamics of the Petrale sole, *Eopsetta jordani*, in waters off western Canada. Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Bulletin 153:1–195.
- King, K.A. 1985. Foreign and joint venture fishing operations off Washington, Oregon, and California, 1977–1984. National Marine Fisheries Service, North West Region Report.
- King, K.A. 1990. Foreign and joint venture fishing operations off Washington, Oregon and California. National Marine Fisheries Service, North West Region Report.
- Kline, D.E. 1996. Radiochemical age verification for two species of deep-sea rockfish (*Sebastolobus altivelis* and *S. alascanus*). M.S. Thesis, San Jose State University. 127 pp.
- Klingbeil, R.A. 1976. Southern range extensions of the blue rockfish, *Sebastes mystinus*, the flag rockfish, *S. rubrivinctus*, and the shortbelly rockfish, *S. jordani*. California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin 62:160.
- Kope, R.G. and L.W. Botsford. 1990. Determination of factors affecting recruitment of Chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* in Central California. U.S. Fisheries Bulletin 88:257–269.
- Kramer, S.H. 1990. Habitat specificity and ontogenetic movements of juvenile California halibut, *Paralichthys californicus*, and other flatfishes in shallow waters of Southern California. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, San Diego. 266 pp.
- Krygier, E.E. and W.G. Pearcy. 1986. The role of estuarine and offshore nursery areas for young English sole, *Parophrys vetulus* Girard, off Oregon. U.S. Fisheries Bulletin 84:119–132.
- Kucas, S.T., Jr. and J. Parsons. 1986. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Southwest) — Northern anchovy. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 82(11.50). 13 pp.

- Kusher, D.I., S.E. Smith, and G.M. Cailliet. 1992. Validated age and growth of the leopard shark, *Triakis semifasciata*, from Central California. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 35(2):187–203.
- Lasker, R. and A. MacCall. 1983. New ideas in the fluctuations of clupeoid stocks off California. In : *Proceedings of the joint oceanographic assembly 1982—General symposia*, Ottawa. 189 pp.
- Lassuy, D.R. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Northwest) — English sole. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 82(11.101).
- Laufle, J.C., G.B. Pauley, and M.F. Shepard. 1986. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Northwest) — Coho salmon. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 28 pp.
- Laurs, R.M. and R.J. Lynn. 1977. Seasonal migration of North Pacific albacore, *Thunnus alalunga*, into North American coastal waters: Distribution, relative abundance, and association with transition zone waters. *U.S. Fishery Bulletin* 75(4):795–822.
- Lea, R.N., R.D. McAllister, and D.A. VenTresca. 1999. Biological aspects of nearshore rockfishes of the genus *Sebastes* with notes on ecologically related sportfishes off Central California. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 177.
- Leet, W.S., C.M. Dewees, and C. W. Haugen. 1992. California's living marine resources. University of California Sea Grant, Davis. 257 pp.
- Leet, W.S., C.M. Dewees, R. Klingbeil, and E. Larson. 2001. California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report. California Department of Fish and Game. 593 pp.
- Lenarz, W.H. 1980. Shortbelly rockfish, *Sebastes jordani*: A large unfished resource in waters off California. *Marine Fisheries Review* (March–April): 34–40.
- Lenarz, W.H. and D.R. Gunderson (eds.). 1987. Widow rockfish: *Proceedings of a workshop*, Tiburon, California, December 10–11, 1980. National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Technical Report 48.
- Lenarz, W.H., D.A. VenTresca, W.M. Graham, F.B. Schwing, and F. Chavez. 1995. Explorations of El Niño events and associated biological population dynamics off Central California. California Cooperative Oceanography and Fisheries Investigation Report 36:106–119.
- Lluch-Belda, D., S. Hernandez-Vazquez, D.B. Lluch-Cota, C.A. Salinas-Zavala and R.A. Schwartzlose. 1992. California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations, Report 33:50–59.
- Love, M.S., G.E. McGowen, W. Westphal, R.J. Lavenberg, and L. Martin. 1984. Aspects of the life history and fishery of the white croaker, *Genyonemus lineatus* (Sciaenidae), off California. *U.S. Fisheries Bulletin* 82:179–198.
- Love, M.S., P. Morris, M. McCrae, and R. Collins. 1990. Life history aspects of 19 rockfish species (Scorpaenidae: *Sebastes*) from the Southern California Bight. National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Technical Report No. 87. 38 pp.
- Love, R.M. 1996. Probably more than you ever wanted to know about the fishes of the Pacific coast. Really Big Press, Santa Barbara, CA. 215 pp.
- Lui, Hsi-Chiang and N. Bartoo. 1995. Report of the fourteenth North Pacific albacore workshop. Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China. 39 pp.
- MacCall, A.D. and M.H. Prager. 1988. Historical changes in abundance of six fish species off Southern California, based on CalCOFI egg and larvae samples. California Cooperative Oceanography and Fisheries Investigation Report 29:91–101.
- Mangelsdorf, T. 1986. A history of Steinbeck's cannery row. Western Tanager Press, Santa Cruz, CA. 216 pp.

Markle, D.F., P.M. Harris, and C.L. Toole. 1992. Metamorphosis and an overview of early-life-history stages in Dover sole *Microstomus pacificus*. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 90:285–301.

Marliave, J. B. and M. Roth. 1995. Agarum kelp beds as nursery habitat of spot prawns, *Pandalus platyceros* Brandt, 1851 (Decapoda, Caridea). Crustacea 68(1):27–37.

Martin, L. and G.D. Zorzi. 1993. Status and review of the California skate fishery. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Technical Report 115. pp 39–52.

Mason, J.C. 1986. Fecundity of the pacific hake, *Merluccius productus*, spawning in Canadian waters. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 84(1):209–217.

Mason, J.E. 1965. Chinook salmon in offshore waters. International North Pacific Fisheries Commission Bulletin 16:41–74.

Mason, J.E. 1995. Species trends in sport fisheries, Monterey, CA, 1959–86. Marine Fisheries Review 57(1):1–16.

Mason, J. E. 1998. Declining rockfish lengths in the Monterey Bay, California, recreational fishery. Marine Fisheries Review 60(3): 15-28.

McArdle, D.A. 1997. California Marine Protected Areas. California Sea Grant College System, La Jolla, CA 92093.

McGowan, J.A., D.B. Chelton, and A. Conversi. 1996. Plankton patterns, climate, and change in the California Current. California Cooperative Oceanography and Fisheries Investigation Report 37:45–67.

McWilliams, B. and G. Goldman. 1994. Commercial and recreational fishing in California: Their impact on the state economy. University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Publication CNR001.

Melteff, B.R. (ed.). 1983. Proceedings of the international sablefish symposium. 1983. University of Alaska Sea Grant Report 83–8. Alaska Sea Grant Program, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Miller, D.J. and J. Geibel. 1973. Summary of blue rockfish and lingcod life histories: A reef ecology study; and giant kelp, *Macrocystis pyrifera*, experiments in Monterey Bay, California. California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin No. 158. 137 pp.

Miller, D.J. and R.N. Lea. 1972. Guide to the coastal marine fishes of California. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin No. 157.

Monterey County Office of Economic Development and Pacific Group, Inc. 2000. Monterey County's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). <http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/oed/docs/CEDS010501.doc>

Moser, H.G. 1967. Reproduction and development of *Sebastes paucispinis* and comparison with other rockfishes off Southern California. Copeia 1967:773–797.

Moser, H.G. and E.H. Ahlstrom. 1978. Larvae and pelagic juveniles of blackgill rockfish, *Sebastes melanostomus*, taken in midwater trawls off Southern California and Baja California. Journal of Fisheries Research Board of Canada 35(7):981–996.

Mottet, M.G. 1978. A review of the fishery biology of abalones. State of Washington Department of Fisheries, Technical Report 37. 81 pp.

Moyle, P.B and J.J. Cech, Jr. 1988. Fishes: An introduction to ichthyology. Prentice Hall, New York, NY. 559 pp.

Murawski, S.A. 1991. Can we manage our multispecies fisheries? Fisheries 16(5):5–13.

Mysak, L.A. 1986. El Niño, Interannual variability and fisheries in the Northeast Pacific Ocean. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 43:464–497.

NMFS. 1999. Our living oceans. Report on the status of U.S. living marine resources,

1999. U.S. Department of Commerce. NOAA Technical Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-41, 301 pp.
- O'Connell, C.P. 1953. The life history of the cabezon *Scorpaenichthys marmoratus* (Ayres). California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 93. 76 pp.
- O'Connell, V.M., D.A. Gordon, A. Hoffman, and K. Hepler. 1992. Northern range extension of the vermilion rockfish (*Sebastes miniatus*). California Department of Fish and Game Fish Bulletin 78(4):173.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1979. The Fishery Conservation Management Act. Pacific Fishery Management Council 1977–1978 Progress Report, Metro Center, Suite 420, 2000 SW First Avenue, Portland, OR 97201.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1988. Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act and fisheries management off Alaska. North Pacific Fishery Management Council, P.O. Box 103136, Anchorage, AK 99510.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1990. Form and function. Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Metro Center, Suite 420, 2000 SW First Avenue, Portland, OR 97201.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1995. Economic status of the Washington, Oregon and California groundfish fisheries. Appendix F. In: Status of the Pacific Coast groundfish fishery through 1995 and recommended acceptable biological catches for 1996: Stock assessment and fishery evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Metro Center, Suite 420, 2000 SW First Avenue, Portland, OR 97201.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1995. Status of the Pacific coast groundfish fishery through 1995 and recommended acceptable biological catches for 1996: Stock assessment and fishery evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2130 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 224, Portland, OR 97201.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. 1999. Review of 1999 Ocean Salmon Fisheries. Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2130 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 224, Portland, OR 97201.
- Pacific State Marine Fisheries Commission. 1997. Commercial and recreational fisheries statistics published on world wide web at www.psmfc.org. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, OR.
- Parks, N.B. and F.R. Shaw. 1989. Relative abundance and size composition of sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*) in the coastal waters of California and Southern Oregon, 1984–88. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Center, Technical Memorandum 167.
- Parrish, R.H., N.W. Bartoo, S.F. Herrick Jr., P.M. Kleiber, R.M. Laurs and J.A. Wetherall. 1989. Albacore Management Information Document. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Center, Technical Memorandum 126. 56 pp.
- Parrish, R.H. and A.D. MacCall. 1978. Climatic variation and exploitation in the Pacific mackerel fishery. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bull 167.
- Parrish, R.H., C.S. Nelson, and A. Bakun. 1981. Transport mechanisms and reproductive success of fishes in the California Current. Biological Oceanography 1(2):175–203.
- Pauly, G.B., D.A. Armstrong, and T.W. Heun. Year. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates — Dungeness crab. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 20 pp.
- Pearcy, W.G. 1962. Egg masses and early developmental stages of the scorpaenid fish, *Sebastolobus*. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 19:1169–1173.

Pearcy, W.G. 1992. Movements of acoustically-tagged yellowtail rockfish *Sebastes flavidus* on Heceta Bank, Oregon. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 90:726–735.

Pearcy, W.G. 1992. Ocean ecology of north Pacific salmonids. Washington Sea Grant Program. University of Washington Press, Seattle. 179 pp.

Pearson, D.E., J.E. Hightower, and J.T.H. Chan. 1991. Age, growth, and potential yield for shortbelly rockfish (*Sebastes jordani*). Fisheries Bulletin 89:403–409.

Pearson, D.E. and S. Ralston. 1990. Trends in landings, species composition, length-frequency distributions, and sex ratios of 11 rockfish species (genus *Sebastes*) from Central and Northern California ports (1978–88). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS no. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-145. 65 pp.

Phillips, J.B. 1959. A review of the lingcod, *Ophiodon elongatus*. California Department of Fish and Game 45(1):19–27.

Phu, C.H. 1990. The U.S. sea urchin industry and its market in Tokyo. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Technical Memorandum 25. 36 pp.

Pikitch, E.K., D.L. Erickson, and J.R. Wallace. 1988. An evaluation of the effectiveness of trip limits as a management tool. National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Science Center processed report 88–27. Seattle, WA. 33 pp.

Piner, K., M. Schirripa, T. Builder, J. Rogers, and R. Methot. 2000. Bank rockfish (*Sebastes rufus*) stock assessment for Eureka, Monterey, and Conception INPFC areas north of Pt. Conception, California. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Pleschner, D.B. 1988. Vince Aliotti: Seining squid in Monterey Bay. Pacific Fishing, October. pp. 38–43.

Ralston, S. and D.F. Howard. 1995. On the development of year-class strength and cohort variability in two Northern California rockfishes. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 93(4):710–720.

Ralston, S., J.N. Ianelli, R.A. Miller, D.E. Pearson, D. Thomas, and M.E. Wilkins. 1996. Status of bocaccio in the Conception/Monterey/Eureka INPFC areas in 1996 and recommendations for management in 1997. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 3150 Paradise Drive, Tiburon, California 94920.

Recksiek, C.W. and H. W. Frey. 1978. Biological, oceanographic, and acoustic aspects of the Market Squid, *Loligo opalescens* Berry. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 169. 185 pp.

Reed, R.J. 1988. Changing the size limit: How it could affect California halibut fisheries. California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations, Report 29:158–166.

Reilly, P.N., D. Wilson-Vandenberg, D.L. Watters, J.E. Hardwick, and D. Short. 1993. On board sampling of the rockfish and lingcod commercial passenger fishing vessel industry in Northern and Central California, May 1987 to December 1991. California Department of Fish and Game Administrative Report 93–4.

Rexstad, E.A. and E.K. Pikitch. 1986. Stomach contents and food consumption estimates of Pacific hake, *Merluccius productus*. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 84(4):947–956.

Richards, L.J. and A.J. Cass. 1987. The British Columbia inshore rockfish fishery: Stock assessment and fleet dynamics of an unrestricted fishery. In: Melteff, B.R., ed., Proceedings of the international

- rockfish symposium. Alaska Sea Grant Report no. 87-2. pp. 299-308.
- Roedel, P.M. and W.E. Ripley. 1950. California sharks and rays. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 75.
- Roemmich, D. and J. McGowan. 1995. Climatic warming and the decline of zooplankton in the California Current. *Science* 267(5202):1324-1326.
- Rogers, J.B. 1994. Preliminary status of the splitnose rockfish stock in 1994. Appendix H in Appendix Volume 2, Status of the Pacific coast groundfish fishery through 1994 and recommended acceptable biological catches for 1995. Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224, Portland, OR 97201.
- Rogers, J. B., R. D. Methot, T. L. Builder, K. Piner, M. Wilkins. 2000. Status of the darkblotched rockfish (*Sebastes crameri*) resource in 2000. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Rogers, J.B. and E.K. Pikitch. 1992. Numerical definition of groundfish assemblages caught off the coasts of Oregon and Washington using commercial fishing strategies. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 49:2648-2656.
- Rose, C. 1994. Observation of fish behavior in trawls: finding ways to reduce bycatch. National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Quarterly Report, April-May-June 1994.
- Rounsefell, G.A. 1975. Ecology, utilization, and management of marine fisheries. C.V. Mosby Co., St. Louis, MO. 516 pp.
- Sakuma, K.M. and S. Ralston. 1995. Distributional patterns of late larval groundfish off Central California in relation to hydrographic features during 1992 and 1993. California Cooperative Oceanogra-
- phy and Fisheries Investigation Report 36:179-192.
- Sanctuary and Reserves Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1992. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary final environmental impact statement/management plan. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C.
- Santa Cruz County Committee for Economic Vitality. 1996. Office of Economic Development Program, report and program projection, June 1996. Report prepared for Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors. County Administrative Office for Economic Development, Santa Cruz, CA.
- Scofield, W.L. 1947. Drift and set line fishing gear in California. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 66. 41 pp.
- Shaw, W.N. and T.J. Hassler. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Pacific Northwest) — Lingcod. Biological Report, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 10 pp.
- Shepherd, J.G., J.G. Pope, and R.D. Cousens. 1984. Variations in fish stocks and hypotheses concerning their links with climate. *Rapports et Proces-Verbaux Reunions Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer*. 185:255-267.
- Shepherd, S.A., M.J. Tegner, and S.A. Guzmán del Prío, eds. 1992. Abalone of the world: Biology, fisheries and culture. In: Proceedings of the first international symposium on abalone. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, England.
- Smith, B.D. and G.S. Jamieson. 1991. Possible consequences of intensive fishing for males on the mating opportunities of Dungeness crabs. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 120:650-653.
- Smith, P.E. 1990. Monitoring interannual changes in spawning area of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*). California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations. Report 31:145-151.

- Smith, S.E. and N. Abramson. 1990. Leopard shark *Triakis semifasciata* distribution, mortality rate, yield, and stock replenishment estimates based on a tagging study in San Francisco Bay. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 88(2):371–381.
- Soutar, A. and J. Isaacs. 1969. History of fish populations inferred from fish scales in anaerobic sediments off California. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 13:63–70.
- Soutar, A. and J. Isaacs. 1974. Abundance of pelagic fish during the 19th and 20th centuries as recorded in anaerobic sediment off California. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 72:257–273.
- Spratt, J.D. and L.A. Ferry. 1993. A profile of the Monterey squid fleet in 1992. California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resource Division, Administrative Report No. 93–2.
- Spratt, J.D. and B. Leos (eds.). 1993. Monterey Bay commercial fisheries report #4. California Department of Fish and Game. 6 pp.
- Stanley, R.D., B.M. Leaman, L. Haldorson, and V.M. O'Connell. 1994. Movements of tagged adult yellowtail rockfish, *Sebastes flavidus*, off the west coast of North America. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 92:655–663.
- Starr, R.M., K.A. Johnson, N. Laman, and G.M. Cailliet. 1998. Fishery resources of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. California Sea Grant College System Publication No. T-042, 101 pp.
- Starr, R.M., J.N. Heine, J.M. Felton, and G.M. Cailliet. 2002. Movements of bocaccio (*Sebastes paucispinis*) and greenspotted (*Sebastes chlorostictus*) rockfishes in a Monterey submarine canyon: Implications for the design of marine reserves. Fishery Bulletin Vol. 100, pp. 324–337.
- Strasburg, D.W. 1958. Distribution, abundance, and habits of pelagic sharks in the central Pacific Ocean. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 138(58):335–361.
- Sullivan, C.M. 1995. Grouping of fishing locations using similarities in species composition for the Monterey Bay area commercial passenger fishing vessel fishery, 1987–1992. California Department of Fish and Game Tech Report 59.
- Sunada, J.S. 1984. Spot prawn (*Pandalus platyceros*) and ridgeback prawn (*Sicyonia ingentis*) fisheries in the Santa Barbara Channel. California Cooperative Oceanic and Fisheries Investigations, Report 25:100–104.
- Sunada, J.S. 1986. Growth and reproduction of spot prawns in the Santa Barbara Channel. California Department of Fish and Game, 72:83–93.
- Swartz, S.L. and M.P. Sissenwine. 1993. Achieving long term potential from U.S. fisheries. Sea Technology, 34(8):41–46.
- Tagart, J.V. and F.R. Wallace. 1996. Status of yellowtail rockfish resource in 1996. Draft manuscript. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 600 Capitol Way N, Olympia, WA 98501.
- Tagart, J. V., F. R. Wallace, and J. N. Ianelli. 2000. Status of the yellowtail rockfish resource in 2000. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Tegner, M.J. 1989. The feasibility of enhancing red sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*, stocks in California: An analysis of the options. Marine Fisheries Review 51(2):1–22.
- Tegner, M.J and P.K. Dayton. 1987. El Niño effects on Southern California kelp forest communities. Advances in Ecological Research 17:243–279.
- Thomson, Cynthia J. 2001. Human ecosystem dimension. In: Leet. W.S., C.M. Dewees, R. Klingbeil, and E. Larson. California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report. California Department of Fish and Game. 593 pp.
- Vaughn, A.C. 1993. The state of groundfish resources off the northeastern United

- States. Fisheries 18(3):12–17.
- VenTresca, D.A., J.L. Houk, M.J. Paddock, M.L. Gingras, N.L. Crane, and S.D. Short. 1996. Early life-history studies of nearshore rockfishes and lingcod off Central California, 1987–92. California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resources Division Administrative Report 96–4. 77 pp.
- Vogel, D. 1992. Sacramento winter Chinook: Problem and recovery. Northwest Scientist 66(2). 141 pp.
- Wall, J., R. French and R. Nelson, Jr. 1981. Foreign fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska, 1977–1978. Marine Fisheries Review 43(5):20–35.
- Wallace, R.K., Hosking, W. and S.T. Szedlmayer. 1994. Fisheries management for fishermen: A manual for helping fishermen understand the federal management process. Auburn University Marine Extension & Research Center, 4170 Commanders Dr., Mobile, Alabama 36615. NOAA Award NA37FD0079. 56 pp.
- Wallace, R.K. and R. M Fletcher. 2000. Understanding Fisheries Management: A manual for understanding the federal fisheries management process, including analysis of the 1996 Sustainable Fisheries Act. Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium. Publication 00-005. 2nd edition. 53 pp.
- Ware, D.M. and R.E. Thomson. 1991. Link between long-term variability in upwelling and fish production in the Northeast Pacific Ocean. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 48:2296–2306.
- Watson, W. 1982. Development of eggs and larvae of the white croaker *Genyonemus lineatus* Ayres (Pisces: Sciaenidae), off the Southern California coast. U.S. Fisheries Bulletin 80:403–417.
- Watters, D.L. 1993. Age determination and confirmation from otoliths of the bank rockfish, *Sebastes rufus* (Scorpaenidae). MS Thesis, San Jose State University. 59 pp.
- Weber, M. L. and B. Heneman. 2000. Guide to the California's Marine Life Management Act. Common Knowledge Press, Bolinas, California. 133 pp.
- Weber, P. 1994. Net loss: Fish, jobs, and the marine environment.. Worldwatch Paper 120. Worldwatch Institute, Boston, MA.
- Weise, M. J. 2001. Abundance, food habits, and annual fish consumption of California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) and its impact on salmonid fisheries in Monterey Bay, California. MS Thesis, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories. 103 pp.
- Wild, P.W. and R.N. Tasto (eds.). 1993. Life history, environment, and mariculture studies of the Dungeness crab, *Cancer magister*, with emphasis on the Central California Fishery Resource. California Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin 172. 352 pp.
- Wilimovsky, N.J., L.S. Incze, and S.J. Wettrheim (eds). 1988. Species synopses: Life histories of selected fish and shellfish of the Northeast Pacific and Bering Sea. Washington Sea Grant Program and Fisheries Research Institute, University of Washington, Seattle. 111 pp.
- Wilkins, M.E. 1980. Size composition, age composition, and growth of chilipepper, *Sebastes goodei*, and bocaccio, *S. paucispinis*, from the 1977 rockfish survey. Marine Fisheries Review 42:48–58.
- Wilkins, M.E. 1996. Long term trends in abundance: Results of triennial bottom trawl surveys of west coast groundfish resources between 1977 and 1995. Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS/NOAA, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, Washington 98115.
- Williams, E. H., A. D. MacCall, S. V. Ralston, and D. E. Pearson. 2000. Status of the widow rockfish resource in Y2K. In: Appendix to the Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery through 2000 and Recommended Acceptable Biological Catches for 2001 Stock Assessment and

Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Wilson, C.E., L.A. Halko, D. Wilson-Vandenberg, and P.N. Reilly. 1996. Onboard sampling of the rockfish and lingcod commercial passenger fishing vessel industry in Northern and Central California. California Department of Fish and Game Administrative Report 96-2.

Wilson-Vandenberg, D., P.N. Reilly, and L. Halko. 1995. On board sampling of the rockfish and lingcod commercial passenger fishing vessel industry in Northern and Central California, January through December 1993. California Department of Fish and Game Administrative Report 95-2.

Wilson-Vandenberg, D., P.N. Reilly, and C. Wilson. 1996. Onboard sampling of the rockfish and lingcod commercial passenger fishing vessel industry in Northern and Central California, January through December 1994. California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Resources Division Administrative Report 96-6. 96 pp.

Winn, R.N. 1985. Comparative ecology of three cancrinid crab species (*Cancer anthonyi*, *C. antennarius* and *C. productus*) in marine subtidal habitats in Southern California. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles. 235 pp.

Wolf, P. 1992. Recovery of the Pacific sardine and the California sardine fishery. California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations, Report 33:76-86.

Wolotira, R.J. Jr., M.J. Allen, T.M. Sample, R.L. Henry, C.R. Iten, and S.F. Noel. 1990. Life history and harvest summaries for selected invertebrate species occurring off the west coast of North America. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Center, Technical Memorandum 183. 191 pp.

Woodbury, D. and S. Ralston. 1991. Interannual variation in growth rates and back-calculated birthdate distributions of pelagic juvenile rockfishes (*Sebastes* spp.) off the Central California coast. Fisheries Bulletin 89(3):523-533.

Wylie Echeverria, T. 1987. Thirty-four species of California rockfishes: Maturity and seasonality of reproduction. U.S. Fishery Bulletin 85:229-250.

GLOSSARY

ABC	Acceptable (sometimes Allowable) Biological Catch. A seasonally determined catch or range of catches based on the best scientific estimates of current stock conditions.
Age at 50%	Age at which 50% of the population is estimated to be reproductively mature.
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game.
CPFV	Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel.
CPUE	Catch per Unit Effort. The total number or weight of fish harvested by a defined unit of fishing effort. Measures of “unit of effort” are variable and defined separately within each fishery (e.g., angler day, hours fished, trips, vessel days, number of hooks, etc.)
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone. The zone out to 200 miles in which the United States claims control over natural resources.
EFP	Experimental Fishery Permit.
ESA	Endangered Species Act.
Fecundity	The potential net reproductive output of a female (e.g., the number of eggs present in the ovaries).
FCMA	Fishery Conservation and Management Act, or “Magnuson Act.” The Fishery Conservation and Management Act was created in 1976 and was renamed the “Magnuson Act” in 1980. The MFCMA established the 200-mile EEZ and the regional fishery management council system. Reauthorized as the Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) or the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 1996.
FMP	Fishery Management Plan. The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act provides that each Council shall prepare a FMP with respect to each fishery within its geographical area of authority. Among the necessary components of such FMPs are the conservation and management measures (1) applicable to foreign and domestic fishing, (2) necessary and appropriate for the conservation and management of the fishery, and (3) consistent with the seven national standards, the other provisions of the FCMA, and any other applicable law. California’s Marine Life Management Act also requires that fishery managers create fishery management plans that foster sustainable fisheries.
IFQ	Individual Fishery Quotas. IFQs are certificates or licenses given to individual fishers which represent the right to catch and sell a certain share of the Total Allowable Catch. When these certificates are transferable between fishers they are referred to as Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs).
IFS	Individual Fishery Shares. IFSs are under consideration for the nearshore fishery in California and are in use in a few fisheries around the world. IFSs represent an individual’s share of the total allowable commercial catch.
MBNMS	Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

Appendices

Appendix A. Common and scientific names of species commonly caught and sold in the commercial fishery (C), commercial live-fish fishery (C/L), and recreational fishery (R) within the MBNMS.

Common Name	Scientific Name	C	C/L	R
Invertebrates				
Abalone, red	<i>Haliotis rufescens</i>	X	X	X
Abalone, black	<i>Haliotis cracherodii</i>	X		X
California spiny lobster	<i>Panulirus interruptus</i>	X	X	
Clam, California jackknife	<i>Tagelus californians</i>			X
Clam, common littleneck	<i>Protothaca staminea</i>	X		X
Clam, common Washington	<i>Saxidomus nuttalli</i>	X		X
Clam, gaper	<i>Tresus nuttalli</i>	X		X
Clam, northern quahog	<i>Mercenaria mercenaria</i>			X
Clam, northern razor	<i>Siliqua patula</i>			X
Clam, Pismo	<i>Tivela stultorum</i>	X		X
Clam, purple	<i>Nuttallia nuttallia</i>			X
Clam, rosy razor	<i>Solen rosaceus</i>			X
Clam, softshell	<i>Mya arenaria</i>			X
Crab, box	Family: Lithodidae	X	X	
Crab, Dungeness	<i>Cancer magister</i>	X	X	X
Crab, rock	<i>Cancer</i> spp.	X	X	X
Crab, shore	<i>Pachygrapsus</i> spp.			X
Crab, shore	<i>Hemigrapsus</i> spp.			X
Crab, spider	<i>Loxorhynchus grandis</i>	X	X	X
Limpet, owl	<i>Lottia gigantea</i>	X		X
Mussel, California	<i>Mytilus californianus</i>	X		X
Mussel, bay	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	X		X
Octopus	<i>Octopus</i> spp.	X	X	X
Prawn, ridgeback	<i>Sicyonia ingentis</i>	X	X	
Prawn, spot	<i>Pandalus platyceros</i>	X	X	
Scallop, rock	<i>Hinnites multirugosus</i>			X
Sea cucumber	<i>Parastichopus</i> spp.	X	X	X
Sea snail	Subclass: Prosobranchia	X	X	X
Sea star	Class: Asteroidea	X		X
Shrimp, bay	<i>Crangon stylirostris</i>	X		X
Shrimp, Pacific ocean (Pink)	<i>Pandalus jordani</i>	X	X	
Squid, market	<i>Loligo opalescens</i>	X		
Urchin, purple sea	<i>Strongylocentrotus purpuratus</i>	X	X	X
Urchin, red sea	<i>Strongylocentrotus franciscanus</i>	X	X	X
Whelk, Kellet's	<i>Kelletia kelletii</i>	X	X	
Fishes				
Albacore	<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>	X	X	X
Anchovy, northern	<i>Engraulis mordax</i>	X	X	X
Barracuda, California	<i>Sphyræna argentea</i>	X		X
Bass, kelp	<i>Paralabrax clathratus</i>	X		X
Bass, striped	<i>Morone saxatilis</i>	X		X
Blacksmith	<i>Chromis punctipinnis</i>			X
Blenny, bay	<i>Hypsoblennius gentilis</i>			X
Bonito, Pacific	<i>Sarda chiliensis</i>	X		X
Butterfish, Pacific	<i>Peprilus simillimus</i>	X		X
Cabezon	<i>Scorpaenichthys marmoratus</i>	X	X	X
Cabrilla, spotted	<i>Epinephelus analogus</i>	X	X	X
Cod, Pacific	<i>Gadus microcephalus</i>	X		

Appendix A. (continued) Common and scientific names of species commonly caught and sold in the commercial fishery (C), commercial live-fish fishery (C/L), and recreational fishery (R) within the MBNMS.

Common Name	Scientific Name	C	C/L	R
Croaker, white	<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>	X	X	X
Dolphinfish	<i>Corypahaena hippurus</i>			X
Eel, California moray	<i>Gymnothorax mordax</i>	X	X	
Flounder, arrowtooth	<i>Atheresthes stomias</i>	X		X
Flounder, starry	<i>Platichthys stellatus</i>	X	X	X
Fringehead, onespots	<i>Neoclinus uninotatus</i>			X
Fringehead, sarcastic	<i>Neoclinus blanchardi</i>			X
Goby, bay	<i>Lepidogobius lepidus</i>			X
Goby, yellowfin	<i>Acanthogobius flavimanus</i>			X
Goby, zebra	<i>Lythrypnus zebra</i>	X	X	
Greenling, kelp	<i>Hexagrammos decagrammus</i>	X	X	X
Greenling, painted	<i>Oxylebius pictus</i>			X
Greenling, rock	<i>Hexagrammos lagocephalus</i>	X	X	X
Grenadier, Pacific	<i>Coryphaenoides acrolepis</i>	X		
Grouper, broomtail	<i>Mycteroperca xenarcha</i>			X
Grouper, gulf	<i>Mycteroperca jordani</i>			X
Guitarfish, shovelnose	<i>Rhinobatus productus</i>	X		X
Hagfish, Pacific	<i>Eptatretus stoutii</i>	X		
Hagfish, black	<i>Eptatretus deani</i>	X		
Hake, Pacific	<i>Meluccius productus</i>	X		X
Halfmoon	<i>Medialuna californiensis</i>	X	X	X
Halibut, California	<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>	X	X	X
Halibut, Pacific	<i>Hippoglossus stenolepis</i>	X		X
Herring Pacific	<i>Clupea pallasii</i>	X		X
Irish lord, brown	<i>Hemilepidotus spinosus</i>			X
Irish lord, red	<i>Hemilepidotus hemilepidotus</i>			X
Jacksmelt	<i>Atherinops californiensis</i>	X		X
Kelpfish, giant	<i>Heterostichus rostratus</i>	X	X	X
Kelpfish, striped	<i>Gibbonsia metzi</i>	X	X	X
Lancetfish, longnose	<i>Alepisaurus ferox</i>			X
Lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>	X	X	X
Lizardfish, California	<i>Synodus lucioceps</i>	X		X
Louvar	<i>Luvarus imperialis</i>	X		
Mackerel, Pacific	<i>Scomber japonicus</i>	X	X	X
Mackerel, jack	<i>Trachurus symmetricus</i>	X		X
Midshipman, plainfin	<i>Porichthys notatus</i>			X
Opaleye	<i>Girella nigricans</i>	X	X	X
Prickleback, monkeyface	<i>Cebidichthys violaceus</i>	X	X	X
Prickleback, rock	<i>Xiphister mucosus</i>			X
Queenfish	<i>Seriphus politus</i>	X		X
Ratfish, spotted	<i>Hydrolagus collieri</i>	X		X
Ray, bat	<i>Myliobatis californica</i>	X	X	X
Ray, Pacific electric	<i>Torpedo californica</i>			X
Rockfish, aurora	<i>Sebastes aurora</i>	X		X
Rockfish, bank	<i>Sebastes rufus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, black	<i>Sebastes melanops</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, black-and-yellow	<i>Sebastes chrysomelas</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, blackgill	<i>Sebastes melanostomus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, blue	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, bocaccio	<i>Sebastes paucispinis</i>	X	X	X

Appendix A. (continued) Common and scientific names of species commonly caught and sold in the commercial fishery (C), commercial live-fish fishery (C/L), and recreational fishery (R) within the MBNMS.

Common Name	Scientific Name	C	C/L	R
Rockfish, bronzespotted	<i>Sebastes gilli</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, brown	<i>Sebastes auriculatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, calico	<i>Sebastes dalli</i>			X
Rockfish, canary	<i>Sebastes pinniger</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, chameleon	<i>Sebastes phillipsi</i>	X		
Rockfish, chilipepper	<i>Sebastes goodei</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, China	<i>Sebastes nebulosus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, copper (whitebelly)	<i>Sebastes caurinus (vexillaris)</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, cowcod	<i>Sebastes levis</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, darkblotched	<i>Sebastes crameri</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, dusky	<i>Sebastes ciliatus</i>			X
Rockfish, flag	<i>Sebastes rubrivinctus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, freckled	<i>Sebastes lentiginosus</i>			X
Rockfish, gopher	<i>Sebastes carnatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, grass	<i>Sebastes rastrelliger</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, greenblotched	<i>Sebastes rosenblatti</i>	X		X
Rockfish, greenspotted	<i>Sebastes chlorostictus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, greenstriped	<i>Sebastes elongatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, halfbanded	<i>Sebastes semicinctus</i>			X
Rockfish, honeycomb	<i>Sebastes unbrosus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, kelp	<i>Sebastes atrovirens</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, Mexican	<i>Sebastes mcdonaldi</i>	X		
Rockfish, olive	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, Pacific Ocean Perch	<i>Sebastes alutus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, pink	<i>Sebastes eos</i>	X	X	
Rockfish, quillback	<i>Sebastes maliger</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, redbanded	<i>Sebastes babcocki</i>	X		X
Rockfish, redstripe	<i>Sebastes proriger</i>			X
Rockfish, rosethorn	<i>Sebastes helvomaculatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, rosy	<i>Sebastes rosaceus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, rougheye	<i>Sebastes aleutianus</i>			X
Rockfish, sharpchin	<i>Sebastes zacentrus</i>			X
Rockfish, shortbelly	<i>Sebastes jordani</i>	X		X
Rockfish, silvergray	<i>Sebastes brevispinis</i>			X
Rockfish, speckled	<i>Sebastes ovalis</i>	X		X
Rockfish, splitnose	<i>Sebastes diploproa</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, squarespot	<i>Sebastes hopkinsi</i>	X		X
Rockfish, starry	<i>Sebastes constellatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, stripetail	<i>Sebastes saxicola</i>	X		X
Rockfish, swordspine	<i>Sebastes ensifer</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, tiger	<i>Sebastes nirgocinctus</i>	X		X
Rockfish, treefish	<i>Sebastes serripes</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, vermilion	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, widow	<i>Sebastes entomelas</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, yelloweye	<i>Sebastes ruberrimus</i>	X	X	X
Rockfish, yellowtail	<i>Sebastes flavidus</i>	X	X	X
Sablefish	<i>Anoplopoma fimbria</i>	X	X	X
Salmon, chinook	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	X	X	X
Salmon, chum	<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>			X
Salmon, coho	<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	X		

Appendix A. (continued) Common and scientific names of species commonly caught and sold in the commercial fishery (C), commercial live-fish fishery (C/L), and recreational fishery (R) within the MBNMS.

Common Name	Scientific Name	C	C/L	R
Salmon, pink	<i>Oncorhynchus gorbuscha</i>	X		X
Sand bass, barred	<i>Paralabrax nebulifer</i>			X
Sand lance, Pacific	<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>			X
Sanddab, longfin	<i>Citharichthys xanthostigma</i>	X		X
Sanddab, Pacific	<i>Citharichthys sordidus</i>	X	X	X
Sanddab, speckled	<i>Citharichthys stigmaeus</i>	X		X
Sandfish, Pacific	<i>Trichodon trichodon</i>			X
Sardine, Pacific	<i>Sardinops sagax</i>	X		X
Saury, Pacific	<i>Cololabis saira</i>			X
Sculpin, Pacific staghorn	<i>Leptocottus armatus</i>	X	X	X
Sculpin, sharpnose	<i>Clinocottus acuticeps</i>			X
Seabass, white	<i>Atractoscion nobilis</i>	X	X	X
Senorita	<i>Oxyjulis californica</i>			X
Shad, American	<i>Alosa sapidissima</i>			X
Shark, bigeye thresher	<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>	X		X
Shark, blue	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	X		X
Shark, common thresher	<i>Alopias vulpinus</i>	X		X
Shark, leopard	<i>Triakis semifasciata</i>	X	X	X
Shark, Pacific angel	<i>Squatina californica</i>	X	X	X
Shark, seven gill	<i>Notorynchus cepedianus</i>			X
Shark, shortfin mako	<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	X		X
Shark, six gill	<i>Hexanchus griseus</i>	X		X
Shark, soupfin	<i>Galeorhinus galeus</i>	X	X	X
Shark, spiny dogfish	<i>Squalus acanthias</i>	X	X	X
Sheephead, California	<i>Semicossyphus pulcher</i>	X	X	X
Sierra, gulf	<i>Scomberomorus concolor</i>			X
Skate, big	<i>Raja binoculata</i>	X		X
Skate, California	<i>Raja inornata</i>	X		X
Skate, longnose	<i>Raja rhina</i>	X		X
Smelt, night	<i>Spirinchus starksi</i>	X	X	X
Smelt, surf	<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>	X		X
Smelt, whitebait	<i>Allosmerus elongatus</i>			X
Smoothhound, brown	<i>Mustelus henlei</i>	X		X
Smoothhound, gray	<i>Mustelus californicus</i>	X		X
Sole, bigmouth	<i>Hippoglossina stomata</i>	X		X
Sole, butter	<i>Isopsetta isolepis</i>	X		X
Sole, Dover	<i>Microstomus pacificus</i>	X	X	X
Sole, English	<i>Parophrys vetulus</i>	X		X
Sole, fantail	<i>Xystreurys liolepis</i>	X		X
Sole, petrale	<i>Eopsetta jordani</i>	X	X	X
Sole, rex	<i>Errex zachirus</i>	X	X	X
Sole, rock	<i>Lepidopsetta bilineata</i>	X	X	X
Sole, sand	<i>Psettichthys melanostictus</i>	X	X	X
Stingray, diamond	<i>Dasyatis brevis</i>			X
Stingray, round	<i>Urolophus halleri</i>			X
Sturgeon, green	<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>			X
Sturgeon, white	<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>			X
Sunfish, ocean	<i>Mola mola</i>			X
Surfperch, barred	<i>Amphistichus argenteus</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, black	<i>Embiotoca jacksoni</i>	X	X	X

Appendix A. (continued) Common and scientific names of species commonly caught and sold in the commercial fishery (C), commercial live-fish fishery (C/L), and recreational fishery (R) within the MBNMS.

Common Name	Scientific Name	C	C/L	R
Surfperch, calico	<i>Amphistichus koelzi</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, dwarf	<i>Micrometrus minimus</i>			X
Surfperch, kelp	<i>Brachyistius frenatus</i>			X
Surfperch, pile	<i>Damalichthys vacca</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, rainbow	<i>Hypsurus caryi</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, redbtail	<i>Amphistichus rhodoterus</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, rubberlip	<i>Rhacochilus toxotes</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, sharpnose	<i>Phanerodon atripes</i>			X
Surfperch, shiner	<i>Cymatogaster aggregata</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, silver	<i>Hyperprosopon ellipticum</i>			X
Surfperch, spotfin	<i>Hyperprosopon anale</i>			X
Surfperch, striped	<i>Embiotoca lateralis</i>	X	X	X
Surfperch, walleye	<i>Hyperprosopon argenteum</i>	X		X
Surfperch, white	<i>Phanerodon furcatus</i>	X	X	X
Thornyhead, longspine	<i>Sebastolobus altivelis</i>	X	X	X
Thornyhead, shortspine	<i>Sebastolobus alascanus</i>	X	X	X
Tomcod, Pacific	<i>Microgadus proximus</i>			X
Topsmelt	<i>Atherinops affinis</i>	X		X
Trout, steelhead	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>			X
Tuna, bigeye	<i>Thunnus obesus</i>	X		X
Tuna, bluefin	<i>Thunnus thynnus</i>	X		X
Tuna, skipjack	<i>Euthynnus pelamis</i>	X	X	X
Tuna, yellowfin	<i>Thunnus albacares</i>	X	X	X
Turbot, C-O	<i>Pleuronichthys coenosus</i>	X		X
Turbot, Curlfin	<i>Pleuronichthys decurrens</i>	X		X
Turbot, Diamond	<i>Hypsopsetta guttulata</i>	X		X
Whitefish, ocean	<i>Caulolatilus princeps</i>	X	X	X
Wolf eel	<i>Anarrhichthys ocellatus</i>	X	X	X
Yellowtail	<i>Seriola lalandi</i>	X		X
Zebraperch	<i>Hermosilla azurea</i>			X

Appendix B. Reported commercial landings (1,000 lb) of major species at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000. Species listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

Species	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Market squid	28,209.87	23,314.21	2,064.50	930.82	8,516.49	13,799.65	13,095.68	11,430.98	15,757.81	17,612.52	17,539.96
Pacific sardine	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.00	185.79	104.63	6.51	523.60	546.06	2,169.07
Total rockfish	7,043.85	11,338.49	9,601.53	9,395.03	7,494.43	9,992.31	8,113.75	7,880.44	9,526.64	8,415.13	6,226.35
Northern anchovy	10,195.75	5,751.24	705.65	4,168.41	2,507.23	1,778.74	1,487.93	1,534.74	2,076.98	4,689.17	5,558.81
Dover sole	1,312.43	2,005.74	3,256.11	5,393.83	8,065.35	4,509.87	7,508.20	4,349.66	3,405.62	2,514.18	2,947.43
Chinook salmon	1,128.49	1,802.42	909.94	843.83	937.73	2,407.42	1,637.35	4,176.74	2,298.30	2,153.80	1,573.84
Pacific mackerel	2,983.05	4,115.39	5,916.04	7,087.59	988.75	2,082.23	707.17	51.74	31.64	4,653.33	296.10
Sablefish	1,999.34	2,325.05	1,950.15	1,581.12	2,241.76	2,118.14	1,860.87	1,775.80	2,013.18	1,688.15	1,381.80
Albacore	5,115.90	676.13	6,098.84	1,923.22	2,407.15	2,013.33	1,787.06	832.44	474.03	291.04	152.81
Jack mackerel	465.37	617.10	5,405.80	12,057.41	501.82	420.55	461.58	267.89	85.65	461.87	95.96
Unspecified mackerel	8.12	406.19	1,682.82	8,652.38	4,973.47	2,313.17	1,408.90	83.36	116.25	867.88	362.45
Swordfish	0.00	60.54	820.53	633.16	1,613.90	1,087.86	1,104.58	1,127.54	850.04	845.37	669.77
Sanddabs	202.47	272.93	130.97	173.82	236.46	471.92	394.55	576.16	794.00	917.49	918.26
English sole	662.77	617.85	346.48	329.98	435.53	658.24	652.89	642.14	750.02	986.08	829.58
Dungeness crab	129.14	116.58	259.36	233.62	126.98	344.48	682.55	915.86	355.19	255.77	343.84
Petrale sole	445.17	412.17	263.10	255.99	534.40	746.77	487.10	525.71	597.76	731.79	575.37
Lingcod	575.83	746.70	487.45	351.63	177.56	246.66	495.00	545.80	811.27	566.15	340.36
Rex sole	210.69	229.83	314.01	178.75	580.60	438.15	506.18	646.54	470.29	351.10	368.30
White croaker	623.66	739.29	320.06	262.59	564.50	680.86	519.22	646.91	588.90	377.10	426.27
Pink shrimp	871.46	482.75	760.06	126.54	0.46	799.72	472.16	312.60	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unspecified grenadier	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.62	22.04	0.00
California halibut	199.83	229.13	196.79	197.32	176.07	178.27	236.54	260.88	279.86	134.86	159.13
Rock crab	36.98	43.21	67.01	143.11	283.21	266.02	143.09	145.11	304.22	295.88	314.45
Common thresher shark	18.33	199.12	541.71	320.03	345.99	165.22	229.00	145.93	192.21	273.04	318.82
Pacific herring	276.21	550.48	285.38	208.87	134.77	309.72	136.75	28.47	27.39	280.54	243.47
Unspecified skate	168.08	165.95	203.48	86.97	54.47	57.93	47.70	58.74	106.35	99.81	81.64
Red sea urchin	22.09	12.43	22.86	9.90	1.78	10.98	16.61	260.99	727.58	190.89	164.14
Spot prawn	64.02	90.11	44.68	26.27	28.51	15.03	17.01	22.09	11.35	11.00	18.72
Other species	148.87	163.66	304.33	77.77	100.83	160.38	37.47	241.05	19.34	10.87	110.22
Red abalone	59.22	65.78	40.74	52.29	106.44	63.89	104.10	109.10	129.43	104.46	75.90
Cabezon	27.41	34.54	14.08	12.47	19.01	10.27	4.49	7.57	10.27	4.20	3.83
Miscellaneous fish	26.36	22.42	64.33	72.03	77.18	58.23	34.58	32.01	60.50	45.69	39.84
Unspecified hagfish	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	867.99	0.00
Sand sole	52.21	70.29	63.82	75.53	68.57	91.74	50.67	31.17	24.53	16.83	31.26
Unspecified flatfish	89.91	74.27	44.46	59.53	98.78	91.43	48.33	43.41	56.80	23.32	16.76
Shortfin mako	0.46	9.28	58.30	26.18	26.38	19.07	50.82	23.96	48.71	80.94	60.63
Pacific bonito	1.98	16.10	146.19	10.21	5.26	3.96	450.58	2.07	0.44	28.64	0.00
Bluefin tuna	0.46	0.00	0.13	0.64	1.17	0.00	0.70	1.36	1.50	13.16	2.79
Unspecified clam	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	47.81	112.46	105.86	99.84	61.40	11.00
Surfperch	20.77	36.54	28.36	13.93	14.08	24.24	44.57	41.05	32.25	30.87	28.25
Starry flounder	5.76	1.45	13.79	42.66	79.90	59.80	38.08	64.70	22.13	9.61	19.23
Pacific angel shark	36.28	28.09	24.44	45.78	40.55	34.10	67.54	47.78	48.38	23.28	12.10
Soupin shark	23.80	30.87	36.23	35.93	40.46	27.13	29.77	16.32	20.99	25.41	19.56
Coho salmon	2.31	11.33	5.68	69.43	2.97	13.27	1.36	10.87	15.03	77.31	188.78
Unspecified shark	48.91	45.74	39.16	46.20	65.14	32.05	20.42	27.63	13.71	6.84	4.33

Appendix B. (continued) Reported commercial landings (1,000 lb) of major species at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000. Species listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

Species	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total	Mean
Market squid	18,566.33	19,712.00	35,730.73	7,066.42	11,199.98	18,672.08	0.00	636.15	15,352.66	279,208.84	13,960.44
Pacific sardine	6,805.02	1,487.46	5,036.99	12,495.27	17,573.31	29,279.36	23,019.19	37,682.94	25,043.61	161,959.56	8,097.98
Total rockfish	6,087.69	5,412.00	4,334.70	4,994.77	4,698.47	4,100.27	4,323.22	650.32	355.22	129,984.63	6,499.23
Northern anchovy	1,338.11	2,827.00	2,506.50	2,646.14	7,828.33	8,580.42	1,983.52	3,329.59	14,464.67	85,958.91	4,297.95
Dover sole	4,470.49	3,418.58	2,829.20	4,042.50	4,029.85	3,538.94	1,769.04	1,844.72	1,414.31	72,626.07	3,631.30
Chinook salmon	1,001.07	1,745.68	2,386.36	4,888.60	3,199.44	4,128.56	1,320.53	2,287.82	3,370.95	44,198.86	2,209.94
Pacific mackerel	843.13	85.29	87.23	1,014.42	1,550.01	7,059.01	3,207.40	6.18	86.81	42,852.50	2,142.63
Sablefish	1,494.88	911.57	738.32	1,533.71	2,151.14	1,807.37	724.22	900.39	827.13	32,024.06	1,601.20
Albacore	254.80	648.82	368.94	455.25	567.78	2,934.73	451.97	1,467.00	1,632.73	30,553.97	1,527.70
Jack mackerel	244.57	759.88	421.34	240.50	201.50	720.39	73.24	53.20	110.46	23,666.08	1,183.30
Unspecified mackerel	3.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,879.65	1,043.98
Swordfish	602.98	541.27	363.37	613.05	763.14	546.44	660.64	636.70	545.20	14,086.07	704.30
Sanddabs	416.61	504.77	892.39	865.28	1,056.20	1,200.08	1,233.65	1,280.77	868.30	13,407.06	670.35
English sole	486.33	331.45	319.62	326.99	381.11	379.39	245.74	209.11	150.96	9,742.26	487.11
Dungeness crab	371.98	275.77	825.31	996.07	541.46	971.37	719.99	246.47	375.47	9,087.25	454.36
Petrale sole	325.97	277.73	323.31	401.02	509.32	447.72	278.74	251.66	182.27	8,573.07	428.65
Lingcod	403.99	552.51	410.59	248.25	259.42	206.05	82.83	62.44	13.35	7,583.84	379.19
Rex sole	319.40	339.77	476.72	620.03	455.33	254.74	181.32	125.40	66.09	7,133.24	356.66
White croaker	124.89	195.32	84.90	75.11	132.68	67.65	32.56	21.89	12.58	6,496.93	324.85
Pink shrimp	2.57	0.00	366.41	746.59	257.93	386.54	313.02	228.07	339.13	6,465.56	323.30
Unspecified grenadier	7.92	8.76	60.21	476.32	1,991.48	932.40	520.43	331.50	227.39	4,579.08	229.09
California halibut	190.30	141.61	108.09	155.89	212.92	443.85	344.32	419.12	158.14	4,422.90	221.15
Rock crab	431.00	338.34	205.57	204.89	114.03	83.40	88.46	73.48	49.65	3,631.10	181.56
Common thresher shark	144.19	17.25	27.63	108.44	75.15	106.44	94.89	28.25	22.02	3,373.66	168.68
Pacific herring	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.35	546.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.30	3,092.65	154.63
Unspecified skate	73.66	53.81	55.42	77.77	115.10	244.75	177.03	158.07	103.64	2,190.36	109.52
Red sea urchin	151.89	126.21	42.57	7.63	27.41	23.32	0.00	15.38	8.65	1,843.31	92.17
Spot prawn	22.04	61.51	129.78	199.43	186.14	231.51	372.04	209.77	166.19	1,927.20	96.36
Other species	28.73	12.94	10.69	62.26	7.17	10.69	71.92	53.17	15.62	1,647.98	82.40
Red abalone	122.34	79.31	67.54	75.90	65.27	38.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,360.24	68.01
Cabezon	9.22	8.69	42.57	124.39	161.94	159.35	219.52	136.75	85.47	1,096.04	54.80
Miscellaneous fish	54.52	48.00	41.58	48.20	66.44	75.59	54.52	23.28	10.98	956.27	47.81
Unspecified hagfish	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	868.45	43.56
Sand sole	52.84	44.84	16.46	20.31	32.25	26.53	19.01	24.90	28.03	841.79	42.09
Unspecified flatfish	34.06	19.71	10.12	6.07	8.56	12.67	24.29	24.88	5.43	792.81	39.64
Shortfin mako	47.39	24.42	22.46	30.93	27.98	53.72	38.06	20.28	12.87	682.40	34.14
Pacific bonito	1.89	2.07	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.24	3.04	0.44	0.84	674.15	33.71
Bluefin tuna	9.35	39.97	15.16	21.49	58.63	58.87	37.51	249.13	44.79	556.36	27.84
Unspecified clam	51.70	24.46	6.67	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	522.06	26.22
Surfperch	34.43	26.58	22.88	26.47	20.81	25.67	34.45	8.23	7.50	521.93	26.10
Starry flounder	18.19	9.66	5.26	8.34	15.40	24.95	30.38	28.27	18.63	516.21	25.81
Pacific angel shark	10.34	10.69	6.38	6.18	5.96	5.30	4.25	8.34	4.42	470.18	23.51
Soupin shark	13.68	24.46	19.87	18.28	12.54	15.11	23.10	15.00	7.77	456.28	22.81
Coho salmon	8.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.25	408.41	20.42
Unspecified shark	3.89	4.14	5.52	5.57	2.82	1.65	3.04	13.86	10.67	401.28	20.06

Appendix B. (continued) Reported commercial landings (1,000 lb) of major species at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000. Species listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

Species	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Bigeye thresher shark	0.46	0.46	72.53	15.25	46.97	9.37	11.42	10.12	14.67	11.70	39.31
Unspecified smelt	17.71	35.55	23.56	4.69	12.10	13.99	6.07	7.72	7.57	12.45	6.42
Unspecified squid	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Leopard shark	6.42	18.19	6.71	10.65	16.63	17.47	12.98	7.72	12.98	5.83	2.77
Rock sole	5.48	9.59	4.75	8.84	11.79	5.83	5.02	2.84	9.20	3.85	3.50
White seabass	2.38	1.41	4.38	2.51	2.18	2.86	0.81	1.21	1.10	6.89	0.88
Unspecified octopus	7.13	18.13	6.05	1.47	0.42	0.42	1.61	2.11	19.87	6.64	2.84
Yellowtail	1.06	12.63	10.41	50.03	0.13	0.35	0.46	0.46	0.13	0.00	0.00
Unspecified salmon	18.33	12.21	7.77	12.47	16.13	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unspecified tuna	0.46	0.40	2.44	0.59	1.58	1.32	1.50	4.05	1.19	2.20	2.95
Yellowfin tuna	0.46	0.81	9.92	0.64	4.03	2.20	2.24	3.96	0.37	5.50	1.52
Kelp greenling	0.13	0.55	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.55	0.53	2.20	3.83	0.22	1.58
Unspecified ocean shrimp	2.99	0.46	8.98	18.90	4.60	2.62	0.90	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other tuna	0.46	0.46	2.71	0.46	1.21	1.28	3.01	8.36	0.00	0.57	3.81
Skipjack tuna	0.46	0.46	11.35	1.30	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.24	4.11
Pacific hake	0.46	0.77	0.46	9.39	5.63	2.90	1.61	2.57	0.99	0.22	1.78
Butter sole	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	23.28	0.00	7.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spiny dogfish	1.32	0.46	0.46	13.49	0.46	0.46	0.31	0.62	0.15	0.00	0.00
Other sea urchins	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.78
California sheephead	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.46	0.04	0.18	0.46
Pelagic thresher shark	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	56,539.16	46,709.15	34,114.45	46,974.20	37,310.13	38,932.67	37,344.87	32,241.40	34,326.71	43,304.23	38,575.55
Taxonomic Groups											
Invertebrates	29,404.30	24,145.04	3,275.62	1,544.31	9,070.27	15,351.53	14,646.17	13,306.59	17,405.28	18,538.56	18,499.62
Anadromous fishes	1,149.13	1,825.96	923.38	925.74	956.82	2,421.14	1,638.71	4,187.61	2,313.32	2,231.11	1,762.62
Flatfishes	3,187.18	3,923.72	4,634.74	6,716.71	10,287.93	7,275.29	9,927.57	7,151.06	6,410.23	5,689.11	5,868.81
Pelagic Fishes	19,067.91	12,244.25	21,122.24	34,809.70	13,158.66	10,217.86	7,664.78	3,963.26	4,198.28	12,698.25	9,571.83
Nearshore	13,947.71	11,489.35	14,030.13	32,239.48	9,123.91	7,107.45	4,315.10	1,983.48	2,870.19	11,511.52	8,734.07
Offshore	5,120.19	754.91	7,092.12	2,570.22	4,034.76	3,110.40	3,349.68	1,979.78	1,328.10	1,186.72	837.76
Roundfishes	3,229.67	3,848.46	2,777.50	2,212.63	3,006.39	3,060.27	2,881.08	2,979.94	3,429.21	3,552.91	2,155.19
Rockfishes	7,043.85	11,338.49	9,601.53	9,395.03	7,494.43	9,992.31	8,113.75	7,880.44	9,526.64	8,415.13	6,226.35
Sharks and Rays	304.52	498.63	983.49	600.93	637.52	363.26	469.94	338.82	458.15	526.86	539.18
Surfperches	20.77	36.54	28.36	13.93	14.08	24.24	44.57	41.05	32.25	30.87	28.25

Appendix B. (continued) Reported commercial landings (1,000 lb) of major species at the five major ports associated with the MBNMS from 1981–2000. Species listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

Species	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total	Mean
Bigeye thresher shark	5.90	2.57	5.10	10.43	4.29	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	262.88	13.19
Unspecified smelt	3.94	2.62	14.19	3.61	30.14	10.54	1.69	1.17	10.23	225.96	11.30
Unspecified squid	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70	190.32	0.00	0.00	191.03	9.69
Leopard shark	4.95	5.41	9.22	4.64	2.18	2.88	2.99	2.64	1.25	154.53	7.73
Rock sole	3.43	7.30	3.63	10.38	3.28	4.11	9.92	3.30	3.28	119.33	5.97
White seabass	1.65	5.87	9.72	2.13	1.12	9.61	4.16	5.32	25.94	92.14	4.61
Unspecified octopus	4.38	4.93	1.50	0.15	0.59	3.04	3.17	2.66	1.50	88.59	4.43
Yellowtail	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.46	3.82
Unspecified salmon	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.90	3.37
Unspecified tuna	11.73	14.41	3.41	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	48.80	2.46
Yellowfin tuna	1.43	2.11	0.53	0.46	0.46	2.90	3.67	2.31	0.57	44.73	2.40
Kelp greenling	4.14	0.57	2.02	1.17	2.00	3.70	4.44	7.26	10.52	45.41	2.34
Unspecified ocean shrimp	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.88	2.07
Other tuna	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.69	0.00	38.63	2.00
Skipjack tuna	0.29	0.00	0.13	2.93	0.18	2.07	4.69	0.00	9.22	37.03	1.94
Pacific hake	0.00	0.70	1.39	0.48	0.11	0.46	0.46	0.97	2.40	31.92	1.78
Butter sole	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31.13	1.67
Spiny dogfish	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46	1.25	0.00	12.89	30.69	1.63
Other sea urchins	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.78	1.58
California sheephead	1.50	0.46	3.32	5.90	4.11	2.35	2.51	2.82	1.28	25.54	1.32
Pelagic thresher shark	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.68	0.00	8.45	0.86	18.99	1.09
Total	39,646.42	35,792.59	55,158.00	41,040.41	56,487.42	83,838.61	38,696.81	53,173.16	65,983.48	916,153.39	
Taxonomic Groups											
Invertebrates	19,724.23	20,622.54	37,376.06	9,297.09	12,393.68	20,410.48	1,687.00	1,411.98	16,293.24	304,394.84	15,225.03
Anadromous fishes	1,009.89	1,745.68	2,386.36	4,888.60	3,199.44	4,128.56	1,320.53	2,287.82	3,372.20	44,674.17	2,233.73
Flatfishes	6,317.63	5,095.42	4,984.78	6,456.80	6,704.21	6,332.99	4,136.42	4,212.14	2,895.44	118,205.87	5,910.41
Pelagic Fishes	10,121.43	6,411.61	8,818.85	17,502.06	29,120.52	49,196.62	29,447.02	43,447.32	42,007.83	384,782.42	19,279.88
Nearshore	9,238.97	5,162.96	8,067.64	16,407.78	27,730.34	45,651.36	28,285.51	41,074.04	39,774.48	338,742.69	16,937.36
Offshore	882.46	1,248.65	751.21	1,094.28	1,390.18	3,545.26	1,161.51	2,373.27	2,233.35	46,039.73	2,342.52
Roundfishes	2,048.18	1,684.21	1,351.66	2,466.97	4,703.91	3,188.48	1,590.67	1,468.37	1,203.66	52,811.48	2,653.02
Rockfishes	6,087.69	5,412.00	4,334.70	4,994.77	4,698.47	4,100.27	4,323.22	650.32	355.22	129,984.63	6,499.23
Sharks and Rays	304.19	142.76	151.60	262.24	246.03	443.23	344.61	254.89	176.40	8,041.24	402.36
Surfperches	34.43	26.58	22.88	26.47	20.81	25.67	34.45	8.23	7.50	521.93	26.10

Note: Species with mean landings less than 1000 lb/yr are not included. Data were collected by CDFG and provided by NMFS.

Appendix C. Estimated commercial landings (lb) of rockfishes and thornyheads at the five major ports, plus San Francisco, associated with the MBNMS from 1978–2000. Determined from an expansion of species composition sampling conducted by CDFG. Species are listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

Species	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
Chilepepper	1,363,359	501,869	4,199,228	3,343,406	3,036,042	2,247,748	3,549,686	4,186,536	3,920,844	2,501,774	2,637,777	3,605,117
Bocaccio	3,309,375	3,176,662	7,214,520	4,184,258	6,434,226	4,994,637	4,027,813	2,515,652	2,856,430	3,431,133	2,261,291	3,353,817
Widow rockfish	285,019	5,169	815,057	1,948,033	7,222,981	1,029,648	984,179	1,600,870	1,212,778	1,480,255	744,442	1,743,254
Bank rockfish	763,511	0	31,073	1,089,325	1,605,314	964,551	1,015,065	1,190,902	2,723,304	1,788,681	1,872,397	1,438,460
Shortspine thornyhead	394,162	648,523	7,333	472,942	676,515	842,098	1,473,751	1,987,593	1,113,320	217,556	1,331,126	1,798,682
Longspine thornyhead	192,243	85,295	0	9,150	48,187	40,071	9,630	13,638	151,402	104,611	800	990,605
Splitnose rockfish	355,213	180,682	293,269	304,748	442,346	846,709	840,034	943,765	784,561	58,021	542,108	536,025
Yellowtail rockfish	185,851	542,251	461,917	350,916	593,244	1,280,176	871,430	959,536	929,070	522,412	286,203	875,936
Blackgill rockfish	228,307	0	64,171	173,258	526,284	258,232	96,853	161,492	470,591	50,954	1,028,696	452,468
Vermilion rockfish	2,810	88	158,414	23,968	1,257	121,306	62,134	102,797	65,224	197,719	107,556	79,503
Unspecified thornyhead	3,727	17,267	361,531	4,492	2,068	2,209	770	7,372	14,077	1,702,347	12,149	29,897
Brown rockfish	794,251	124,940	383,942	113,036	126,888	46,400	20,144	12,720	84,996	9,174	8,423	19,463
Yelloweye rockfish	574,790	726,660	28,179	299,978	29,866	1,920	21,643	2,392	11,881	8,515	34,685	17,630
Canary rockfish	48,954	44	88,229	74,434	46,521	48,683	61,287	190,438	1,985	11,663	43,380	197,493
Darkblotched rockfish	11,869	0	24,353	6,990	60,032	133,730	325,234	176,536	177,993	55,941	75,247	94,524
Aurora rockfish	0	0	5,257	0	7,110	60,002	5,237	57,830	65,281	0	116,418	188,589
Greenspotted rockfish	8,368	55,403	19,480	58,848	110,931	22,080	30,961	43,772	10,858	8,342	40,273	43,180
Blue rockfish	57,236	78,954	113,233	142,012	81,473	55,660	29,326	263,293	35,774	18,200	17,149	55,945
Gopher rockfish	95,731	74,995	140,528	115,493	85,557	54,794	19,633	773	249	0	13	28
Cowcod	22,227	0	19,038	16,072	26,813	18,973	50,039	20,033	12,418	18,078	19,511	60,185
Speckled rockfish	4,283	59,121	0	30,369	27,293	89,013	58,822	0	108,524	0	0	50,507
Black rockfish	139,620	136,418	26,514	11,886	9,663	12,103	14,826	22,540	25,452	14,334	731	7,852
Copper rockfish	1,641	1,606	34,652	3,874	10,345	27,830	5,355	1,329	2,176	2,273	6,771	2,107
Olive rockfish	25,355	0	25,194	1,660	5,229	38,807	44	1	3,576	26,634	12,763	763
China rockfish	8,106	22,808	52,665	42,448	32,533	15,731	21,947	6,664	5,002	12,769	16,332	1,010
Grass rockfish	0	0	0	134	34	0	115	0	41	3,371	0	0
Starry rockfish	266	22	464	268	4,930	575	205	5,333	463	0	7,013	27,490
Greenstriped rockfish	2,049	0	40,317	580	12,847	10,779	8,031	21,249	8,964	4,888	17,776	33,083
Black-and-Yellow rockfish	0	515	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66,671	0	13
Redbanded rockfish	2,783	0	0	2,654	7,079	1,716	63,353	45,174	9,207	43	8,823	4,554
Stripetail rockfish	3,484	22,223	37,492	54,854	28,283	521	1,453	10,762	6,119	666	1,988	1,128
Shortbelly rockfish	6,771	0	6,398	609	1,219	7,654	4,892	62,284	6,882	736	567	1,297
Greenblotched rockfish	0	0	4,068	8,019	3,384	0	8,515	0	299	0	230	202
Rosy rockfish	0	1,064	0	0	0	5,391	0	278	0	0	218	760
Quillback rockfish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sharpchin rockfish	0	0	0	0	0	1,375	3,044	10,742	1,834	80	0	0
Flag rockfish	30	1,029	331	0	20,234	4	0	424	5,042	7,587	1,913	935
Kelp rockfish	0	0	68	25	0	2	0	205	0	12,151	40	0
Tiger rockfish	0	0	0	14,311	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rosethorn rockfish	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1,897	317	0	2,334	5,807
Bronzespotted rockfish	0	0	0	0	0	436	833	0	0	1,642	627	0
Total	8,891,391	6,463,608	14,656,915	12,903,050	21,326,728	13,281,572	13,686,284	14,626,822	14,826,934	12,339,221	11,257,770	15,718,309

Appendix C. (continued) Estimated commercial landings (lb) of rockfishes and thornyheads at the five major ports, plus San Francisco, associated with the MBNMS from 1978–2000. Determined from an expansion of species composition sampling conducted by CDFG. Species are listed in order of decreasing average annual landings.

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total	Mean
Chilipepper	3,573,137	3,924,882	3,739,511	2,844,178	2,476,053	2,684,696	2,572,620	2,506,189	2,787,198	910,154	349,979	63,461,983	2,759,217
Bocaccio	2,976,039	1,908,281	2,090,076	1,603,232	1,379,472	1,026,518	699,326	393,619	198,927	71,168	26,448	60,132,920	2,614,475
Widow rockfish	1,689,812	981,617	681,574	468,059	321,554	1,059,249	891,474	717,909	435,612	337,044	263,857	26,919,446	1,170,411
Bank rockfish	1,056,712	925,194	844,089	387,880	320,217	591,315	872,051	459,360	765,069	32,593	95,090	20,832,153	905,746
Shortspine thornyhead	1,783,461	533,701	1,356,411	1,072,269	1,306,560	960,526	712,161	547,241	504,966	357,464	200,635	20,298,996	882,565
Longspine thornyhead	2,035,603	1,006,858	1,923,078	1,503,804	611,175	1,715,163	1,695,917	1,409,444	808,274	693,032	443,122	15,491,102	673,526
Splitnose rockfish	566,371	806,950	492,563	523,977	465,909	513,549	804,945	832,993	2,351,717	331,295	81,393	13,899,143	604,311
Yellowtail rockfish	1,103,840	406,322	619,301	270,170	313,578	256,502	98,102	225,733	118,564	46,922	50,502	11,368,478	494,282
Blackgill rockfish	513,746	211,233	616,315	260,252	310,926	294,556	346,238	294,058	226,366	73,079	38,086	6,696,161	291,137
Vermilion rockfish	251,046	260,260	228,544	386,651	215,858	156,685	151,807	150,479	132,997	66,893	11,465	2,935,461	127,629
Unspecified thornyhead	15,279	27,283	47,674	8,583	20,583	32,436	87,901	82,882	27,305	22,816	23,983	2,554,631	111,071
Brown rockfish	14,722	89,951	76,821	106,963	41,423	19,996	28,682	84,857	83,874	114,020	37,529	2,443,215	106,227
Yelloweye rockfish	58,147	102,684	64,372	70,155	67,920	26,881	46,862	55,478	7,801	15,102	734	2,274,275	98,882
Canary rockfish	144,882	255,129	110,232	147,752	120,219	111,279	298,247	117,476	57,158	18,939	2,442	2,196,866	95,516
Darkblotched rockfish	207,150	30,788	41,045	18,453	8,336	66,660	95,121	288,880	37,058	12,430	16,828	1,965,198	85,443
Aurora rockfish	284,998	3,342	192,489	199,856	143,551	117,837	95,721	45,579	38,688	16,081	23,803	1,667,669	72,507
Greenspotted rockfish	67,060	180,545	149,841	181,136	148,744	165,212	186,408	58,801	20,432	13,135	2,811	1,626,621	70,723
Blue rockfish	46,090	63,427	112,447	140,107	67,713	39,853	13,711	45,407	43,995	36,393	7,162	1,564,560	68,024
Gopher rockfish	91	5	123,444	100,040	76,648	46,596	43,476	18,817	55,201	69,842	37,763	1,159,717	50,422
Cowcod	49,293	30,616	75,267	69,390	46,284	87,733	46,555	69,538	20,959	11,352	496	790,870	34,386
Speckled rockfish	18,282	22,659	31,146	15,193	30,420	28,077	12,231	26,547	6,378	482	43	619,390	26,930
Black rockfish	2,526	10,542	23,393	42,649	26,779	10,318	56,122	33,475	40,577	13,049	2,316	683,685	29,725
Copper rockfish	1,984	48,163	67,438	92,431	26,308	57,269	40,808	25,882	20,096	27,278	5,406	513,022	22,305
Olive rockfish	16,065	166,482	15,660	16,734	45,947	7,914	42,953	2,841	10,526	5,809	1,050	472,007	20,522
China rockfish	2,166	11,038	35,009	9,798	37,228	33,410	12,226	37,567	8,898	1,757	15,563	442,675	19,247
Grass rockfish	0	3,655	12,183	21,266	48,873	75,492	69,371	46,610	68,678	38,389	24,391	412,603	17,939
Starry rockfish	30,067	46,267	74,575	46,288	69,324	22,127	34,261	24,571	7,514	1,100	11	403,134	17,528
Greenstriped rockfish	27,218	18,284	14,963	13,065	22,986	21,146	24,722	41,331	5,701	2,326	538	352,843	15,341
Black-and-Yellow rockfish	0	0	3,396	6,849	14,195	9,189	9,165	5,473	70,188	49,794	29,913	265,361	11,537
Redbanded rockfish	11,641	8,899	10,186	10,842	1,017	18,573	15,006	3,124	10,192	16,492	1,687	253,045	11,002
Stripetail rockfish	437	4,362	258	10,475	6,397	17,375	66,072	2,627	6,863	0	0	206,261	8,968
Shortbelly rockfish	4,984	3,476	1,039	1,528	1,969	18,394	26,799	3,931	51,185	49	9	170,877	7,429
Greenblotched rockfish	2,280	770	542	16,270	21,017	23,308	21,578	10,859	7,010	502	100	166,542	7,241
Rosy rockfish	16,434	16,239	13,188	20,850	45,992	6,079	12,927	19,034	16,568	6,383	3,743	102,924	4,475
Quillback rockfish	0	3,620	4,296	184	27,772	8,397	8,194	31,649	337	0	0	88,270	3,838
Sharpchin rockfish	3,335	3,463	10,888	1,879	7,174	4,276	8,194	2,350	116	85	34	86,960	3,781
Flag rockfish	600	1,623	7,777	18,037	13,290	1,935	3,584	2,350	9,589	4,519	1,685	85,985	3,738
Kelp rockfish	0	40	2,169	23,961	12,988	10,213	5,132	3,198	9,589	0	0	41,181	1,790
Tiger rockfish	25,001	0	823	0	191	0	0	176	679	0	0	36,269	1,577
Rosethorn rockfish	8,176	893	3,334	0	5,363	1,819	1,680	2,607	1,090	872	72	36,269	1,577
Bronzespotted rockfish	0	8	13	113	54	0	31,987	378	493	0	37	36,621	1,592
Total	16,608,675	12,119,551	13,917,370	10,731,319	8,928,007	10,348,553	10,287,794	8,739,981	9,084,227	3,420,111	1,800,726	265,964,918	11,563,692

Appendix D. Estimated catch of species in 1,000 fish in Northern and Central California sport fisheries from 1980–2000.

Species	Total	Mean	Species	Total	Mean
Surf smelt	37,939	2,232	Albacore	303	17
Blue rockfish	11,166	620	White sturgeon	281	16
Yellowtail rockfish	5,789	322	Grass rockfish	277	15
Black rockfish	5,365	298	Pacific hake	274	15
White croaker	4,981	277	Sablefish	266	15
Pacific sanddab	4,532	252	Calico surfperch	235	13
Jack smelt	3,854	214	Surfperch family	208	12
Night smelt	3,622	201	Rainbow surfperch	207	11
Canary rockfish	2,714	151	Pacific staghorn sculpin	207	11
Barred surfperch	2,626	146	Speckled rockfish	173	10
Lingcod	2,577	143	Brown smouthound	168	9
Brown rockfish	2,418	134	Rosethorn rockfish	154	9
Chilipepper	2,347	130	Quillback rockfish	148	8
Pacific mackerel	1,949	108	Swordspine rockfish	128	7
Striped surfperch	1,541	86	Speckled sanddab	123	7
Gopher rockfish	1,520	84	Rainbow trout	116	7
Walleye surfperch	1,478	82	Topsmelt	109	6
Copper rockfish	1,469	82	Sand sole	112	6
Olive rockfish	1,445	80	Monkeyface prickleback	102	6
Bocaccio	1,438	80	Scorpionfish family	99	6
Redtail surfperch	1,405	78	Rougheye rockfish	86	5
Kelp greenling	1,317	73	Coho salmon	64	4
Pacific herring	1,278	71	Sea run trout	76	4
Chinook salmon	1,147	64	Spiny dogfish	74	4
Shiner surfperch	1,098	61	Flag rockfish	72	4
Rosy rockfish	985	55	Cowcod	64	4
Striped bass	945	53	Pacific tomcod	63	4
Vermilion rockfish	934	52	Pacific bonito	60	3
Cabezon	883	49	Bat ray	55	3
Northern anchovy	829	46	Buffalo sculpin	54	3
Widow rockfish	824	46	Longfin sanddab	52	3
Silver surfperch	813	45	Sanddab genus	52	3
Greenspotted rockfish	791	44	Rock sole	47	3
Rockfish genus	757	42	Yellowfin goby	46	3
White surfperch	707	39	Greenblotched rockfish	41	2
Pacific sardine	646	36	Pacific sandlance	39	2
Pile surfperch	679	38	Shortspine thornyhead	37	2
California halibut	624	35	Kelp bass	33	2
China rockfish	540	30	Petrale sole	33	2
Starry rockfish	514	29	Squarespotted rockfish	33	2
Black surfperch	456	25	Sculpin family	29	2
Starry flounder	441	25	Salmon genus	28	2
Rubberlip surfperch	391	22	Sea bass family	27	2
Rock greenling	368	20	Goby family	22	1
Kelp rockfish	366	20	Sharpnose surfperch	23	1
Jack mackerel	356	20	Sturgeon	23	1
Greenstriped rockfish	355	20	Total	127,142	
Black and Yellow rockfish	354	20			
Yelloweye rockfish	343	19			
Leopard shark	305	17			

Note: Species with estimate annual catch less than 1,000 fish/yr are not included. Data were provided by PSMFC.

Appendix E. Recreational species landed in the MBNMS grouped by habitat.

HABITAT GROUP	GUILD	COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME
Nearshore Rocky Reef/ Kelp	Vertebrates		
	Hexagrammids	Kelp greenling	<i>Hexagrammos decagrammus</i>
		Lingcod	<i>Ophiodon elongatus</i>
		Rock greenling	<i>Hexagrammos lagocephalus</i>
	Pricklebacks	Monkeyface prickleback	<i>Cebidichthys violaceus</i>
	Scorpaenids	Black rockfish	<i>Sebastes melanops</i>
		Black-and-yellow rockfish	<i>Sebastes chrysomelas</i>
		Blue rockfish	<i>Sebastes mystinus</i>
		Brown rockfish	<i>Sebastes auriculatus</i>
		China rockfish	<i>Sebastes nebulosus</i>
		Copper (whitebelly) rockfish	<i>Sebastes caurinus (vexillaris)</i>
		Gopher rockfish	<i>Sebastes carnatus</i>
		Grass rockfish	<i>Sebastes rastrelliger</i>
		Kelp rockfish	<i>Sebastes atrovirens</i>
		Olive rockfish	<i>Sebastes serranoides</i>
		Quillback rockfish	<i>Sebastes maliger</i>
		Rosy rockfish	<i>Sebastes rosaceus</i>
		Squarespot rockfish	<i>Sebastes hopkinsi</i>
		Vermilion rockfish	<i>Sebastes miniatus</i>
	Cottids	Buffalo sculpin	<i>Enophrys bison</i>
		Cabezon	<i>Scorpaenichthys marmoratus</i>
	Surfperches	Black surfperch	<i>Ebiotoca jacksoni</i>
		Pile surfperch	<i>Racochilus vacca</i>
		Rainbow surfperch	<i>Hypsurus caryi</i>
		Rubberlip surfperch	<i>Rhacochilus toxotes</i>
		Striped surfperch	<i>Embiotoca lateralis</i>
	Other species	Kelp bass	<i>Paralabrax clathratus</i>
Nearshore Soft Bottom	Vertebrates		
	Sciaenids	White croaker	<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>
	Sculpins	Pacific staghorn sculpin	<i>Leptocottus armatus</i>
	Elasmobranchs	Bat ray	<i>Myliobatis californica</i>
		Brown smoothhound	<i>Mustelus henlei</i>
		Leopard shark	<i>Triakis semifasciata</i>
	Surfperch	Barred surfperch	<i>Amphistichus argenteus</i>
		Calico surfperch	<i>Amphistichus koelzi</i>
		Redtail surfperch	<i>Amphistichus rhodoterus</i>
		Sharpnose surfperch	<i>Phanerodon atripes</i>
		Shiner surfperch	<i>Cymatogaster aggregata</i>
		Silver surfperch	<i>Hyperprosopon ellipticum</i>
		Walleye surfperch	<i>Hyperprosopon argenteum</i>
		White surfperch	<i>Phanerodon furcatus</i>
	Flatfish	California halibut	<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>
		Longfin sanddab	<i>Citharichthys xanthostigma</i>
		Pacific sanddab	<i>Citharichthys sordidus</i>
		Sand sole	<i>Psettichthys melanostictus</i>
		Speckled sanddab	<i>Citharichthys stigmatæus</i>
		Starry flounder	<i>Platichthys stellatus</i>
	Other species	Pacific sand lance	<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>
		Yellowfin goby	<i>Acanthogobius flavimanus</i>

Appendix E. *(continued)* Recreational species landed in the MBNMS grouped by habitat.

HABITAT GROUP	GUILD	COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME
Rocky Deep Shelf and Slope	Vertebrates		
	Scorpaenids		
	Semi-pelagic	Bocaccio	<i>Sebastes paucispinis</i>
		Canary rockfish	<i>Sebastes pinniger</i>
		Chilipepper rockfish	<i>Sebastes goodei</i>
		Widow rockfish	<i>Sebastes entomelas</i>
		Yellowtail rockfish	<i>Sebastes flavidus</i>
		Demersal	Cowcod
		Flag rockfish	<i>Sebastes rubrivinctus</i>
		Greenblotched rockfish	<i>Sebastes rosenblatti</i>
		Greenspotted rockfish	<i>Sebastes chlorostictus</i>
		Rosethorn rockfish	<i>Sebastes helvomaculatus</i>
		Rougheye rockfish	<i>Sebastes aleutianus</i>
		Speckled rockfish	<i>Sebastes ovalis</i>
		Starry rockfish	<i>Sebastes constellatus</i>
		Swordspine rockfish	<i>Sebastes ensifer</i>
	Yelloweye rockfish	<i>Sebastes ruberrimus</i>	
Soft Bottom Shelf and Slope	Vertebrates		
	Scorpaenids	Sablefish	<i>Anoplopoma fimbria</i>
		Greenstriped rockfish	<i>Sebastes elongatus</i>
	Flatfish	Shortspine thornyhead	<i>Sebastolobus alascanus</i>
		Petrable sole	<i>Eopsetta jordani</i>
		Rock sole	<i>Lepidopsetta bilineata</i>
Open Water			
Small Coastal Pelagics	Vertebrates	Pacific mackerel	<i>Scomber japonicus</i>
		Jack mackerel	<i>Trachurus symmetricus</i>
		Northern anchovy	<i>Engraulis mordax</i>
		Pacific sardine	<i>Sardinops sagax</i>
Coastal Migrants	Vertebrates		
	Anadromous	Chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>
		Coho salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>
		White sturgeon	<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>
		Rainbow trout	<i>Salmo clarkii</i>
	Elasmobranchs	Spiny dogfish	<i>Squalus acanthias</i>
	Other species	Jacksmelt	<i>Atherinops californiensis</i>
		Night smelt	<i>Spirinchus starksi</i>
		Pacific bonito	<i>Sarda chilensis</i>
		Pacific hake	<i>Meluccius productus</i>
		Pacific herring	<i>Clupea pallasii</i>
		Pacific tomcod	<i>Microgadus proximus</i>
		Striped bass	<i>Morone saxatilis</i>
		Surf smelt	<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>
	Topsmelt	<i>Atherinops affinis</i>	
Pelagic Migrants	Vertebrates		
	Scombrids	Albacore	<i>Thunnus alalunga</i>

G. Gear Regulations

- ## P. Permit Regulations

- ## Q. Quota Regulations

- [illegible]

Q. Quota Regulations (continued)

- ### S. Size Limit Regulations

- 148

f. Fishing Regulations

- ### g. Gear Regulations

- s/b. **Size and Bag Limits**

- 1981: 22 inch size limit established for lingcod.
- 1982: 12 inch size limit established for cabezon.
- 1982: Bag limit for lingcod changed from 10 to 5 fish. Size limit of 22 inches.
- 1982: Limit of ten bonito per trip. Size limit of 24 inches fork length or 5 pounds. Five fish less than 24 inches fork length or weighing less than five pounds may be taken and possessed as part of the 10 fish limit.
- 1999: Minimum size limit of 14 in. (356 mm) total length established for cabezon; Bag limit of 10 California scorpionfish, with a minimum size of 10 inches (254 mm) total length; Bag limit of 10 each of kelp and rock greenlings, with a minimum size of 12 inches (305 mm) total length; Bag limit of 5 California sheephead, with a minimum size of 12 inches (305 mm) total length.
- 2000: Daily bag limit of rockfish reduced from 15 to 10 fish.
- 2000: Bag limit of 10 cabezon, with a minimum size of 14 inches.

Appendix H. Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

RED ABALONE		DUNGENESS CRAB	
Habitat	intertidal to subtidal rocky reefs	Habitat	sand and sand/mud bottoms
Depth range	intertidal to 165 m	Depth range	intertidal to 230 m
Max. length	NA	Max. width	23 cm
Max. age	NA	Max. age	6 years
length @ maturity	Both 7 to 10 cm	width @ maturity	M 140 mm; F 100 mm
age @ maturity	Both 4 to 5 years	age @ maturity	M 3; F 2 years
Fecundity	a few thousand to 6 million eggs	Fecundity	500,000 to 2 million eggs
spawning season	year-round	spawning season	March to July
ALBACORE		ROCK CRAB	
Habitat	pelagic	Habitat	rocky reefs; sand and mud bottoms; estuaries
Depth range	surface to 380 m	Depth range	intertidal to 91 m
Max. length	152 cm	Max. width	155 to 190 mm
Max. age	13 years	Max. age	6 yrs.
length @ maturity	Both 85 to 101 cm	length @ maturity	3 inches carapace length
age @ maturity	Both 3 to 5 years old	age @ maturity	NA
Fecundity	up to 2.6 million eggs	Fecundity	400,000 to 4 million eggs
spawning season	January to June	spawning season	year-round
NORTHERN ANCHOVY		WHITE CROAKER	
Habitat	pelagic	Habitat	neritic; sandy nearshore bottom and midwaters; kelp beds
Depth range	surface to 310 m	Depth range	inshore to 236 m
Max. length	24.8 cm	Max. length	41 cm
Max. age	7 years	Max. age	15 years
length @ maturity	Both around 5 cm	length @ maturity	M 14; F 15 cm
age @ maturity	Both 2 years	age @ maturity	Both 1 year
Fecundity	130,000 eggs per season/multiple spawner (every 10 days during spawning season)	Fecundity	37,200 eggs per batch/multiple spawner
spawning season	February to April	spawning season	July to March
CABEZON		STARRY FLOUNDER	
Habitat	rocky reefs and kelp beds	Habitat	gravel, sand, and mud
Depth range	intertidal to 110 m	Depth range	nearshore to 375 m
Max. length	99 cm	Max. length	91 cm
Max. age	17 years	Max. age	24 years
length @ maturity	Both >34 cm	length @ maturity	M 36.8 cm; F 40.6 cm
age @ maturity	Both > 2 years	age @ maturity	M 2 to 3 years; F 3 to 4 years
Fecundity	35 per batch/at least two batches per season/multiple spawner	Fecundity	11 million eggs
spawning season	October to March	spawning season	November to February
COWCOD		KELP GREENLING	
Habitat	hard or rocky bottoms	Habitat	rocky reef and kelp forests
Depth range	72 to 491 m	Depth range	intertidal to 158 m
Max. length	94 cm	Max length	53 cm
Max. age	55 years	Max. age	18 years
length @ maturity	Both 43 to 44 cm	length @ maturity	Both 30 cm
age @ maturity	NA	age @ maturity	Both 3 to 4 years
Fecundity	181,000 eggs per brood/multiple brooder (3 per season)	Fecundity	4,000 eggs per egg mass/multiple spawner (at least 3 per season)
spawning season	November to May	spawning season	September to December

Appendix H. *(continued)* Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

GRENADIER		PACIFIC MACKEREL	
Habitat	sandy bottom on the continental slope	Habitat	pelagic
Depth range	235 to 2,825 m	Depth range	surface to 300 m
Max. length	95 cm	Max. length	64 cm
Max. age	> 56 years	Max. age	11 years
length @ maturity	M 51 cm; F 66 cm	length @ maturity	Both around 30 cm
age @ maturity	Both >10 years	age @ maturity	M 1; F 2 years
Fecundity	150,000 eggs/possible multiple spawner	Fecundity	68,000 eggs/spawning; multiple spawner (up to 8 a season)
spawning season	late winter to early spring	spawning season	April to July
PACIFIC HAKE		SPOT PRAWN	
Habitat	continental shelf and slope	Habitat	offshore banks; sandy bottoms
Depth range	12 to 1327 m	Depth range	45 to 400 m
Max. length	91 cm	Max. length	NA
Max. age	23 years	Max. age	6 years
length @ maturity	M 28; F 37 to 41 cm	length @ maturity	M 1.5 inches carapace length; F 1.75 inches
age @ maturity	M 3; F 3 to 4 years	age @ maturity	F 3 years; Individuals are protandrous
Fecundity	496,000 cm	Fecundity	1,400 to 5,000 eggs
spawning season	October to June	spawning season	September
CALIFORNIA HALIBUT		BANK ROCKFISH	
Habitat	benthic, sandy substrate often aggregate near structures	Habitat	deep rocky walls and canyons
Depth range	nearshore to 183 m	Depth range	31–454 m
Max. length	152.4 cm	Max length	55.2 cm
Max. age	30 years	Max. age	53 years
length @ maturity	Both 47 cm	length @ maturity	M 31 cm; F 36 cm
age @ maturity	Both 3 to 4 years	age @ maturity	NA
Fecundity	5.5 million eggs per spawning season/ multiple spawner	fecundity	up to 600,700 eggs
spawning season	November to April	spawning season	December to May
LINGCOD		BLACK ROCKFISH	
Habitat	rocky reef and kelp forest/sandy offshore bottoms	Habitat	high-relief rocky reefs; in and around kelp beds; boulder fields; midwater; pelagic
Depth range	3 to 491 m	Depth range	<1 to 366 m
Max length	152 cm TL	Max. length	91 cm
Max. age	25 years	Max. age	M 48; F 35
length at 50% maturity	M 50 to 60 cm; F 65 to 75 cm TL	length @ maturity	46 cm
age at 50% maturity	M 3 to 4 yr.; F 4 to 5	age @ maturity	9 to 13 years
fecundity	up to 500,000 eggs	Max. fecundity	1.2 million eggs
spawning season	November to March	spawning season	January to May
JACK MACKEREL		BLACK-AND-YELLOW ROCKFISH	
Habitat	pelagic	Habitat	shallow rocky reefs and kelp beds
Depth range	surface to 402 m	Depth range	<1 to 37
Max. length	81 cm	Max. length	39 cm
Max. age	35 years	Max. age	24 years
length @ maturity	Both 20 cm	length @ maturity	Both 16 cm
age @ maturity	Both 1 year	age @ maturity	Both 3 to 4 years
Fecundity	multiple spawner	Max. fecundity	110,000 eggs
spawning season	July to September	spawning season	January to May

Appendix H. (continued) Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

BLACKGILL ROCKFISH		CHILIPEPPER ROCKFISH	
Habitat	deep rocky and hard bottoms	Habitat	over rocky reefs and along canyon walls
Depth range	87 to 768 m	Depth range	<1 to 491 m
Max length	64 cm	Max. length	59 cm
Max. age	~90 years	Max. age	27 years
length @ maturity	Both - 34	length @ maturity	Both- 30.5 to 33 cm
age @ maturity	7 to 8 or 19 to 20	age @ maturity	Both- 3 to 4 years
fecundity	770,000 eggs	Fecundity	538,000 eggs/possible multiple brooder
spawning season	January to June	spawning season	September to April
BLUE ROCKFISH		CHINA ROCKFISH	
Habitat	within and around the kelp canopy; high relief rocky and artificial reefs	Habitat	rock and cobble; rocky shelf
Depth range	<1 to 549 m	Depth range	3 to 128 m
Max length	53 cm	Max. length	43 cm
Max. age	40 to 44 years	Max. age	78 years
length @ maturity	M- 27/F- 29	length @ maturity	Both- 27 to 28 cm
age @ maturity	M- 5/F- 6	age @ maturity	Both - 4 years
Max. fecundity	524,000 eggs	Fecundity	NA
spawning season	October to March	spawning season	January to June
BOCACCIO		COPPER ROCKFISH	
Habitat	primarily over rocky and hard bottoms, but occasionally found on soft bottoms	Habitat	shallow rock/ high-relief rocky shelf; rock-sand interface; eelgrass beds
Depth range	20 to 475 m	Depth range	<1 to 183
Max. length	91 cm	Max. length	58 cm
Max. age	46 years	Max. age	55 years
length @ maturity	36 cm	length @ maturity	M- 33 cm/F- 34 cm
age @ maturity	M- 4 to 5/F- 4 to 6	age @ maturity	M- 4/F- 6 years
Max. fecundity	2.3 million larvae	Max. fecundity	654,000 eggs
spawning season	year-round (multiple broods)	spawning season	January to April
BROWN ROCKFISH		DARKBLOTCHED ROCKFISH	
Habitat	shallow rock/ rocky shelf; often within crevices; estuarine; high relief rock	Habitat	on rocky and hard bottoms; mud-rock interface
Depth range	<1 to 135	Depth range	25 to 904 m
Max. length	56 cm	Max. length	58 cm
Max. age	20 years	Max. age	66 years
length @ maturity	Both- 31 cm	length @ maturity	M- 29.6/F- 36.5 cm
age @ maturity	Both - 5 years	age @ maturity	M- 5/ F- 8 years
Max. fecundity	340,000 eggs	Fecundity	500,000 eggs
spawning season	December to July (may be multiple spawner)	spawning season	December to March
CANARY ROCKFISH		GOPHER ROCKFISH	
Habitat	aggegrate around reefs and pinnicles; rocky shelf; larger fish found at deeper depths	Habitat	shallow rocky reef bottoms/ rocky shelf; kelp forest bottom
Depth range	<1 to 275 m	Depth range	<1 to 80
Max. length	76 cm	Max. length	34.8 cm
Max. age	84 years	Max. age	30 years
length @ maturity	Both - 41 to 43 cm	length @ maturity	Both- 17 cm
age @ maturity	Both - 7 to 9 years	age @ maturity	Both 4 cm
Fecundity	1.9 million	Max. fecundity	249 eggs/female gram
spawning season	November to March	spawning season	February to July

Appendix H. (continued) Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

GRASS ROCKFISH		QUILLBACK ROCKFISH	
Habitat	low relief rock, often in crevices; kelp forests	Habitat	deeper rock/rocky shelf; high relief rock and artificial reefs; boulder fields
Depth range	<1 to 46	Depth range	<1 to 274 m
Max. length	56 cm	Max. length	61 cm
Max. age	23 years	Max. age	90 years
length @ maturity	Both 24 to 25 cm	length @ maturity	Both 31 to 32 cm
age @ maturity	Both 3 to 4 years	age @ maturity	Both 13 to 14 years
Max. fecundity	760,000 eggs	Fecundity	NA
spawning season	November to March	spawning season	April to July
GREENSPOTTED ROCKFISH		SHORTBELLY ROCKFISH	
Habitat	rocky shelf; hard or mixed bottom; high relief; cobble-mud	Habitat	midwater over soft bottoms
Depth range	30 to 273 m	Depth range	91 to 491 m
Max. length	50 cm	Max. length	35 cm
Max. age	33 years	Max. age	31 years
length @ maturity	Both 28 cm	length @ maturity	Both 16.5 cm
age @ maturity	Both 6 to 9 years	age @ maturity	Both 3 years
Fecundity	759,000 eggs	Fecundity	139 eggs/gram body weight
spawning season	April to June	spawning season	January to April
GREENSTRIPED ROCKFISH		SPLITNOSE ROCKFISH	
Habitat	rocky shelf; mud-rock or sand-mud interface; fine-sediments; high and low relief	Habitat	on sand and mud bottoms
Depth range	25 to 495 m	Depth range	90 to 795 m
Max. length	43 cm	Max. length	46 cm
Max. age	54 years	Max. age	84 years
length @ maturity	Both 23 cm	length @ maturity	Both 21 cm
age @ maturity	Both 7 years	age @ maturity	Both 5 years
Fecundity	344,000 eggs	Fecundity	255,000 eggs
spawning season	May to August (possible multiple spawner)	spawning season	May to June
KELP ROCKFISH		VERMILION ROCKFISH	
Habitat	shallow rocky reef and kelp canopy; midwater nearshore	Habitat	rocky shelf and boulder fields; in crevices; continental slope/basin; sandy/soft bottoms; kelp forest bottom
Depth range	<1 to 46	Depth range	<1 to 436 m
Max. length	42.5 cm	Max. length	63 cm
Max. age	20 years	Max. age	60 years
length @ maturity	Both 26 cm	length @ maturity	Both 35.6 cm
age @ maturity	Both 4 to 5 years	age @ maturity	Both 5 to 6 years
Fecundity	172,000 eggs	Fecundity	2.7 million eggs
spawning season	February to July	spawning season	December to September/possible multiple spawner
OLIVE ROCKFISH		WIDOW ROCKFISH	
Habitat	rocky shelf; kelp canopy in mid-water column	Habitat	over rocky reefs or other hard bottoms
Depth range	<1 to 172 m	Depth range	near surface to 549 m
Max. length	61 cm	Max. length	59 cm
Max. age	25 years	Max. age	60 years
length @ maturity	Both 33 to 36 cm	length @ maturity	Both 25 to 35 cm
age @ maturity	Both 4 to 5 years	age @ maturity	Both 4 to 5 years
Fecundity	490,000 eggs	Fecundity	915,000 eggs
spawning season	December to March	spawning season	December to February

Appendix H. *(continued)* Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

YELLOWTAIL ROCKFISH		WHITE SEABASS	
Habitat	rocky and hard bottoms; sand and mud	Habitat	kelp forest and sandy bottoms
Depth range	intertidal to 549 m	Depth range	inshore to 122 m
Max. length	66 cm	Max. length	152 cm
Max. age	64 years	Max. age	20 years
length @ maturity	M 34 to 41; F 37 to 45 cm	length @ maturity	Both 81 cm
age @ maturity	M 5 to 9; F 6 to 10 years	age @ maturity	Both 6 years
Fecundity	1.15 million	Fecundity	NA/multiple spawners
spawning season	February to March	spawning season	January to August
SABLEFISH		RED SEA URCHIN	
Habitat	benthopelagic on soft bottoms	Habitat	rocky reef and kelp forests
Depth range	<1 to 740 m	Depth range	intertidal to 125 m
Max. length	114 cm	Max. length	18 cm in diameter
Max. age	94 years	Max. age	> 100 yrs.
length @ maturity	M 51; F 61 cm	length @ maturity	2 inches test diameter
age @ maturity	M 4 to 6; F 5 to 6	age @ maturity	NA
Fecundity	1.3 million eggs	Fecundity	several million eggs
spawning season	October to February	spawning season	late spring to early summer
CHINOOK SALMON		PACIFIC OCEAN SHRIMP	
Habitat	coastal pelagic	Habitat	mud or sand bottoms
Depth range	surface to 375 m	Depth range	36 to 357 m
Max. length	147 cm	Max. length	30 mm carapace length
Max. age	5 years	Max. age	5 years in north; 3 years in south
length @ maturity	NA	length @ maturity	NA
age @ maturity	M 2 to 5 years; F 4 to 5 years	age @ maturity	M at birth; F 2 to 3 years. Individuals are protandrous
Fecundity	up to 20,000 eggs	Fecundity	800 to 3,900 eggs
spawning season	Fall run: September to December; Late fall run: October to April; Spring run: March to October	spawning season	January to May
PACIFIC SANDDAB		MARKET SQUID	
Habitat	sand and mud bottoms	Habitat	sand bottoms
Depth range	0 to 549 m	Depth range	NA
Max. length	41 cm	Max. length	190 mm
Max. age	10 years	Max. age	2 years
length @ maturity	Both 19 cm	length @ maturity	NA
age @ maturity	Both 2 to 3 years	age @ maturity	1 to 2 years. Semelparous
Fecundity	NA/multiple spawner	Fecundity	3,600 to 9,000 eggs
spawning season	July to September	spawning season	June ot September
PACIFIC SARDINE		DOVER SOLE	
Habitat	pelagic	Habitat	sand and mud bottoms
Depth range	surface	Depth range	7 to 1281 m
Max. length	41 cm	Max. length	76.2 cm
Max. age	13 years	Max. age	53 years
length @ maturity	Both 18 to 20 cm	length @ maturity	F 31 cm
age @ maturity	NA	age @ maturity	F 5 to 6 years
Fecundity	30,000 to 65,000 eggs	Fecundity	>266,000 eggs/multiple spawner
spawning season	April to August	spawning season	November to April

Appendix H. (continued) Summary of life history parameters for selected species in the MBNMS.

ENGLISH SOLE		SHINER SURFPERCH	
Habitat	shallow sand and mud	Habitat	kelp and seagrass beds; estuaries; docks and pilings; sandy/muddy bottoms; deeper water in winter
Depth range	nearshore to 183 m		
Max. length	57 cm	Depth range	inshore to 209 m
Max. age	22 years	Max. length	19.3 cm
length @ maturity	M 26 cm/F- 30 cm	Max. age	9 years
age @ maturity	Both- 3 years	length @ maturity	M 5 cm; F 13 cm
Fecundity	1.1 million eggs/possible multiple spawner	age @ maturity	M at birth; F 1 to 2 years
spawning season	January to June	Fecundity	4 to 17, with an average of about 8 or 9 offspring
<hr/>		spawning season	April to August
PETRALE SOLE		<hr/>	
Habitat	sandy and sand-mud bottom	STRIPED SURFPERCH	
Depth range	<1 to 550 m.	Habitat	kelp canopy; pilings and docks; rocky shores and reefs; reefs with foliose red algae; eelgrass
Max. length	70 cm		
Max. age	35 years	Depth range	1 to 45 m
length @ maturity	M 36 to 37/F- 40 to 44 cm	Max. length	38 cm
age @ maturity	M 7/ F- 8 years	Max. age	7 to 10 years
Fecundity	NA/multiple spawner	length @ maturity	Both 28.6 cm
spawning season	November to April	age @ maturity	Both 3 years
<hr/>		Fecundity	18 offspring
REX SOLE		spawning season	March to June
Habitat	mud and mud boulder	<hr/>	
Depth range	<1 to 863 m	LONGSPINE THORNYHEAD	
Max. length	59 cm	Habitat	soft bottoms of continental slope/ basin
Max. age	24 years	Depth range	20 to 1756 m
length @ maturity	M 16 /F- 24 cm	Max. length	39 cm
age @ maturity	M 3/F- 5 years	Max. age	45 years
Fecundity	238,000 eggs	length @ maturity	10 to 18 cm
spawning season	January to June	age @ maturity	14 years
<hr/>		Fecundity	106,000 eggs
PILE SURFPERCH		spawning season	February to March
Habitat	rocky shores; pilings; kelp forest bottoms; surfgrass beds; soft-bottoms	<hr/>	
Depth range	1 to 209 m	SHORTSPINE THORNYHEAD	
Max. length	44 cm	Habitat	soft bottoms of continental slope/ basin
Max. age	7 to 10 years	Depth range	20 to 1524 m
length @ maturity	Both 32.8 cm	Max. length	84.6 cm
age @ maturity	NA	Max. age	89 years
Fecundity	30 to 80 offspring	length @ maturity	21 to 23 cm
spawning season	May to June	age @ maturity	12 or 13 years
<hr/>		Fecundity	450,000 eggs
RUBBERLIP SURFPERCH		spawning season	February to March
Habitat	rocky shores and reef bottoms; midwater; kelp beds and forest	<hr/>	
Depth range	3 to 47 m		
Max. length	47 cm		
Max. age	7 to 10 years		
length @ maturity	Both 29 cm		
age @ maturity	NA		
Fecundity	21 offspring		
spawning season	April to June		
<hr/>			

Index

A

Albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*) 113

B

Bank Rockfish (*Sebastes rufus*) 81
Blackgill Rockfish (*Sebastes melanostomus*) 92
Bocaccio (*Sebastes paucispinis*) 82

C

Cabezon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*) 65
California Halibut (*Paralichthys californicus*) 94
California Marine Life Management Act 132
California Marine Life Protection Act 132
Canary Rockfish (*Sebastes pinniger*) 83
Catch per unit effort 1
Chilipepper (*Sebastes goodei*) 83
Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) 109
Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) 111
Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels 8

D

Darkblotched Rockfish (*Sebastes crameri*) 93
Demersal Rockfishes 79
Dover Sole (*Microstomus pacificus*) 96
Dungeness Crab (*Cancer magister*) 90

E

Endangered Species Act 109
English Sole (*Parophrys vetulus*) 96

F

Fishery Conservation and Management Act 35

G

Greenspotted Rockfish (*Sebastes chlorostictus*) 80

J

Jack Mackerel (*Trachurus symmetricus*) 106

K

Kelp Greenling (*Hexagrammos decagrammus*) 63

L

Lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) 64

M

Market Squid (*Loligo opalescens*) 70

N

Nearshore Rockfishes (*Sebastes* species) 59
Nearshore Sharks 72
Northern Anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*) 107

P

Pacific Grenadier (*Coryphaenoides acrolepis*) 100
Pacific Hake (*Merluccius productus*) 111
Pacific Mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*) 105
Pacific Ocean Shrimp (*Pandalus jordani*) 89
Pacific Sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) 108
Petrable Sole (*Eopsetta jordani*) 97

R

Red Abalone (*Haliotis rufescens*) 57
Red Sea Urchin
(*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) 58
Rex Sole (*Errex zachirus*) 98
Rock Crab (*Cancer productus*,
C. antennarius, and *C. anthonyi*) 56
Rocky Deep Shelf and Slope Rockfishes 77

S

Sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*) 91
Sanddabs (*Citharichthys* spp.) 98
Semi-pelagic Rockfishes 80
Shortbelly Rockfish (*Sebastes jordani*) 84
Splitnose Rockfish (*Sebastes diploproa*) 93
Spot Prawn (*Pandalus platyceros*) 76
Starry Flounder (*Platichthys stellatus*) 99
Surfperches (Embiotocidae) 66
Sustainable Fisheries Act 37
Swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*) 114

T

Thornyheads (*Sebastolobus altivelis*
and *S. alascanus*) 93

W

White Croaker (*Genyonemus lineatus*) 73
Widow Rockfish (*Sebastes entomelas*) 84

Y

Yellowtail Rockfish (*Sebastes flavidus*) 85

Photo credits: Greenspotted rockfish (cover); fishing boats and fishers; coastal scenes; yellowtail and yelloweye rockfishes (p. 41); rosy rockfishes (p. 53); baby squid (p. 68); and canary rockfishes (p. 74) by Richard M. Starr. Yellowtail rockfishes (p. 31) courtesy of Cordell Bank Expeditions, NOAA archives; Monterey Fishing Company (p. 116) by Georgia Ratcliffe.