Figure 1. Location of trawl tows during survey year 1 (top), 2 (middle) and 3 (bottom). (See Table 9 for sampling effort.)
Figure 2. Comparison of selected gear characteristics among the net category types. (See Table 5.)
Note, throughout this report all pie slices begin at 3 O’Clock and proceed counterclockwise reading from left to right from the legend.

Figure 3. Sampling effort by vessel (top left), gear (top right), season (bottom left) and target species (bottom right) for all trawl tows where some catch data were recorded. (See Tables 10 and 23, 24, 13 and 25, and 22 and 26, respectively.)
Figure 4. Comparison of selected station variables among vessels (means and standard error bars shown, see Table 23).
Figure 5. Comparison of mean total catch, kept catch and discarded catch per tow among vessels (standard error bars shown, see Table 23).
Figure 6. Comparison of mean total catch CPUE, kept CPUE, and discard CPUE among vessels (standard error bars shown, see Table 23).
Figure 7. Comparison of the mean percentage of discard per tow among vessels (standard error bars shown, see Table 23).
Figure 8. Comparison of selected station variables among gears (means and standard error bars shown, see Table 24).
Figure 9. Comparison of mean total catch, kept catch and discarded catch among gear types (standard error bars shown, see Table 24).
Figure 10. Comparison of mean total, kept and discarded CPUE among gears (standard error bars shown, see Table 24).
Figure 11. Comparison of the mean percentage of the catch discarded among gear types (standard error bars shown, see Table 24).
Figure 12. Comparison of selected station variables among seasons (means and standard error bars shown, see Table 25).
Figure 13. Comparison of mean total, kept and discarded catch per tow among seasons (standard error bars shown, see Table 25).
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Figure 14. Comparison of mean total, kept and discard CPUE per tow by season (standard error bars shown, see Table 25).
Figure 15. Mean percentage of catch discarded each tow by season (standard error bars shown, see Table 25).
**Figure 16.** Comparison of selected station variables among target species (standard error bars shown, see Table 26).
Figure 17. Comparison of mean total, kept and discard catch for all species combined among target species (standard error bars shown, see Table 26).
Figure 18. Comparison of mean total, kept and discard CPUE for all species combined among target species (standard error bars shown, see Table 26).
Figure 19. Comparison of the mean percentage of total discard of all species per tow among target species (standard error bars shown, see Table 26).
Figure 20. Dominant species in trawl samples based on mean total, kept and discard pounds of catch per tow. (See Table 28.)
Figure 21. Dominant species in trawl samples based on mean total, kept and discard CPUE (catch per tow-hour). (See Table 29.)
Figure 22. Comparison of the dominant species based on mean discard catch per tow (lbs/tow) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 30.)
Figure 23. Comparison of the dominant species based on mean kept catch (lbs/tow) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 30.)
Figure 24. Comparison of the dominant species based on mean total catch (lbs/tow) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 30.)
Figure 25. Comparison of dominant species based on the mean discard CPUE (lbs/tow-hour) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 31.)
Figure 26. Comparison of the dominant species based on mean kept CPUE (lbs/tow-hour) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 31.)
Figure 27. Comparison of the dominant species based on mean total CPUE (lbs/tow-hour) among the nine most frequently sampled vessels. (See Table 31.)
Figure 28. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean discard (lbs/tow). (See Table 32.)
Figure 29. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean kept catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 32.)
Figure 30. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean total catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 32.)
Figure 31. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean discard CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 33.)
Figure 32. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean kept CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 33.)
Figure 33. Comparison of species captured among gear types based on mean total catch CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 33.)
Figure 34. Comparison of species captured among seasons based on mean discard catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 34.)
Figure 35. Comparison of species captured among seasons based on mean kept catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 34.)
Figure 36. Comparison of species captured among seasons based on mean total catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 34.)
Figure 37. Comparison of species captured among seasons based on mean discard CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 35.)
Figure 38. Comparison of species captured among seasons based on mean kept CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 35.)
**Figure 39.** Comparison of species captured based on mean total catch CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 35.)
Figure 40. Comparison of species discarded among target species tows based on mean discard catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 36.)
Figure 41. Comparison of species kept among target species tows based on mean kept catch (lbs/tow). (See Table 36.)
Figure 42. Comparison of species composition by target species based on mean total catch (lbs/tow).
(See Table 36.)
Figure 43. Comparison of discarded species among target species tows based on mean CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 37.)
Figure 44. Comparison of species kept among target species tows based on mean kept CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 37.)
Figure 45. Comparison of species caught among target species based on mean total CPUE (lbs/tow-hour). (See Table 37.)