# Gulf of Alaska Pacific cod 

 Steven Barbeaux, Bridget Ferriss, Wayne Palsson, Kelei Shotwell, Ingrid Spies, Muyin Wang, and Stephani Zador|  | As estimated or specified last <br> year for: |  | ls estimated or specified this <br> Qear for: |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Quantity | 2020 | 2021 | 2021 | 2022 |
| $M$ (natural mortality rate) | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| Tier | 3 b | 3 b | 3 b | 3 b |
| Projected total (age 0+) biomass |  |  |  |  |
| (t) | 203,373 | 261,484 | 265,661 | 312,783 |
| Female spawning biomass (t) |  |  |  |  |
| Projected | 32,958 | 42,026 | 39,977 | 50,813 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $B_{100 \%}$ | 187,780 | 187,780 | 180,111 | 180,111 |
| $B_{40 \%}$ | 75,112 | 75,112 | 72,045 | 72,045 |
| $B_{35 \%}$ | 65,723 | 65,723 | 63,039 | 63,039 |
| $F_{O F L}$ | 0.27 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.54 |
| $\operatorname{maxF} F_{A B C}$ | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.43 |
| $F_{A B C}$ | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.43 |
| OFL (t) | 17,794 | 30,099 | 28,977 | 46,587 |
| maxABC (t) | 14,621 | 24,820 | 23,627 | 38,141 |
| ABC (t) | $* 14,621$ | $* 24,820$ | 23,627 | 38,141 |

- 2021 above $B_{20 \%}$
- 2021 maxABC $23,627 t$
- 2022 maxABC $38,141 t$
- 2021 OFL $28,977 t$
- 2022 OFL 46,587t


## Summary of results

Tier 3b stock status in 2021 estimated to be at $\mathrm{B}_{22 \%}$ and in 2022 at $\mathrm{B}_{28 \%}$. No overfishing, not overfished, and not approaching overfished.

## Response to Plan Team and SSC Plan Team Comments - November 2019

The Team recommended that the author coordinate with IPHC to obtain and evaluate length compositions so that the IPHC RPN index can be investigated within the assessment model.

- Authors coordinated with IPHC for collection of lengths however due to changes in IPHC policy on data collection and COVID-19 pandemic no cod lengths were collected during the 2020 survey.

The Team recommended that the author work with the AFSC FMA Division (Observer Program) to identify alternative ways to collect information on cod for 2019 and beyond given the likelihood of a reduced fishery and expanding displacement of observers with EM and that these efforts should complement ADFG data collection efforts.

- The authors coordinated with the FMA division and data are being collected in nontarget fisheries. As there wasn't a directed federal fishery in 2020, there was not opportunity to increases sampling effort for EM fisheries. However lack of biological data from the EM fleet will be a continuing issue in the future when the fishery reopens. Currently ADFG port sampling data are being used to support the assessment model when at-sea federal observer data are not available for a specific time, gear, and area.


## Response to Plan Team and SSC Plan Team Comments - November 2019

The Team proposed apportionment percentages that are an average between the apportionments estimated in 2017 and 2019 as an alternative to the 2019 random effects model results. The Team also recommended that the author investigate alternatives of the random effects model that integrates multiple population indices.

- The authors were planning on using IPHC survey results to inform apportionment. Since these data became unavailable for the western GOA, this method will not be considered for this year. We did investigate using the AFSC longline survey results. However using the RPNs from this survey for allocation would result in a substantial shift of $A B C$ to the eastern GOA as $47 \%$ and $49 \%$ of the total RPN were estimated to be in eastern GOA strata in 2019 and 2020. On average over the full time series, the eastern GOA accounts for $30 \%$ of the total Pacific cod RPN for the AFSC longline survey.


## Response to Plan Team and SSC SSC Comments - December 2019


#### Abstract

The SSC requests the authors compare results from the standard projection model with results from projections generated within the SS model under different assumptions about natural mortality (perhaps time or age-varying) and recruitment.


- Projections using the stock synthesis were conducted and presented here. Model 20.1 is presented as an experimental model with growth modeled as a function of temperature and recruitment as a function of the spawning marine heatwave cumulative index. Other models were explored with natural mortality impacted by the MHWI, however relationships between temperature and natural mortality appeared to be largely driven by the 2014-2016 heatwave event. These models were judged to not provide adequate mechanisms for explaining natural mortality during less extreme conditions.

The SSC recommends that the authors in 2020 choose a model nomenclature of their new models that is more in line with SAFE guidelines, such as Model 19.3, if the base model from 2019 is chosen.

- The authors changed to a simpler model naming convention in line with SAFE guidelines. Model 19.14.48c is not named Model 19.1, this year's experimental model is names Model 20.1 as it has substantial changes from Model 19.1 and is new in 2020.


## Changes in the input data

- Federal and state catch data for 2019 were updated and preliminary federal and state catch data for 2020 were included;
- Commercial federal and state fishery size composition data for 2019 were updated, and preliminary commercial federal and state fishery size composition data for 2020 were included;
- AFSC bottom trawl survey Pacific cod conditional length-at-age data for the GOA for 2019 were included;
- AFSC longline survey Pacific cod abundance index and length composition data for the GOA for 2020 were included;
- All length composition samples with less than 30 fish for a particular area, year, quarter, and gear type were excluded from the dataset. This made up $2 \%$ of the data representing $<1 \%$ of the overall catch.


## Model changes

- Model 19.1 is Model 19.14.48c, last year's accepted management model with new data
- Model 20.1 is a climate-enhanced Model 19.1
- Growth - temperature influenced von Bertananffy growth
- $\mathrm{L}_{\infty}$ and K scaled to mean June SST anomaly
- $\mathrm{L}_{0}$ scaled to temperature dependent juvenile growth rate from Laurel et al. 2015
- Recruitment
- $\quad \mathrm{R}_{0}$ scaled to the cube of the spawning marine heatwave cumulative index (Feb-Mar HWCI)


Year

- 2015
$-\quad 2016$

2019 heatwave conditions during spawning

## 2020 cooler SST during spawning season

CFSR Temperatures in June for Pacific cod at mean depth for length

2019 warmest June bottom temperatures

2020 cooler June bottom temperatures to below the 1982-2012 mean

## Ecosystem data

Sea surface and bottom temperatures were cooler in 2020 Winter and Spring

$\rightarrow 0-20 \mathrm{~cm} \rightarrow 40-60 \mathrm{~cm} \cdots-0-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ Mean 1982-2012 .....-40-60 cm Mean 1982-2012



- 2019 heatwave conditions throughout the year
- 2020 heatwave conditions during summer and into fall

Temperatures and heatwave indices show a warm 2020 summer and fall


## Data in the models

Three fisheries, two surveys, length composition from all, conditional age-at-length composition for Bottom trawl survey and three fisheries.


## 2019 Bottom trawl survey

- 126\% increase in abundance from 2017
- $5.6 \times 10^{7}$ to $12.7 \times 10^{7}$ fish
- Second lowest biomass estimate in time series
- $69 \%$ increase to 181,581 t
- Highest CV in time series $(0.243)$



## 2020 Longline survey

- 30\% increase in abundance from 2019
- Second lowest RPN in time series
- 2019 lowest estimate in time series


## Survey indices: used in model

AFSC bottom trawl and AFSC longline surveys still at low values

## IPHC longline survey

- 2020 reduced survey area not including western GOA strata
- Data not yet available
- No Pacific cod lengths measured
- 2019 survey $4 \%$ decrease from 2018


## 2020 ADFG trawl survey

- 2020 survey $41 \%$ increase in abundance

from 2019


## Survey indices: not used in assessment

Some mixed signals, but continued lower abundance for both surveys


## AFSC bottom trawl survey lengths

2019 AFSC bottom trawl survey length composition shows wide distribution with apparent incoming 2017 and 2018 year classes.


## AFSC longline survey lengths

## AFSC longline survey length composition larger fish with an increasing mean length in last three years
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対 2020


## Pot fishery length composition

Increase in mean length in 2019 and 2020 with fewer small fish also larger proportion from ADF\&G port sampling.

CPUE by weight of fish


Catch weighted standardized combined gear CPUE

CPUE by number of fish


2019 has few longline and pot data in central GOA due to electronic monitoring coverage

## Fishery CPUE through 2019

Mixed signal on CPUE but overall drop in CPUE from 2015-2018 in central GOA and variable signal in the western GOA.


Encounter rate of Pacific cod in the pollock fishery indicates increases in the western GOA, but decreases in central GOA
Pcod bycatch in GOA Shallow water flatfish fisheries 2008-2020


Shallow water flatfish show a steady increase in bycatch of Pacific cod since 2017 low

Pacific cod bycatch indices
Mixed signals in Pacific cod bycatch


Trawl Fishery


Pot Fishery


Longline Fishery


AFSC bottom trawl survey


AFSC longline survey


## Model 19.1 selectivity

> Annual varying and blocks for the AFSC bottom trawl survey and all fisheries, single selectivity for the AFSC longline survey.


## Model 19.1 fit to length composition

## Overall good fit to length composition.

AFSC bottom trawl survey


AFSC longline survey


Poorer fits to 2020 survey length composition data as mean length trend diverges between trawl and longline survey data.

NOAA



## Model 19.1 fit to length composition

Poor fit to 2019 and 2020 length composition data as mean length trend diverges between trawl length composition data and pot and longline length composition data.

## Main model results

- Model 19.1 from last year
- Natural mortality
- General estimate to 0.47 (from 0.49)
- 2014-2016 block to 0.82 (from 0.81)
- Survey catchability

- $\quad \mathrm{Q}_{\text {BTS }}$ to 1.16 (from 1.08) effective Q of 0.94
- $\quad \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{LL}}$ between 1.1 and 1.9 (little difference from 2019)
- Fit to $0-20 \mathrm{~cm}$ CFSR temps
- Recruitment
- Lower recruitment 1977-2013 and 2019-2020 due to lower M
- Lower 2015-2017 recruitment estimates
- Higher 2018 estimate

- Model 19.1 results in similar SSB to 2019 reference model

- Scale of recruitment differs for this years models due to change in natural mortality estimate.


## Model 19.1 comparison with previous year

Slight reduction in peak SSB in 2012-2015 with lower natural mortality.
Lower recruitment with lower natural mortality estimate.



## Model 19.1 compared to previous years

Model 19.1 similar results to previous 3 models.


- Poor recruitment since 2014
- Recent fishery carried on 20102013 year classes
- 2018 recruitment better, but still projected to be below average recruitment
- 2019 recruitment modeled as near average even though most indicators suggest it is much lower
- Although modeled as average we have no data on 2020


## Model 19.1 recruitment

Poor recent recruitment post-2013. 2018 better recruitment, but little data to inform 2019. Post-2019 is average recruitment.



Pacific cod 2020 Model 19.1


- Increasing F over time
- Highest F 2016-2017
- Below $\mathrm{B}_{20 \%}$ 2018-2020


## Model 19.1 fishing mortality

Increasing trend in F over time until 2018 with relatively high F for 2016-2017. Below B20\% for 2018-2020. Above B ${ }_{20 \%}$ in 2021.


- Assuming average recruitment expect to reach $\mathrm{B}_{40 \%}$ by 2026 while fishing at maxABC

- Assuming average recruitment expect steady rise in catch to 2026


## Projections using standard bootstrap method

Above $\mathrm{B}_{20 \%}$ after 2021, assumes maxABC after 2021, also assumes average recruitment after 2019 and near average recruitment in 2019.

| Quantity | As estimated or specified last year for: |  | As estimated or specified this year for: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020 | 2021 | 2021 | 2022 |  |  |
| $M$ (natural mortality rate) | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.47 |  |  |
| Tier | 3b | 3b | 3b | 3b |  |  |
| Projected total (age 0+) biomass (t) | 203,373 | 261,484 | 265,661 | 33 |  | 2021 above $\mathrm{B}_{20 \%}$ |
| Female spawning biomass (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Projected | 32,958 | 42,026 | 39,977 | 50,813 |  | 2021 maxABC 23,627t |
| $\mathrm{B}_{100 \%}$ | 187,780 | 187,780 | 180,111 | 180,111 |  | 2022 maxABC $38,141 \mathrm{t}$ |
| $\mathrm{B}_{40 \%}$ | 75,112 | 75,112 | 72,045 | 72,045 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{35 \%}$ | 65,723 | 65,723 | 63,039 | 63,039 |  |  |
| $F_{\text {OFL }}$ | 0.27 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.54 |  | 2021 OFL 28,977t |
| $\max _{\text {ABC }}$ | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.43 |  | 2022 OFL 46,587t |
| $F_{A B C}$ | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.43 |  |  |
| OFL (t) | 17,794 | 30,099 | 28,977 | 46,587 |  |  |
| $\operatorname{maxABC}(\mathrm{t})$ | 14,621 | 24,820 | 23,627 | 38,141 |  |  |
| ABC (t) | *14,621 | *24,820 | 23,627 | 38,141 |  |  |

- 2021 ABC is 5\% lower than projected for 2021 last year
- 2021 OFL id $4 \%$ lower than projected for 2021 last year


## Summary of results

Tier 3b stock status in 2021 estimated to be at $\mathrm{B}_{22 \%}$ and in 2022 at $\mathrm{B}_{28 \%}$. No overfishing, not overfished, and not approaching overfished.

| Assessment- <br> related <br> considerations | Population <br> dynamics <br> considerations | Environmental <br> /ecosystem <br> considerations | Fishery <br> Performance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Level 2: <br> Substantially <br> increased | Level 2: <br> Substantially <br> increased | Level 1: <br> Normal | Level 1: <br> Normal |

- Assessment-related concerns
- High uncertainty in 1977-1989 recruitment and SSB subject to assumptions on selectivity
- Sub-27cm fish not well fit for AFSC bottom trawl survey
- Population dynamics considerations
- 2019 year class appears much lower in ancillary data and ecosystem-linked model than projected in the reference model


## Risk Table

No reduction in maxABC recommended for 2021 and 2022.

| Assessment- <br> related <br> considerations | Population <br> dynamics <br> considerations | Environmental <br> lecosystem <br> considerations | Fishery <br> Performance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Level 2: <br> Substantially <br> increased | Level 2: <br> Substantially <br> increased | Level 1: <br> Normal | Level 1: <br> Normal |

- Environmental/ecosystem
- Cooler spring
- Warm summer and fall
- Mixed signals in prey, predators, and competition
- Fishery performance
- No federal fishery in 2020
- Mixed signals by area and fishery
- Appears to have some indications of increasing bycatch in other target fisheries


## Risk Table

No reduction in maxABC recommended for 2021 and 2022

AFSC bottom trawl survey RE Model for allocation


## Random Effects model apportionment

|  | Western | Central | Eastern | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Random effects area | $22.7 \%$ | $70.6 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| apportionment | 5,363 | 16,681 | 1,583 | 23,627 |
| 2021 ABC | 8,658 | 26,928 | 2,555 | 38,141 |
| 2022 ABC |  |  |  |  |

- In 2019 the SSC chose a stair-step approach as the mean between 2018 and 2019 random effects model
apportionment proportions


## Stair-step apportionment

|  | Western | Central | Eastern | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stair-step area apportionment | $33.8 \%$ | $57.8 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| 2021 ABC | 7,986 | 13,656 | 1,985 | 23,627 |
| 2022 ABC | 12,892 | 22,045 | 3,204 | 38,141 |

## Apportionment

Random effects model used 2013-2018, in 2019 SSC recommended a stair-step approach due to the large change from 2018.

## Model 20.1

Ecosystem-linked model



Short-term projections shows difference due to difference in estimated 2019 recruitment.

Model RCP 2.6 projections without fishing


Model RCP 4.5 projections without fishing


## Model 20.1 IPCC model projections

Five IPCC models under RCP 2.6 and RCP 4.5, the most optimistic IPCC scenarios. Both scenarios result in reduction in productivity.


IPCC models

---- Model20.1MPI_ESM_MR_2.6

Model RCP 4.5 projections fishing


IPCC models
IPCC Model Average
Average Conditions
Model20.1HadGEM2_ES_4.5 Model20.1MIROC_ESM_4.5 Model20.1MIROC5_4. 5
Model20.1MPI_ESM_LR_4.5 Model20.1MPI_ESM_MR_4.5

## IPCC models

Model RCP 2.6 projections with fishing under standard control rule


IPCC models

- IPCC Model Average
--.- Average Conditions
....... Model20.1HadGEM2_ES_4.5
- Model20.1MIROC_ESM_4. 5

Model20.1MIROC5_4.5
---. Model20.1MPI_ESM_LR_4.5

- Model20.1MPI_ESM_MR_4.5

Model RCP 4.5 projections with fishing under standard control rule


## Model 20.1 IPCC model projections

## 23-27\% reduction in spawning biomass with fishing

30-36\% reduction in catch 2050-2099


## Summary of results/recommendations

Recommending Model 19.1 OFL and maxABC with no reduction from risk table adjustments and continued use of the stair-step area apportionment for 2021 and 2022.


## Model 19.1 MCMC

> Low probability of ever being below $\mathrm{B}_{17.5 \%}, 74.2 \%$ probability of being below $\mathrm{B}_{20 \%}$ in 2020 and $7.1 \%$ probability in 2021
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