

James Ianelli Taina Honkalehto, Abigail McCarthy, Sarah Stienessen, Kirstin Holsman, Elizabeth Siddon and Ben Fissel Alaska Fisheries Science Center NMFS/NOAA

November 14th 2018

www.tinyurl.com/gfplanteam







Seasonal and area catch patterns

Winter season fishing patterns









Fishing: Seasonal roe production





Aug Sep Apr May Jun Jul Month

Dec

Jan







Closer look at A-season "fatness" trend



Closer look at A-season "fatness" trend

Early on race-for-fish meant earlier in season



Spatial patterns in the summer fishery

Summer fishing distributions



Summer fishing conditions



Summer fishing conditions



Fishing conditions



What ages of pollock are caught?

 New 2017 catch-age data



Fishery catch-at-age

Looking at weight-at-age





Are pollock smaller at age than normal???

- 2008 year class generally small at age
- 2012 looks better!



Average

 fishery weight at-age
 by season
 and year...





Eastern Bering Sea pollock SURVEYS

Pollock density and temperature





Added survey stations in northern

Surveyed in 2010 and 2017

Extra stations
 done in 2018 as
 an "emergency"

Thought to have low abundances of pollock and cod...until 2017









Northern area: 1.34 million t

2018 standard survey (3.1 million t pollock estimated)



Northern area: 1.15 million t

Modeling surveys

- To account for missed areas/years...
- VAST model of Thorson







Year

What are the EBS pollock abundanceat-age estimates like?

• New 2018 abundance-at-age data from the bottom trawl survey



Biennial mid-water acoustic-trawl survey



6 + \I









What are the EBS pollock abundanceat-age estimates like?

 New 2018 abundance-at-age data from the acoustic trawl survey







Acoustic Vessels of Oportunity

Mid-water acoustic surveys...



Acoustic Vessels of Oportunity

Acoustic vessels of opportunity (AVO)

Acoustic Vessels of Oportunity

Data Impact on Model

Models

Data considerations

| Name | Updated catch to 2018 | 2018 ATS data | 2018 Bottom trawl data | AVO 2018 |
|-------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------|
| Catch | Х | | | |
| +ATS | X | Х | | |
| +BTS | X | Х | Х | |
| +AVO | Х | Х | Х | Х |

Data

Impact on

Model

Year

EBS pollock Assessment Results

Model details (1 of 2)

Results

EBS pollock

Assessment

- Tuning indices
 - Acoustic Trawl survey
 - Available biennially (usually)
 - Annual fixed-station bottom trawl survey
 - Tested including northern Bering Sea from VASt
 - Acoustic vessel of opportunity (AVO index)
 - Two new years of data every other year
 - Old foreign trawler CPUE (in 1970s)
- Fishery data
 - Total catch
 - Catch-at-age
 - Mean fishery weights-at-age

EBS pollock Assessment

Results

Model details (2 of 2)

- Age specific schedules
 - Natural mortality
 - Ages 1 and 2 higher, other ages fixed at 0.3
 - Maturity
 - Fixed, 50% at ~ age 3.5 years
 - Other
 - Conditioned on catch biomass (F's estimated)
 - Selectivity varies in fishery
 - Slightly in surveys
 - Stock recruitment model Ricker, affects ABC values, minimal impact on historical trends
 - Projection options built in to evaluate policy trade offs

EBS pollock Assessment Results Bering Sea pollock fishery age data and fits

EBS pollock Assessment

Results

Bering Sea pollock

Bottom trawl survey

age data and fits

EBS pollock Assessment

fits

Results

Bering Sea pollock Acoustic survey age data and

EBS pollock Assessment Results

> Bering Sea pollock

survey

age data and fits

EBS pollock recruitment estimates

Year

Assessment Results

EBS pollock

EBS pollock

Fishing mortality rates

Year

Voor

EBS pollock

Spawning biomass

EBS pollock Assessment

Results

2018 Stock recruitment evaluation

Female spawning biomass (kt)

Decision table diagnostics included

Table 44: Outcomes of decision (expressed as chances out of 100) given different 2019 catches (first row, in kt). Note that for the 2017 and later year-classes average values were assumed. Constant F's based on the 2019 catches were used for subsequent years.

| | 10 | 500 | 1000 | 1250 | 1374 | 1500 | 1750 | 2000 |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| $P[F_{2019} > F_{MSY}]$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 10.1 |
| $P\left[B_{2020} < B_{MSY}\right]$ | 13.3 | 17.7 | 23.9 | 27.7 | 29.8 | 32.1 | 37.2 | 42.8 |
| $P[B_{2021} < B_{MSY}]$ | 8.5 | 13.6 | 21.6 | 26.9 | 29.9 | 33.2 | 40.4 | 48.3 |
| $P\left[B_{2020} < \bar{B}\right]$ | 1.4 | 8.8 | 30.2 | 45.6 | 53.5 | 61.5 | 75.5 | 86.0 |
| $P\left[B_{2023} < B\right]$ | 2.1 | 7.6 | 18.1 | 24.7 | 28.2 | 31.8 | 39.1 | 46.4 |
| $P\left[B_{2023} < B_{2019}\right]$ | 6.9 | 16.9 | 30.8 | 38.1 | 41.7 | 45.2 | 51.8 | 57.8 |
| $P\left[B_{2021} < B_{20\%}\right]$ | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| $P[p_{a_5,2021} > \bar{p}_{a_5}]$ | 10.7 | 30.9 | 53.6 | 62.9 | 66.8 | 70.4 | 76.2 | 80.6 |
| $P\left[D_{2020} < D_{1994}\right]$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $P\left[D_{2023} < D_{1994}\right]$ | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 5.7 | 7.4 | 9.4 | 14.6 | 21.3 |
| $P[E_{2019} > E_{2018}]$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 41.7 | 63.7 | 79.4 | 93.8 | 98.1 |

| | | | Considerations | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | Assessment-related | Population dynamics | Environmental & ecosystem |
| | Level 1 Normal | Typical to moderately increased uncertainty & minor unresolved issues in assessment | Stock trends are typical for the stock; recent recruitment is within normal range. | No apparent environmental & ecosystem concerns |
| Factors for reducing | Level 2 Substan- tially increased concerns | Substantially increased assessment uncertainty unresolved issues. | Stock trends are unusual; abundance increasing or decreasing faster than has been seen recently, or recruitment pattern is atypical. | Some indicators showing an adverse signals but the pattern is inconsistent across all indicators. |
| ABC | Level 3 Major Concern | Major problems with the stock assessment, very poor fits to data, high level of uncertainty, strong retrospective bias. | Stock trends are highly unusual; very rapid changes in stock abundance, or highly atypical recruitment patterns. | Multiple indicators showing consistent adverse signals a) across the same trophic level, and/or b) up or down trophic levels (i.e., predators and prey of stock) |
| | Level 4 Extreme concern | Severe problems with the stock assessment, severe retrospective bias. Assessment considered unreliable. | Stock trends are unprecedented. More rapid changes in stock abundance than have ever been seen previously, or a very long stretch of poor recruitment compared to previous patterns. | Extreme anomalies in multiple ecosystem indicators that are highly likely to impact the stock. Potential for cascading effects on other ecosystem components |

- Unprecedented warm conditions in 2018 resulted in reduced primary and secondary production
- The cold pool prediction for summer 2019 is for continued warm conditions and reduced cold pool extent
- Weak, delayed phytoplankton bloom, reduced biomass, and reduced energy transfer to upper trophic levels (i.e., zooplankton prey base and juvenile pollock)
- Zooplankton prey base reduced (small, lipid-poor taxa, few euphausiids)
- Adult pollock condition index is negative in both SEBS and NBS and has been trending downwards in SEBS since 2010.
- Unprecedented seabird die-off event and broad reproductive failures indicate, in part, a lack of sufficient prey resources

We therefore rated the Ecosystem concern as Level 2, substantially increased concern. These results are summarized as:

| | Considerations | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Assessment-related | Population dynamics | Environmental or | Score (max of |
| | | ecosystem | individual) |
| Level 1: No concern | Level 2: Substantially | Level 2: Substantially | Level 2: Substantially |
| | increased concerns | increased concerns | increased concerns |

EBS pollock Assessment Results

Fishery effort relative to SSB impact

EBS pollock Assessment Results

EBS pollock summary

- Outlook
 - Spawning biomass projected to decline from high levels
 - Decision table may help with TAC considerations

85% of Tier 1 maxABC

| | As estimated or <i>specified</i> | | | As estimated or <i>recommended</i> | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | <i>last</i> ye | ear for: | this year for: | | | | |
| Quantity | 2018 | 2019 | 2019 | 2020 | | | |
| M (natural mortality rate, ages 3+) | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | | | |
| Tier | 1a | 1a | 1a | 1a | | | |
| Projected total (age $3+$) biomass (t) | 10,965,000 t | $10,\!117,\!000$ t | 9,110,000 t | 8,156,000 t | | | |
| Projected female spawning biomass (t) | $3,\!678,\!000 {\rm t}$ | 3,365,000 t | 3,107,000 t | 2,725,000 t | | | |
| B_0 | 5,394,000 t | 5,394,000 t | 5,866,000 t | 5,866,000 t | | | |
| B_{msy} | 2,042,000 t | 2,042,000 t | 2,280,000 t | 2,280,000 t | | | |
| F_{OFL} | 0.621 | 0.621 | 0.645 | 0.645 | | | |
| $maxF_{ABC}$ | 0.466 | 0.466 | 0.51 | 0.51 | | | |
| F_{ABC} | 0.336 | 0.336 | 0.433 | 0.433 | | | |
| OFL | 4,797,000 t | 4,592,000 t | 3,914,000 t | 3,082,000 t | | | |
| maxABC | 3,603,000 t | 3,448,000 t | 3,096,000 t | 2,437,000 t | | | |
| ABC | 2,592,000 t | 2,467,000 t | 2,631,000 t | 2,072,000 t | | | |
| Status | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | | | |
| Overfishing | No | n/a | No | n/a | | | |
| Overfished | n/a | No | n/a | No | | | |
| Approaching overfished | n/a | No | n/a | No | | | |

Re-done w/ ABC=Tier 3

| | As estimated | l or <i>specified</i> | As estimated or <i>recommended</i> | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | last ye | ar for: | this year for: | | |
| Quantity | 2018 | 2019 | 2019 | 2020 | |
| M (natural mortality rate, ages $3+$) | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | |
| Tier | 1a | 1a | 1a | 1a | |
| Projected total (age $3+$) biomass (t) | 10,965,000 t | $10{,}117{,}000~{\rm t}$ | 9,110,000 t | 8,156,000 t | |
| Projected female spawning biomass (t) | 3,678,000 t | 3,365,000 t | 3,107,000 t | 2,725,000 t | |
| B_0 | $5,394,000 \ t$ | $5,394,000 \ t$ | $5,866,000 \ t$ | 5,866,000 t | |
| B_{msy} | 2,042,000 t | 2,042,000 t | 2,280,000 t | 2,280,000 t | |
| F_{OFL} | 0.621 | 0.621 | 0.645 | 0.645 | |
| $maxF_{ABC}$ | 0.466 | 0.466 | 0.51 | 0.51 | |
| F_{ABC} | 0.336 | 0.336 | 0.356 | 0.356 | |
| OFL | 4,797,000 t | 4,592,000 t | 3,914,000 t | 3,082,000 t | |
| maxABC | 3,603,000 t | 3,448,000 t | 3,096,000 t | 2,437,000 t | |
| ABC | 2,592,000 t | 2,467,000 t | 2,163,000 t | 1,792,000 t | |
| Status | 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | |
| Overfishing | No | n/a | No | n/a | |
| Overfished | n/a | No | n/a | No | |
| Approaching overfished | n/a | No | n/a | No | |

Work plan

- Survey data treatment
 - Joining acoustics with bottom trawl (funded proposal)
 - Refining composition data treatment
 - More AVO work
- New data collection methods
 - Sea-floor mounted echo-sounders
- Genetics work
 - For Bogoslof treatment

