## Octopus Update Sept 2016

1) Update of Consumption Estimate for BSAI
2) Research Update: Tagging, Discard Mortality
3) Octopus Population Simulation Model

## Octopus Tagging Study Results Reid Brewer, UAF

VIE tags work well for octopus
Higher temperature, growth rates, movement, maturity in autumn SGR 0.2-1.3\%/day, decreases with size, higher in warmer temps Average annual survival $3.3 \%$ for pot-caught octopus ( $\mathrm{M}=3.4$ ), highly variable with octopus size, sex, maturity. Strongly influence by prevalence of mature adults in tagged population.
abundance estimate for study area 3,180 octopus or 127 per km² Expanded to stat areas 509,517,519:
estimate is 1.47 million octopus, $20,697 \mathrm{mt}$

## Octopus Discard Mortality Research

Observer special project 2006-2007, 2010-2011:
Condition of Octopus at discard by region, season, gear type
Field project Jan 2013, F/V Aleutian Mariner cod pot fishing: 36 octopus held 24-60 hrs, NO observed mortality or decline (in press Fisheries Research, Conners and Levine 2016)

Lab project, AFSC Kodiak Labs, octopus held 21 days Uninjured octopus NO delayed mortality, injured octopus, 50\% delayed mortality (Conrath and Sisson, in review Fisheries Research)

| 2006-2007 | Observer Special Project Data Condition Reported for Observed Octopus |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gear |  | No. Alive | No. Dead | Total | \%Alive |
| Bottom Trawl |  | 32 | 43 | 75 | 42.7\% |
| Pelagic Trawl |  | 28 | 161 | 189 | 14.8\% |
| Pots |  | 431 | 2 | 433 | 99.5\% |
| Longline |  | 132 | 36 | 168 | 78.6\% |
| 2010-2011 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gear | Excellent | Poor | Dead | Total | \% Excellent |
| Bottom Trawl | 16 | 11 | 35 | 62 | 25.8\% |
| Pelagic Trawl | 8 | 7 | 42 | 58 | 13.8\% |
| Pots | 506 | 14 | 16 | 536 | 94.4\% |
| Longline | 122 | 7 | 16 | 146 | 83.6\% |

## Cod Pot Field Study -



## Octopus DMRs: Example



## Octopus Discard Mortality: Plan Team Actions

No Action. Archive study results, revisit if/when octopus retention or market increases. DMR remains 100\%

Use DMR in catch accounting, with current results.
Plan for DMR in catch accounting, gather more data.

- Update viability key based on Lab study
- Observers collect new set of vitality data by gear, CV/CP etc.
- Apply DMRs from published research.
- Use methodology from new Halibut DMRs


## Octopus Population Model



## Population Structure and Growth Variables

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Adult |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size (kg) | $<3$ | $3<9$ | $9<15$ | $15<21$ | $21+$ |  |
| Mean Wt <br> (kg) | 0.5 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mnat | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 10 |
| Pr(Mature) | 0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.75 | 1.0 |  |
| Pr(grow 0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Pr(grow 1) | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.25 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| InitSize\% | 0.55 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.02 | 0.1 |
| N0 | 5,500 | 1,500 | 1,000 | 800 | 200 | 1,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fsel - Pots | 0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Fsel- BTsur | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Fsel- Cod | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Run Variables

| Nclass | 6 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Yrs, burn | 60,10 |
|  |  |
| N0_all | $1,460,000$ |
| Rbar | $5,000,000$ |
| sigmaR | 0 |
|  |  |
| Ftot - Pots | 0 |
| Ftot- BTsurv | 0 |
| Ftot- Cod | 0 |

## Calculated Variables / Outputs (units)

| $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{i})$ vector | Numbers at <br> stage i | $\#$ | Matrix |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{t}+1, \mathbf{i})$ | Numbers next <br> year | $\#$ |  |
| $\mathrm{SF}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{i})$ | Size Frequency | $\%$ | Matrix |
| $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{t})$ | Recruitment | $\#$ | Vector |
| $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{i}), \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{t})$ | Biomass | mt | Vector |
| $\mathrm{SpB}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{i}), \mathrm{SpB}(\mathrm{t})$ | Spawning <br> Biomass | mt | Vector |
| $\mathrm{CAAF}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{i})$ | Catch by stage | $\# /$ stage | Matrix |
| Yield $(\mathrm{t})$ | Fishery Yield | mt | Vector |

## R screen output:

Initial Biomass and Population Size $=83.410000$
Final Biomass and Population Size $=64.1912850$
Average Fishery Yield = 2.77
Ending Size Frequency $=0.6420 .2120 .0820 .0170 .0010 .042$ Mean, Stdev, Min, and Max of time series (after burn-in) for Nt[i] plus Rt, Bt, SBt, Yield

|  | Mean | StDev | Min | Max |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N1 | 5439.621 | 1928.922 | 2396.300 | 9362.232 |
| N2 | 2111.981 | 655.904 | 1080.014 | 3517.209 |
| N3 | 926.392 | 273.844 | 508.435 | 1494.725 |
| N4 | 297.731 | 82.156 | 173.443 | 475.272 |
| N5 | 36.803 | 10.030 | 21.300 | 58.368 |
| N6 | 678.445 | 129.686 | 452.450 | 946.847 |
| Rt | 5439.621 | 1928.922 | 2396.300 | 9362.232 |
| Bt | 64.956 | 10.011 | 45.855 | 84.812 |
| SBt | 14.926 | 2.853 | 9.954 | 20.831 |
| Yield | 2.752 | 0.515 | 1.840 | 3.776 |

## Model 0 - Deterministic, Constant R, No Fishing

Population Numbers


Size Frequency Over Time


## Model 0 - Sensitivity Analysis - Natural Mortality

Sensitivity of Biomass to Mnat


## Model 0 - Sensitivity Analysis - Natural Mortality

Sensitivity of Size Freq (stage 1)


Sensitivity of Size Freq (stage 5)


## Model 0 - Sensitivity Analysis - Natural Mortality




## Model 1 - Deterministic, Constant R, Fishing Effects

Yield Curve


Fishing Depletion Curve


## Model 2 - Deterministic, Random R, Fishing Effects

## Population Numbers



## Model 2 - Deterministic, Random R, Fishing Effects

Biomass and Spawning Biomass


Fishery Yield


## Model 2 - Propogation of Recruitment Variability

Propogation of sigmaR to sigmaB


## Model 2 - Propogation of Recruitment Variability

With $\operatorname{sigmaR}=0.1, \mathrm{Ff}=0.3$
Std/mean for:
Rt 0.70
N1 0.70
N2 0.70
N3 0.72
N4 0.73
N5 0.72
N6 0.41
Bt 0.33
SBt 0.41
Yield 0.40

## Further Development:

- Add variation in Mnat, Growth, Maturity
- Generate CAA data for fishery \& surveys for known parameters, fit with ADMB or SS3, see how close estimates of R, B, etc are to simulated values
- Decrease/Increase variance on specific variables: which data stream has most effect on fit to true underlying Biomass time series?
- Other Ideas ?

