

**Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 09-10**

*A Report of the 48th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop*

**48th Northeast Regional  
Stock Assessment Workshop (48th SAW)  
Assessment Summary Report**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Northeast Fisheries Science Center  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts

July 2009

## Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Documents

**This series is a secondary scientific series** designed to assure the long-term documentation and to enable the timely transmission of research results by Center and/or non-Center researchers, where such results bear upon the research mission of the Center (see the outside back cover for the mission statement). These documents receive internal scientific review, and most receive copy editing. The National Marine Fisheries Service does not endorse any proprietary material, process, or product mentioned in these documents.

All documents issued in this series since April 2001, and several documents issued prior to that date, have been copublished in both paper and electronic versions. To access the electronic version of a document in this series, go to <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/>. The electronic version is available in PDF format to permit printing of a paper copy directly from the Internet. If you do not have Internet access, or if a desired document is one of the pre-April 2001 documents available only in the paper version, you can obtain a paper copy by contacting the senior Center author of the desired document. Refer to the title page of the document for the senior Center author's name and mailing address. If there is no Center author, or if there is corporate (*i.e.*, non-individualized) authorship, then contact the Center's Woods Hole Laboratory Library (166 Water St., Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026).

**This document's publication history is as follows:** manuscript submitted for review July 17, 2009; manuscript accepted through technical review July 17, 2009; manuscript accepted through policy review July 20, 2009; and final copy submitted for publication July 22, 2009. Pursuant to section 515 of Public Law 106-554 (the Information Quality Act), this information product has undergone a pre-dissemination review by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, completed on July 17, 2009. The signed pre-dissemination review and documentation is on file at the NEFSC Editorial Office. This document may be cited as:

Northeast Fisheries Science Center. 2009. 48th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (48th SAW) Assessment Summary Report. US Dept Commer, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 09-10; 50 p. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026, or online at <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/>

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Outcome of Stock Assessment Review Meeting.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. GOLDEN TILEFISH ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR 2009 .....</b>	<b>12</b>
State of Stock.....	12
Projections for 2009-2011 .....	12
Stock Distribution and Identification.....	15
Catches.....	15
Data and Assessment .....	15
Biological Reference Points.....	16
Fishing Mortality .....	16
Biomass.....	17
Recruitment.....	17
Special Comments .....	17
References.....	18
Figures .....	19
<b>B. OCEAN QUAHOG ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR 2009 .....</b>	<b>26</b>
State of the Stock .....	26
Projections .....	26
Stock Distribution and Identification.....	27
Catches.....	27
Data and Assessment .....	28
Biological Reference Points.....	28
Fishing Mortality .....	29
Recruitment.....	29
Stock Biomass.....	29
Special Comments .....	29
References.....	31
Tables.....	32
Figures .....	33
<b>C. WEAKFISH ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR 2009 .....</b>	<b>41</b>
State of Stock .....	41
Projections .....	41
Stock Distribution and Identification.....	41
Catches.....	42
Data and Assessment: .....	42
Biological Reference Points.....	42
Fishing Mortality .....	43
Spawning Stock Biomass.....	43
Recruitment.....	43
Special Comments .....	43
References.....	43
Figures .....	44
<b>Appendix: Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>47</b>

## SAW-48 ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT

### Introduction

The 48<sup>th</sup> SAW Assessment Summary Report contains summary and detailed technical information on three stock assessments reviewed in June 2009 at the Stock Assessment Workshop (SAW) by the 48th Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC-48): golden tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*), ocean quahog (*Arctica islandica*), and weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*). The SARC-48 consisted of three external, independent reviewers appointed by the Center for Independent Experts (CIE) and an external SARC chairman from the New England Fishery Management Council Science and Statistics Committee (NEFMC SSC). The SARC evaluated whether each Term of Reference (listed in the Appendix) was completed successfully based on whether the work provided a scientifically credible basis for developing fishery management advice. The reviewers' reports for SAW/SARC-48 are available at website: <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/saw/> under the heading "SARC 48 Panelist Reports".

An important aspect of any assessment is the determination of current stock status. The status of the stock relates to both the rate of removal of fish from the population – the exploitation rate – and the current stock size. The exploitation rate is the proportion of the stock alive at the beginning of the year that is caught during the year. When that proportion exceeds the amount specified in an overfishing definition, overfishing is occurring. Fishery removal rates are usually expressed in terms of the instantaneous fishing mortality rate,  $F$ , and the maximum removal rate is denoted as  $F_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$ .

Another important factor for classifying the status of a resource is the current stock level, for example, spawning stock biomass (SSB) or total stock biomass (TSB). Overfishing definitions, therefore, characteristically include specification of a minimum biomass threshold as well as a maximum fishing threshold. If the biomass of a stock falls below the biomass threshold ( $B_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$ ) the stock is in an overfished condition. The Sustainable Fisheries Act mandates that a stock rebuilding plan be developed should this situation arise.

Since there are two dimensions to stock status – the rate of removal and the biomass level – it is possible that a stock not currently subject to overfishing in terms of exploitation rates is in an overfished condition, that is, has a biomass level less than the threshold level. This may be due to heavy exploitation in the past, or a result of other factors such as unfavorable environmental conditions. In this case, future recruitment to the stock is very important and the probability of improvement may increase greatly by increasing the stock size. Conversely, fishing down a stock that is at a high biomass level should generally increase the long-term sustainable yield. Stocks under federal jurisdiction are managed on the basis of maximum sustainable yield (MSY). The biomass that produces this yield is called  $B_{\text{MSY}}$  and the fishing mortality rate that produces MSY is called  $F_{\text{MSY}}$ .

Given this, federally managed stocks under review are classified with respect to current overfishing definitions. A stock is overfished if its current biomass is below  $B_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$  and overfishing is occurring if current  $F$  is greater than  $F_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$ . The table below depicts status criteria.

		BIOMASS		
		$B < B_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$	$B_{\text{THRESHOLD}} < B < B_{\text{MSY}}$	$B > B_{\text{MSY}}$
EXPLOITATION RATE	$F > F_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$	Overfished, overfishing is occurring; reduce F, adopt and follow rebuilding plan	Not overfished, overfishing is occurring; reduce F, rebuild stock	$F = F_{\text{TARGET}} \leq F_{\text{MSY}}$
	$F < F_{\text{THRESHOLD}}$	Overfished, overfishing is not occurring; adopt and follow rebuilding plan	Not overfished, overfishing is not occurring; rebuild stock	$F = F_{\text{TARGET}} \leq F_{\text{MSY}}$

Fisheries management may take into account the precautionary approach, and overfishing guidelines often include a control rule in the overfishing definition. Generically, the control rules suggest actions at various levels of stock biomass and incorporate an assessment of risk, in that F targets are set so as to avoid exceeding F thresholds.

### Outcome of Stock Assessment Review Meeting

Based on the Review Panel reports (available at <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/saw/> under the heading “SARC 48 Panelist Reports”), the SARC review committee concluded that the assessment terms of reference were satisfied for each of the three stocks.

For tilefish, neither of the two assessment models presented (an ASPIC surplus production model and a statistical, age-and-length-structured model fit to the CPUE and length-frequency data) fit the data well. However, because both models and their uncertainty were adequately investigated, the SARC was able to conclude that stock is not overfished and that overfishing is not occurring. The ASPIC model results suggested a recent increase in abundance; however, the commercial CPUE index has been declining in recent years in a manner consistent with the passage of a strong cohort through the stock, lack of age-structure in the population, and nonequilibrium stock conditions. Based on these considerations and some additional factors, the SARC review committee was not convinced that the stock had rebuilt to  $B_{\text{TARGET}}$ . They concluded that the tilefish projections are useful for displaying the extent of uncertainty in future stock size, but not for predicting future stock size. They also concluded that for the most recent years the biomass estimates from the ASPIC model are likely overestimates.

For ocean quahogs, the SARC felt commercial landings and fishing effort were well characterized, and the analyses were very thorough. As a whole, the stock is slowly being fished down to its  $B_{\text{MSY}}$  proxy reference point (1/2 of the virgin biomass), the stock is not overfished and overfishing is not occurring. The unique biology of ocean quahogs (slow growth, low levels of recruitment and very long-lived) creates time lags that are outside the planning horizons for most managed activities and presents unique challenges for the assessment of this stock.

For weakfish, multiple analyses were presented to provide estimates of abundance, total mortality and fishing mortality, including an ADAPT VPA, an analysis of survey data as abundance indices, and a Steele-Henderson production model including predation effects. While there are technical issues with some of the modeling, taken as a whole the analyses indicate that abundance has declined markedly, total mortality is high, non-fishing mortality has recently increased and that the stock is currently in a depleted state.

## Glossary

**ADAPT.** A commonly used form of computer program used to optimally fit a Virtual Population Assessment (VPA) to abundance data.

**ASAP.** The Age Structured Assessment Program is an age-structured model that uses forward computations assuming separability of fishing mortality into year and age components to estimate population sizes given observed catches, catch-at-age, and indices of abundance. Discards can be treated explicitly. The separability assumption is relaxed by allowing for fleet-specific computations and by allowing the selectivity at age to change smoothly over time or in blocks of years. The software can also allow the catchability associated with each abundance index to vary smoothly with time. The problem's dimensions (number of ages, years, fleets and abundance indices) are defined at input and limited by hardware only. The input is arranged assuming data is available for most years, but missing years are allowed. The model currently does not allow use of length data nor indices of survival rates. Diagnostics include index fits, residuals in catch and catch-at-age, and effective sample size calculations. Weights are input for different components of the objective function and allow for relatively simple age-structured production model type models up to fully parameterized models.

**ASPM.** Age-structured production models, also known as statistical catch-at-age (SCAA) models, are a technique of stock assessment that integrate fishery catch and fishery-independent sampling information. The procedures are flexible, allowing for uncertainty in the absolute magnitudes of catches as part of the estimation. Unlike virtual population analysis (VPA) that tracks

the cumulative catches of various year classes as they age, ASPM is a forward projection simulation of the exploited population. ASPM is similar to the NOAA Fishery Toolbox applications ASAP (Age Structured Assessment Program) and SS2 (Stock Synthesis 2)

**Availability.** Refers to the distribution of fish of different ages or sizes relative to that taken in the fishery.

**Biological reference points.** Specific values for the variables that describe the state of a fishery system which are used to evaluate its status. Reference points are most often specified in terms of fishing mortality rate and/or spawning stock biomass. The reference points may indicate 1) a desired state of the fishery, such as a fishing mortality rate that will achieve a high level of sustainable yield, or 2) a state of the fishery that should be avoided, such as a high fishing mortality rate which risks a stock collapse and long-term loss of potential yield. The former type of reference points are referred to as “target reference points” and the latter are referred to as “limit reference points” or “thresholds”. Some common examples of reference points are  $F_{0.1}$ ,  $F_{MAX}$ , and  $F_{MSY}$ , which are defined later in this glossary.

**$B_0$ .** Virgin stock biomass, i.e., the long-term average biomass value expected in the absence of fishing mortality.

**$B_{MSY}$ .** Long-term average biomass that would be achieved if fishing at a constant fishing mortality rate equal to  $F_{MSY}$ .

**Biomass Dynamics Model.** A simple stock assessment model that tracks changes in stock

using assumptions about growth and can be tuned to abundance data such as commercial catch rates, research survey trends or biomass estimates.

**Catchability.** Proportion of the stock removed by one unit of effective fishing effort (typically age-specific due to differences in selectivity and availability by age).

**Control Rule.** Describes a plan for pre-agreed management actions as a function of variables related to the status of the stock. For example, a control rule can specify how F or yield should vary with biomass. In the National Standard Guidelines (NSG), the “MSY control rule” is used to determine the limit fishing mortality, or Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT). Control rules are also known as “decision rules” or “harvest control laws.”

**Catch per Unit of Effort (CPUE).** Measures the relative success of fishing operations, but also can be used as a proxy for relative abundance based on the assumption that CPUE is linearly related to stock size. The use of CPUE that has not been properly standardized for temporal-spatial changes in catchability should be avoided.

**Exploitation pattern.** The fishing mortality on each age (or group of adjacent ages) of a stock relative to the highest mortality on any age. The exploitation pattern is expressed as a series of values ranging from 0.0 to 1.0. The pattern is referred to as “flat-topped” when the values for all the oldest ages are about 1.0, and “dome-shaped” when the values for some intermediate ages are about 1.0 and those for the oldest ages are significantly lower. This pattern often varies by type of fishing gear, area, and seasonal distribution of fishing, and the growth and migration of the fish. The pattern can be changed by modifications to fishing gear, for example, increasing mesh or hook size, or by changing the proportion of harvest by gear type.

**Mortality rates.** Populations of animals decline exponentially. This means that the number of animals that die in an “instant” is at all times proportional to the number present. The decline is defined by survival curves such as:

$$N_{t+1} = N_t e^{-Z}$$

where  $N_t$  is the number of animals in the population at time  $t$  and  $N_{t+1}$  is the number present in the next time period;  $Z$  is the total instantaneous mortality rate which can be separated into deaths due to fishing (fishing mortality or  $F$ ) and deaths due to all other causes (natural mortality or  $M$ ) and  $e$  is the base of the natural logarithm (2.71828). To better understand the concept of an instantaneous mortality rate, consider the following example. Suppose the instantaneous total mortality rate is 2 (i.e.,  $Z = 2$ ) and we want to know how many animals out of an initial population of 1 million fish will be alive at the end of one year. If the year is apportioned into 365 days (that is, the ‘instant’ of time is one day), then  $2/365$  or 0.548% of the population will die each day. On the first day of the year, 5,480 fish will die ( $1,000,000 \times 0.00548$ ), leaving 994,520 alive. On day 2, another 5,450 fish die ( $994,520 \times 0.00548$ ) leaving 989,070 alive. At the end of the year, 134,593 fish [ $1,000,000 \times (1 - 0.00548)^{365}$ ] remain alive. If, we had instead selected a smaller ‘instant’ of time, say an hour, 0.0228% of the population would have died by the end of the first time interval (an hour), leaving 135,304 fish alive at the end of the year [ $1,000,000 \times (1 - 0.00228)^{8760}$ ]. As the instant of time becomes shorter and shorter, the exact answer to the number of animals surviving is given by the survival curve mentioned above, or, in this example:

$$N_{t+1} = 1,000,000 e^{-2} = 135,335 \text{ fish}$$

**Exploitation rate.** The proportion of a population alive at the beginning of the year that is caught during the year. That is, if 1 million fish were alive on January 1 and

200,000 were caught during the year, the exploitation rate is 0.20 (200,000 / 1,000,000) or 20%.

**F<sub>MAX</sub>**. The rate of fishing mortality that produces the maximum level of yield per recruit. This is the point beyond which growth overfishing begins.

**F<sub>0.1</sub>**. The fishing mortality rate where the increase in yield per recruit for an increase in a unit of effort is only 10% of the yield per recruit produced by the first unit of effort on the unexploited stock (i.e., the slope of the yield-per-recruit curve for the F<sub>0.1</sub> rate is only one-tenth the slope of the curve at its origin).

**F<sub>10%</sub>**. The fishing mortality rate which reduces the spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSB/R) to 10% of the amount present in the absence of fishing. More generally, F<sub>x%</sub>, is the fishing mortality rate that reduces the SSB/R to x% of the level that would exist in the absence of fishing.

**F<sub>MSY</sub>**. The fishing mortality rate that produces the maximum sustainable yield.

**Fishery Management Plan (FMP)**. Plan containing conservation and management measures for fishery resources, and other provisions required by the MSFCMA, developed by Fishery Management Councils or the Secretary of Commerce.

**Generation Time**. In the context of the National Standard Guidelines, generation time is a measure of the time required for a female to produce a reproductively-active female offspring for use in setting maximum allowable rebuilding time periods.

**Growth overfishing**. The situation existing when the rate of fishing mortality is above F<sub>MAX</sub> and when fish are harvested before they reach their growth potential.

**Limit Reference Points**. Benchmarks used to indicate when harvests should be constrained substantially so that the stock remains within safe biological limits. The probability of

exceeding limits should be low. In the National Standard Guidelines, limits are referred to as thresholds. In much of the international literature (e.g., FAO documents), “thresholds” are used as buffer points that signal when a limit is being approached.

**Landings per Unit of Effort (LPUE)**. Analogous to CPUE and measures the relative success of fishing operations, but is also sometimes used a proxy for relative abundance based on the assumption that CPUE is linearly related to stock size.

**MSFCMA**. (Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act). U.S. Public Law 94-265, as amended through October 11, 1996. Available as NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-23, 1996.

**Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT, F<sub>THRESHOLD</sub>)**. One of the Status Determination Criteria (SDC) for determining if overfishing is occurring. It will usually be equivalent to the F corresponding to the MSY Control Rule. If current fishing mortality rates are above F<sub>threshold</sub>, overfishing is occurring.

**Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST, B<sub>threshold</sub>)**. Another of the Status Determination Criteria. The greater of (a) ½B<sub>MSY</sub>, or (b) the minimum stock size at which rebuilding to B<sub>MSY</sub> will occur within 10 years of fishing at the MFMT. MSST should be measured in terms of spawning biomass or other appropriate measures of productive capacity. If current stock size is below B<sub>THRESHOLD</sub>, the stock is overfished.

**Maximum Spawning Potential (MSP)**. This type of reference point is used in some fishery management plans to define overfishing. The MSP is the spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSB/ R) when fishing mortality is zero. The degree to which fishing reduces the SSB/R is expressed as a percentage of the MSP (i.e., %MSP). A stock is considered overfished when the fishery reduces the



%MSP below the level specified in the overfishing definition. The values of %MSP used to define overfishing can be derived from stock-recruitment data or chosen by analogy using available information on the level required to sustain the stock.

**Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY).** The largest average catch that can be taken from a stock under existing environmental conditions.

**Overfishing.** According to the National Standard Guidelines, “overfishing occurs whenever a stock or stock complex is subjected to a rate or level of fishing mortality that jeopardizes the capacity of a stock or stock complex to produce MSY on a continuing basis.” Overfishing is occurring if the MFMT is exceeded for 1 year or more.

**Optimum Yield (OY).** The amount of fish that will provide the greatest overall benefit to the Nation, particularly with respect to food production and recreational opportunities and taking into account the protection of marine ecosystems. MSY constitutes a “ceiling” for OY. OY may be lower than MSY, depending on relevant economic, social, or ecological factors. In the case of an overfished fishery, OY should provide for rebuilding to  $B_{MSY}$ .

**Partial Recruitment.** Patterns of relative vulnerability of fish of different sizes or ages due to the combined effects of selectivity and availability.

**Rebuilding Plan.** A plan that must be designed to recover stocks to the  $B_{MSY}$  level within 10 years when they are overfished (i.e. when  $B < MSST$ ). Normally, the 10 years would refer to an expected time to rebuilding in a probabilistic sense.

**Recruitment.** This is the number of young fish that survive (from birth) to a specific age or grow to a specific size. The specific age or size at which recruitment is measured may correspond to when the young fish become vulnerable to capture in a fishery or when the

number of fish in a cohort can be reliably estimated by a stock assessment.

**Recruitment overfishing.** The situation existing when the fishing mortality rate is so high as to cause a reduction in spawning stock which causes recruitment to become impaired.

**Recruitment per spawning stock biomass (R/SSB).** The number of fishery recruits (usually age 1 or 2) produced from a given weight of spawners, usually expressed as numbers of recruits per kilogram of mature fish in the stock. This ratio can be computed for each year class and is often used as an index of pre-recruit survival, since a high R/SSB ratio in one year indicates above-average numbers resulting from a given spawning biomass for a particular year class, and vice versa.

**Reference Points.** Values of parameters (e.g.  $B_{MSY}$ ,  $F_{MSY}$ ,  $F_{0.1}$ ) that are useful benchmarks for guiding management decisions. Biological reference points are typically limits that should not be exceeded with significant probability (e.g., MSST) or targets for management (e.g., OY).

**Risk.** The probability of an event times the cost associated with the event (loss function). Sometimes “risk” is simply used to denote the probability of an undesirable result (e.g. the risk of biomass falling below MSST).

**Status Determination Criteria (SDC).** Objective and measurable criteria used to determine if a stock is being overfished or is in an overfished state according to the National Standard Guidelines.

**Selectivity.** Measures the relative vulnerability of different age (size) classes to the fishing gears(s).

**Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB).** The total weight of all sexually mature fish in a stock.

**Spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSB/R or SBR).** The expected lifetime contribution to the spawning stock biomass for each

recruit. SSB/R is calculated assuming that F is constant over the life span of a year class. The calculated value is also dependent on the exploitation pattern and rates of growth and natural mortality, all of which are also assumed to be constant.

**Stock Synthesis 2 (SS2).** This application provides a statistical framework for calibration of a population dynamics model using a diversity of fishery and survey data. SS2 is designed to accommodate both age and size structure and with multiple stock sub-areas. Selectivity can be cast as age specific only, size-specific in the observations only, or size-specific with the ability to capture the major effect of size-specific survivorship. The overall model contains subcomponents which simulate the population dynamics of the stock and fisheries, derive the expected values for the various observed data, and quantify the magnitude of difference between observed and expected data. Parameters are searched for which will maximize the goodness-of-fit. A management layer is also included in the model allowing uncertainty in estimated parameters to be propagated to the management quantities, thus facilitating a description of the risk of various possible management scenarios. The structure of SS2 allows for building of simple to complex models depending upon the data available.

**Survival Ratios.** Ratios of recruits to spawners (or spawning biomass) in a stock-recruitment analysis. The same as the recruitment per spawning stock biomass (R/SSB), see above.

**TAC.** Total allowable catch is the total regulated catch from a stock in a given time period, usually a year.

**Target Reference Points.** Benchmarks used to guide management objectives for achieving a desirable outcome (e.g., OY). Target reference points should not be exceeded on average.

**Uncertainty.** Uncertainty results from a lack of perfect knowledge of many factors that affect stock assessments, estimation of reference points, and management. Rosenberg and Restrepo (1994) identify 5 types: measurement error (in observed quantities), process error (or natural population variability), model error (mis-specification of assumed values or model structure), estimation error (in population parameters or reference points, due to any of the preceding types of errors), and implementation error (or the inability to achieve targets exactly for whatever reason)

**Virtual population analysis (VPA) (or cohort analysis).** A retrospective analysis of the catches from a given year class which provides estimates of fishing mortality and stock size at each age over its life in the fishery. This technique is used extensively in fishery assessments.

**Year class (or cohort).** Fish born in a given year. For example, the 1987 year class of cod includes all cod born in 1987. This year class would be age 1 in 1988, age 2 in 1989, and so on.

**Yield per recruit (Y/R or YPR).** The average expected yield in weight from a single recruit. Y/R is calculated assuming that F is constant over the life span of a year class. The calculated value is also dependent on the exploitation pattern, rate of growth, and natural mortality rate, all of which are assumed to be constant.

## C. WEAKFISH ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR 2009

### State of Stock:

The stock is currently depleted. The biomass based reference point threshold is  $SSB_{20\%} = 10,179$  mt assuming a constant natural mortality rate of  $M = 0.25$  (see Biological Reference Point section below). The mid-year 2008 biomass level as estimated by the index-based method is 1,333 mt. There were 850 mt removed in 2007 and 811 mt in 2008 (including landings and discard mortality). This level of removals is unsustainable under current stock conditions. In terms of biomass the  $F$  in 2008 is estimated to be 0.61. In terms of abundance the  $F$  level in 2008 is estimated to be 0.07, due to the high number of partially selected recruits.

Natural mortality,  $M$ , within this population was approximately 0.25 prior to 1995, but  $M$  has risen substantially since then. At this higher level of natural mortality the stock is unlikely to recover in six years to any biomass reference level even under a scenario of no directed fishing (see Projections section).

Several models were used to explore likely scenarios of increasing  $M$ . All models investigated indicate that weakfish spawning stock biomass is below the overfished biomass threshold. The analyses found that factors such as predation, competition and changes in the environment may have had a stronger influence on recent weakfish stock dynamics than fishing mortality.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission describes the weakfish stock as "depleted" because stock biomass is below the biomass threshold, and fishing mortality is not considered to be the primary cause.

Catch and Status Table ('000 MT): Weakfish

Year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	max <sup>1</sup>	min <sup>1</sup>	mean <sup>1</sup>
Catch weight	5.35	4.96	4.70	3.66	1.56	1.35	1.45	1.13	0.97	0.81	20.20	0.81	6.78
Stock numbers <sup>2,3</sup>	76.47	63.39	37.65	26.33	19.16	33.66	34.70	23.56	21.27	19.26	96.55	17.38	53.06
Stock biomass <sup>2,3</sup>	9.34	9.25	7.18	4.51	2.68	3.29	3.01	2.35	1.71	1.33	28.54	1.33	9.06
N weighted $F^{2,4}$	0.13	0.14	0.26	0.34	0.15	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.07	1.06	0.07	0.36
B weighted $F^{2,4}$	0.57	0.54	0.65	0.81	0.58	0.41	0.48	0.48	0.56	0.61	1.37	0.35	0.74

1: Based on 1981 - 2008 time series; includes commercial and recreational harvest and discards

2: Estimated from the index-based approach detailed in Section C8.0 of the Stock Assessment Report

3: Stock size estimates are mid-year values. Numbers are in millions; biomass is thousands of metric tons.

4:  $F$  estimates are for ages 1+

### Projections:

A stock projection was conducted using a model (i.e., an extended surplus production model with Steele-Henderson predator response) that differs from the index-based model used for the assessment. In this projection (Figure C1), stock biomass and the biomass reference point are scaled to each other (i.e., relative) and are not in absolute units. They provide a reasonable indication of future trends. The projection suggests that little stock growth is possible with current high mortality levels, even under a harvest moratorium. This is because current fishing mortality represents a small component of total mortality, thus reducing the management "leverage" considerably.

### Stock Distribution and Identification:

The range of weakfish extends along the Atlantic coast from Massachusetts to southern Florida, but they are occasionally found as far as Nova Scotia, Canada. Primary abundance occurs between New York and North Carolina. Within their range there is evidence of multiple

stocks based on life history patterns but not genetics. These conclusions result in disparate recommendations on how the stock should be managed. Based on available information, the ASMFC Weakfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) treats Atlantic coast weakfish as a single stock.

### **Catches:**

Since 1982, total removals have been dominated by commercial and recreational harvest (Figures C2 and C3). Removals were greatest during the early portion of the time series, averaging 13,500 mt between 1981 and 1988. Between 1989 and 1993, removals dropped off quickly to 4,000 mt. The next few years showed a slight rebound to a peak of 6,500 mt in 1998 under a concerted effort to reduce F under the auspices of the FMP. Since then, removals have declined continuously to the time series minimum of only 850 mt in 2007. Combined commercial and recreational discard losses were generally less than 5% of total removals prior to 1993. Discarding increased rapidly following implementation of management measures due to minimum size regulations. Regardless, discard losses have averaged less than 20% of total removals since 1994 (Figure C2).

### **Data and Assessment:**

This is the first update to the weakfish stock assessment since 2006 when the assessment was peer reviewed through the ASMFC External Peer Review process (ASMFC 2006). The current assessment includes harvest data and survey indices through 2007. As recommended by SARC 26 (NEFSC 1998), an ADAPT VPA was used to evaluate trends in population parameters. However, while the ADAPT VPA method provided reasonable estimates of biomass and fishing mortality in the early part of the time series (when such models readily converge) the model exhibited a significant retrospective pattern for the most recent years' estimates making them unusable for assessing current stock conditions. In an attempt to remedy this situation, an index-based method was used that was scaled to the biomass estimates taken from the first four years of the converged estimates from the ADAPT VPA. The estimates and reference points used in this report are based on the index-based method.

### **Biological Reference Points:**

When there is a trend in M then, generally speaking, the use of equilibrium reference points for setting management objectives is not appropriate. The current management plan uses reference points that assume constant natural mortality. To create a means for assessing stock status a biomass reference level is proposed that establishes a biomass threshold (SSB20%) under the assumption of constant  $M=0.25$ . SSB20% is estimated to be 10,179 mt. Under current conditions of high natural mortality the stock has negative productivity. For the population to pass through this period of negative productivity, total mortality needs to be reduced to levels that would allow biomass to be at least SSB20% and preferably higher. Even in the absence of fishing this will not likely occur until natural mortality decreases to previous low levels.

Due to the changes in M over time and the current negative productivity of the stock, F reference points are also not currently meaningful. However, should M return to some constant level, then F reference points could again be calculated recognizing that if M remains high an equilibrium yield would likely be low and there would be a significant risk to the stock. If M were to drop back down to previous low levels, a harvest rate could be determined that would allow an appropriate rebuilding schedule.

### **Fishing Mortality:**

Fishing mortality estimated using the index-based approach scaled to the converged portion of the ADAPT VPA biomass while accounting for the estimated trend in M has varied between 0.7 and 1.1 over the years 1981 and 1987. From 1988 through 1990, biomass-weighted F values generally varied around  $F = 1.3$  before dropping rapidly to the time series low of  $F = 0.35$  in 1995. Since that time biomass-weighted F has varied between 0.4 and 0.8, but M has risen substantially. Note that F values given in this assessment are not comparable to F's or F-reference points provided in previous assessments. Values presented in this assessment are for ages 1+ and therefore are affected by partial recruitment of younger ages, while previous assessments provided estimates for fully-recruited ages only.

### **Spawning Stock Biomass:**

Between 1981 and 1990, spawning stock biomass estimated by the approved index-based method dropped from 28,000 to 3,920 mt, then increased to approximately 14,000 mt in 1996, then dropped again to low levels of 2,000 – 4,000 mt in the early 2000s and is now calculated to be less than 2,000 mt in 2008 (Figure C3).

### **Recruitment:**

Recruitment was not estimated from the index-based method. The juvenile abundance surveys indicate that young-of-year weakfish continued to be present in numbers similar to previous years, suggesting that recruitment at this point has not been severely limited in spite of the low stock size.

### **Special Comments:**

\* ADAPT VPA was recommended by the 26<sup>th</sup> SAW as a modeling framework for weakfish; however, concerns regarding some of the underlying assumptions (such as error-free catch at age and constant natural mortality), prominent retrospective patterns, and anomalous results have prompted the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee to investigate alternative models.


\* A key question is the reason for the unexpected decline in abundance in the late 1990s at harvest levels that had previously resulted in stock growth. A suite of analyses was conducted that provide evidence that factors other than fishing mortality resulted in decreased stock size over the last decade.

\* All models investigated indicate that weakfish biomass is at a low level.


### **References:**

- ASMFC. 2006. 2006 Weakfish Stock Assessment: Weakfish Stock Assessment Report, Terms of Reference and Advisory Report, and Technical Committee Supplemental Material. Washington (DC): ASMFC. 315 p.
- NEFSC. 1998. Report of the 26th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (26th SAW): Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC) Consensus Summary of Assessments. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 98-03; p 10-50.


## Figures



**C1.** A projection through 2020 of total weakfish spawning stock biomass (TSSB) which simulates no moratorium as well as a harvest moratorium ( $F=0$ ) beginning in 2009. The projection is based on the assumption that  $M = 0.25$  from 1981-1998, followed by a rise to  $M=0.65$  thereafter. All values in the figure, including SSB20%, have been scaled, so they are indicative of relative trends in biomass in relation to SSB20%, and not absolute biomass. SSB20% was estimated assuming constant natural mortality of  $M = 0.25$ . Projections were conducted based on results of the Steele-Henderson model described in section C9.0 of the stock assessment report.



**C2.** Total weakfish fishery removals. A) Harvest weight (metric tons) for the two principal sectors and all four sectors combined; B) Percent of total biomass removals by sector.



**C3.** Weakfish fishery catch biomass (mt) and estimates of stock biomass (mt) estimated by the SARC48 approved, ‘index-based’ approach. Recent biomass is well below the current estimate of SSB20% (10,179 mt) which the SARC felt could be used as an interim biomass threshold until a future assessment.



### **C. Weakfish**

(Final weakfish TORs approved by Weakfish Management Board 4-24-09)

1. Evaluate biases, precision, uncertainty, and sampling methodology of the commercial and recreational catch (including landings and discards) and effort.
2. Evaluate precision, geographical coverage, representation of stock structure, and relative accuracy of the fisheries independent and dependent indices of abundance. Review preliminary work on standardization of abundance indices.
3. Evaluate the ADAPT VPA catch at age modeling methods and the estimates of  $F$ ,  $Z$ , spawning stock biomass, and total abundance of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty and potential bias of those estimates. Review the severity of retrospective pattern.
4. Evaluate the index-based methods and the estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, and time-varying natural mortality of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty of those estimates. Determine whether these techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
5. Evaluate testing of fishing and additional trophic and environmental covariates and modeling of hypotheses using biomass dynamic models featuring multiple indices blended into a single index with and without a Steele-Henderson (Type III) predator-prey extension. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant  $M$  and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
6. Evaluate AIC-based hypothesis testing of fishing and additional predation-competition effects using multi-index biomass dynamic models with and without prey-based, predator-based, or ratio dependent predator-prey extensions. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant  $M$  and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
7. Review evidence for constant or recent systematic changes in natural mortality, productivity, and/or unreported removals.
8. Estimate biological reference points using equilibrium and non-equilibrium assumptions and evaluate stock status relative to these BRPs.
9. Review stock projections and impacts on the stock under different assumptions of fishing and natural mortality.
10. Make research recommendations for improving data collection and assessment.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

**Summary Report of the 48th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Review  
Committee (SARC 48)**

**Members of SARC 48**

Patrick J. Sullivan, chair

Mike Bell

Jamie Gibson

Sven Kupschus

**Prepared for NE Regional Stock Assessment Workshop**

National Marine Fisheries Service

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Woods Hole, Massachusetts

Meeting dates June 1-4, 2009

Report date June 29, 2009

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

**Contents**

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Background.....	3
1.2	Review of Activities .....	3
1.3	SARC Process.....	4
2	Review of the Tilefish Assessment.....	5
3	Review of the Ocean Quahog Assessment .....	10
4	Review of the Weakfish Assessment.....	17
5	Bibliography of SAW Materials .....	24
6	Statement of Work .....	26
7	Assessment Terms of Reference for SAW/SARC-48, June 1-4, 2009.....	36
7.1	Tilefish .....	36
7.2	Ocean quahog.....	37
7.3	Weakfish .....	38

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Background**

The 48th SARC (Stock Assessment Review Committee) met in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, from Monday, June 1, through Thursday, June 4, 2009, to review three assessments: tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*), ocean quahog (*Arctica islandica*), and weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*).

The review committee was composed of Dr. Patrick J. Sullivan (chair, NEFMC SSC and Cornell University) and three scientists affiliated with the Center for Independent Experts, Northern Taiga Ventures, Inc. (NTVI): Dr. Mike Bell, Dr. Jamie Gibson, and Sven Kupschus.

The SARC was assisted by the NEFSC SAW Chairman, Dr. James Weinberg, and his staff and Dr. Paul Rago, also from the NEFSC. The tilefish report was prepared by the Southern Demersal Working Group and was presented at the meeting by Dr. Paul Nitschke (NEFSC). The ocean quahog report was prepared by the Invertebrate Subcommittee and presented at the meeting by Dr. Larry Jacobson and Ms. Toni Chute (NEFSC). The weakfish report was prepared by the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee and presented at the meeting by Mr. Jeffrey Brust (NJDFW).

### **1.2 Review of Activities**

About two weeks before the meeting, assessment documents and supporting materials were made available to the SARC via an ftp server. On the morning before the meeting, the assessment review committee met with Drs. Weinberg and Rago to discuss the meeting agenda, reporting requirements, and meeting logistics. During the SARC meeting, all documents were made available electronically and in print.

The meeting opened on Monday morning with a welcome and introductions by Jim Weinberg and Pat Sullivan. The tilefish assessment was presented that morning, after the introductions, followed by the ocean quahog assessment. On Tuesday morning the tilefish and ocean quahog assessments were discussed further, and on Tuesday afternoon the weakfish assessment was presented. Wednesday allowed for follow-up discussion on all three assessments and the committee asked further questions and then used the remaining time to derive a consensus on the content of the review. Thursday was spent developing the report.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

### **1.3 SARC Process**

The committee was able to arrive at a consensus on each of the three assessments. The specified terms of reference, in each case, appeared to be satisfied although several recommendations were made towards improving the assessments and the assessment advice. The reviews of each assessment are briefly summarized below with more details provided in the subsequent sections.

The tilefish assessment working group satisfactorily completed the TOR's for this assessment. Neither of the two models presented (a surplus production model and a statistical, age-and-length-structured model fit to the LPUE and length-frequency data) fit the data well nor were plausible parameter estimates derived. However, the working group thoroughly investigated both models, acknowledged issues with the models and provided practical management advice given the uncertainties identified in the analyses. There was a consensus within the review committee that the stock is not overfished and that overfishing is not occurring. The review committee also agreed with the working group that there is little evidence that the stock has rebuilt to  $B_{TARGET}$ .

The ocean quahog assessment working group also completed the TOR's for this assessment. The commercial landings and fishing effort are well characterized for this stock. Analyses were very thorough, at times using multiple independent methods to validate conclusions. As a whole, the stock is slowly being fished down to towards its  $B_{MSY}$  proxy reference point (1/2 of the virgin biomass). There was a consensus among the review committee that the stock is not overfished and that overfishing is not occurring. The unique biology of quahog (slow growth, low levels of recruitment and very long-lived) creates time lags that are outside the planning horizons for most managed activities and presents unique challenges for the assessment of this stock. These issues were handled well in the assessment.

The weakfish assessment working group did a considerable amount of work in meeting the TOR's for this assessment. Multiple analyses were presented to provide estimates of abundance, total mortality and fishing mortality, including an ADAPT VPA, an analysis of survey data as abundance indices, and a Steele-Henderson production model including predation effects. While there are technical issues with some of the modeling, taken as a whole the analyses indicate that abundance has declined markedly, total mortality is high, non-fishing mortality has recently increased and that the stock is currently in a depleted state.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

## **4 Review of the Weakfish Assessment**

There is a substantial history to the assessment of this stock. Previously used assessment methodologies have been troubled by significant deficiencies, which have not allowed effective management based on their results. As a consequence the technical committee was asked by way of the TORs to provide additional information and analyses, which were presented in the full report to the SARC panel. The work itself was well presented and addressed all the TORs adequately given the available data. However, the way in which the conclusions from the different pieces of work were put together in order to arrive at management recommendations was not always clear. Consequently, there were inconsistencies in the steps leading from the data to the assessment and then on to the projections. However, the management recommendations based on the sum of the work is not sensitive to these inconsistencies as the decline in the stock is very dramatic. The decline is clearly based on a change in the natural mortality rate in recent years, and is likely further exacerbated by continued significant removals by the commercial and recreational fisheries.

The assessment methodology accepted by the panel was based on relative changes in abundance using an indexed-based approach, resulting in estimates of  $Z$  over the time series. To obtain absolute estimates of  $F$  the relative estimates were anchored to absolute values in the converged part of the VPA assessed by ADAPT over the period 82-85 when natural mortality estimates of  $M=0.25$  were considered appropriate. Division of the observed catches by the index based abundance estimates then enables the estimation of a time series of natural mortality rates assuming accurate estimation of catches and survey abundances. Results indicate that  $M$  is now around 0.75, whilst fishing mortality has dropped to low levels around 0.07 weighted by numbers, although this is not comparable with  $F$  levels in the previous ADAPT assessment which represents an age-based average. SSB is estimated to be around 1,330 mt.

Projections for this stock present a very bleak picture, where even under a moratorium of fishing the stock is unlikely to recover rapidly to anywhere near what one could describe as safe biological conditions, although the longer-term outlook is highly dependent on the assumed rate of natural mortality. When natural mortality is high managers have limited options for increasing abundance. Having accepted that natural mortality is variable, the panel felt that equilibrium reference points, particularly those based on fishing mortality do not present a suitable management regime. We do however recognise the need for managers to have some measure of stock status so have tried to provide some basis for biomass reference points. Despite some dependence on model choice and some sensitivity to the exact estimate of natural mortality there is little doubt that the stock is depleted to levels well below any past or presently proposed reference point.

The main uncertainties in the assessment and advice include:

- The assessment assumes a variable natural mortality rate. Although strong supporting evidence of such an effect was provided, and a methodology for

## **FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

determining the magnitude of the change in mortality, the resulting vector of mortalities is almost entirely dependent on the survey abundance index. The accepted methodology assumes the abundance indices are virtually exact so that bias and variance in the survey has now been subsumed in the mortality vector. Assuming there is still variability in the survey the exact magnitude of the change in mortality remains unknown.

- Discard mortality in the commercial data has been estimated on the basis of by-catch ratios, over the entire period of commercial catches, so that not only are the amounts of discards independent of year class strength, but also dependent on fluctuations in the abundance of other commercially exploited species. ADAPT VPA is likely to find it difficult to interpret year class signals and hence recruitment in the absence of better catch-at-age data at the younger ages.
- The projections for this stock indicate that the stock is unlikely to recover in the near future in the absence of fishing and for that purpose the projections are adequate. However the current assessment and other methods used for projections require further information than that usually used in a forecast if more precise estimates, such as an ABC, were to be required.

The panel considered the final assessment model as representing a valid basis for development of management advice despite the uncertainties, mainly because the state of the stock is so critical. However, future advice, particularly if M were to decline and the stock started to recover, would benefit from further research on these issues.

### **Meeting the TOR for Weakfish**

#### **1. Evaluate biases, precision, uncertainty, and sampling methodology of the commercial and recreational catch (including landings and discards) and effort.**

This Term of Reference was completed successfully. The data collection schemes are adequate for estimating the quantity and size/age composition of all significant removals due to commercial and recreational fishing.

Discard estimates for the commercial fleet likely affect the ability of the model to track year class variation.

Some uncertainty exists regarding the release mortality from recreational discards.

#### **2. Evaluate precision, geographical coverage, representation of stock structure, and relative accuracy of the fisheries independent and dependent indices of abundance. Review preliminary work on standardization of abundance indices.**

The TOR was completed thoroughly and the panel agreed with the conclusions reached by the technical committee.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

All evidence points to the fact that there is some significant structure at levels below that of the stock as currently defined, however the fishery and the fish operate at levels wider than the population structure so that it is not possible to draw representative assessment substructures at this point without further information on the spatial movements of both fish and fishers. The panel agrees with the technical committee that it is most appropriate to deal with the stock as a single unit at this point in time, accepting that mixing is unlikely to be complete in this stock.

The review of indices was substantial, expanding on work done for previous assessments. The results indicate that there are a number of indices that are consistent between each other and their spatial coverage indicates they should be representative of the dynamics of the stock. The panel agreed with both the choice of the indices taken forward into the assessment, as well as reasoning for the exclusion of others.

YOY indices indicated that reproduction was currently not strongly impaired in this stock, despite the very small stock size, but correlation with the older age disaggregated indices was poor in the most recent time period. The technical committee interpreted this as supporting evidence that the mortality of 1+ weakfish had changed in this period and the panel agreed that it is consistent with such a theory.

The final assessment as well as a number of the other assessment models investigated by the technical committee used normalized indices derived by subtracting the mean, dividing by the standard deviation and adding two. This is a common method in correlation analysis and here was employed to weight all indices equally irrespective of the scale of measurement at which they were collected. However, this could prove to be problematic, not because of the scale effect, which will merely alter the estimate of  $q$  in the assessment method, but because of the standardization to the scale of the variability, so that a linear decline in abundance by 10% is indistinguishable from linear decline in the abundance by 90%. Clearly the two are not the same if we are talking about the decline in a population.

A part of the assessment and projections was run using the transformed indices in the original assessment report. At the SARC meeting this part was rerun using an untransformed index and in this case it made very little difference and certainly had no impact on the management advice. Future assessments should ensure the use of either raw indices or means standardized indices.

**3. Evaluate the ADAPT VPA catch at age modeling methods and the estimates of  $F$ ,  $Z$ , spawning stock biomass, and total abundance of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty and potential bias of those estimates. Review the severity of retrospective pattern.**

ADAPT VPA estimates, including retrospectives were presented to the panel's satisfaction of the completion of the TOR. The panel agreed with the interpretation that the ADAPT VPA model was unsatisfactory for estimating recent trends in  $F$  and SSB because of the unrealistically high values of  $F$  in the recent period and the retrospective



**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

bias indicated by the model. More detailed presentation and analysis of the diagnostics would have helped the panel considerably in identifying the sources of the conflict in the data, but these were not available during the review.

Using a different vector of  $M$  over the time period, derived from the accepted index based approach could not cure the retrospective bias in the ADAPT VPA model, not withstanding the fact that this would have introduced some circularity into the analysis, because the index was also used in the ADAPT VPA. At least part of the reason for this was that the  $Z$ 's developed from the index model produced  $n$ -weighted mortalities, not compatible with the age-based mortalities used in the ADAPT VPA approach.

**4. Evaluate the index-based methods and the estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, and time-varying natural mortality of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty of those estimates. Determine whether these techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

The technical committee produced a large number of analyses to test for evidence of changes in natural mortality and / or production of the stock on the basis of predation, competition and environment. The quality of the analysis and the multitude of the approaches employed fully satisfied the requirements of this TOR. The production approaches all indicated a change in production in recent years and convinced the panel that a model allowing for some change in  $M$  was necessary to explain the observed stock trends compared to models varying in  $F$  only. Although, based on very different assumptions all the models indicated productivity had decreased in a very similar pattern over time.

No conclusion could be reached as to which of these models provided the most realistic interpretation of the stock development, but the panel agreed that this not particularly important to the single species management of the stock and decided to base its management advice on the index based approach as it dealt with time varying natural mortality without attributing causality which could lead to spurious future projections dependent on the covariates used in the assessment. This is in line with the views expressed by the technical committee.

The new methodology should be thought of as an interim measure only, as it does not currently allow for a number of important management diagnostics (reference points,  $F$ -at-age vectors, recruitment), and more importantly is increasingly susceptible to variability and bias due to changes in the stock dynamics and survey CPUE. In addition, any error in the catch matrix in the converged part of the VPA 82-85 will be compounded in all future assessments should the methodology be applied over longer time periods.

**5. Evaluate testing of fishing and additional trophic and environmental covariates and modeling of hypotheses using biomass dynamic models featuring multiple indices blended into a single index with and without a Steele-Henderson (Type III) predator-prey extension. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological**

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

**reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

The TOR was completed to the satisfaction of the panel. Although the analysis was conducted in isolation the topics and conclusions and the TOR's themselves largely overlapped with TOR 4-7 so that the panel felt it necessary to treat these as a single TOR to avoid substantial repetition. The panel conclusions are given under TOR 4.

**6. Evaluate AIC-based hypothesis testing of fishing and additional predation-competition effects using multi-index biomass dynamic models with and without prey-based, predator-based, or ratio dependent predator-prey extensions. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

The TOR was completed to the satisfaction of the panel. Although the analysis was conducted in isolation the topics and conclusions and the TOR's themselves largely overlapped with TOR 4-7 so that the panel felt it necessary to treat these as a single TOR to avoid substantial repetition. The panel conclusions are given under TOR 4.

**7. Review evidence for constant or recent systematic changes in natural mortality, productivity, and/or unreported removals.**

The TOR was completed to the satisfaction of the panel. Although the analysis was conducted in isolation the topics and conclusions and the TOR's themselves largely overlapped with TOR 4-7 so that the panel felt it necessary to treat these as a single TOR to avoid substantial repetition. The panel conclusions are given under TOR 4.

**8. Estimate biological reference points using equilibrium and non-equilibrium assumptions and evaluate stock status relative to these BRPs.**

The technical committee provided a plethora of possible biomass and F reference points based on a variety of the analyses conducted for this assessment and as such satisfied the requirements of the TOR. However the panel in discussion and to a large part in agreement with the technical committee felt that equilibrium reference points as requested in the terms of reference were inappropriate for a stock under non equilibrium conditions with unknown trajectories of time-variant M.

F reference points are particularly meaningless in this scenario and the technical committee's suggestion of the use of  $Z_{MSY}$  was found to be lacking any sensible conceptual underpinning. However, the panel recognized that there was a need for managers to have some reference points in order to assess the degree of depletion in this

## **FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

stock. An interim threshold and target biomass reference points should be considered as SSB 20% and SSB 50% under  $M=0.25$ . The rationale is that  $M=0.25$  represents the lowest observed natural mortality and that population growth under such conditions rapidly rebuilds the stock buffering SSB sufficiently to allow the stock to pass through periods of more unfavorable conditions.

Recent levels of  $M$  seem to have stabilized around levels of 0.75, which should allow the calculation of new  $F$  reference points should this pattern be maintained. At this higher level productivity in the stock will be very low, and the risk to the stock would presumably be much more severe than that usually associated with a  $B_{MSY}$  level. This further underlines the difficulty in attempting to manage stocks by equilibrium reference points under time varying conditions.

### **9. Review stock projections and impacts on the stock under different assumptions of fishing and natural mortality.**

The TOR could not be addressed adequately given the accepted assessment methodology chosen by the panel. Nevertheless, a number of projections were provided by the technical committee, which although not wholly satisfactory with regards to the precise estimates of stock and yield trends clearly showed that irrespective of the assumptions as to the cause of the change in mortality, the stock was unlikely to recover to levels where a significant yield could be sustainably removed in the near future, unless natural mortality reverted to the lower levels previously observed in the stock.

### **10. Make research recommendations for improving data collection and assessment.**

The technical committee made good progress on most of the previous research recommendations. Much of this work concentrated on demonstration of time variant mortality, and a wide variety of suggestions why this might be occurring. Having produced some convincing evidence that there are few other explanations for the poor state of the stock and some plausible causes for the increase in mortality, the committee needs now to focus on obtaining more certain estimates of the mortality rate and assuming it continues to fluctuate, some means of predicting likely changes and consequential impacts on the stock. Much of the evidence about cause of the change in  $M$  was based on correlations, which can lead to spurious conclusions when the data contain substantial trends. The committee is encouraged to consider the use of time series approaches (e.g. differencing the data series, ARIMA models) when exploring the causes of the change.

One approach is to develop a maximum likelihood-based approach in an age-based assessment, able to take account of the uncertainty in recent  $M$ 's compared to the magnitude of historic  $M$ 's. In addition this would allow for a more comprehensive inclusion of the uncertainty of various data sources in the catch matrix, commercial vs recreational, retained vs discarded (avoiding the current problem of determining discard ratios for the whole time series), and contributions of different survey tuning information.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

Further important information to any assessment can come from tagging information. This may give an independent estimate of total mortality, as well as provide important information regarding stock structure. The technical committee indicated that they have started to tag weakfish again.

The technical committee should continue to pursue the development of more flexible, forward projecting, statistical catch-at-age models. Even if this does not result in a satisfactory assessment methodology it will allow the technical committee to better understand the conflicts of the data.

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009****5 Bibliography of SAW Materials**

<b>Working paper</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Authors</b>
A-1	Assessment of Golden tilefish	Southern Demersal Working Group
Appendix 1	An overview of the tilefish data collected through the NEFSC Study Fleet Project	Palmer, Ball, Anderson, Conboy, Moser
Appendix 2	Evaluating shifts in size and age at maturity of Golden tilefish from the Mid-Atlantic Bight	Vidal
Appendix 3	Model Output	Nitschke
A-2	Golden tilefish Assessment Summary Report	Nitschke
A-3	Assessment of Golden tilefish (2005)	Southern Demersal Working Group
A-4	Golden tilefish Assessment Summary Report for 2005	
A-5	SARC 41 Chair's Report to the CIE (2005)	Jones
B-1	Stock Assessment for Ocean quahogs	Invertebrate Subcommittee
B-1a	Ocean quahog Appendix Report	Invertebrate Subcommittee
Appendix 1	Invertebrate Working Group	
Appendix 2	Ocean quahog resources in Maine waters	
Appendix 3	Clam dredge performanc	
Appendix 4	2008 Cooperative Industry Surfclam/Ocean quahog survey	
Appendix 5	Maps of clam survey catches 1980-2008	
Appendix 6	KLAMZ assessment model details	
Appendix 7	West Coast Harvest Policy	
Appendix 8	Updated shell length/meat weight	
B-2	Assessment Summary Report for Ocean quahogs	
B-3	SARC 44 Assessment Report (2005)	Invertebrate Subcommittee
B-4	2006 Ocean quahog Assessment Summary Report	
B-5	SARC 44 Summary Report for CIE (2006)	Jones
B-6	F35% Revisited 10 Years Later	Clark

**FINAL REPORT 6/29/2009**

<b>Working paper</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Authors</b>
C-1	Weakfish Stock Assessment Report	ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee
C1a (App C1-C5) C-1	Weakfish Tech. Committees response to Data Poor Meeting comments	ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee
Appendix C-2	Proportional Stock Density Indices for Weakfish	
Appendix C-3	SAS-based application of the Harvest Control Model to conduct Weakfish stock projections	
Appendix C-4	Index Standardization	
Appendix C-5	Preferred Run ADAPT Output	
C-2	Weakfish Assessment Summary Report	
C-3	2004 Assessment	
	2006 Assessment	
	Estimating Discards	
	Population Structure	
C-4	Report by the Peer Review Panel for the Northeast Data Poor Stocks Working Group	Miller

**Weakfish**

# **WEAKFISH STOCK ASSESSMENT REPORT**

A Report of the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee

Presented to the 48<sup>th</sup> Stock Assessment Workshop  
Stock Assessment Review Committee  
Woods Hole, MA

SAW/SARC 48  
June 1-4 2009

## **C1.0 Contributors**

### ***Principal Authors***

Jeffrey Brust, New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife, *Stock Assessment Subcommittee Chair*

Dr. Vic Crecco, Connecticut Bureau of Marine Fisheries

Jim Uphoff, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Lee Paramore, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

Dr. Des Kahn, Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife

Dr. Yan Jiao, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Russ Allen, New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife, *Technical Committee Chair*

Nichola Meserve, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, *Species Coordinator*

### ***Additional reviewers***

Greg Skomal, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries

Brian Murphy, Rhode Island Division of Fish and Wildlife

Christina Grahn, New York Department of Environmental Conservation

Ellen Cosby, Potomac River Fishery Commission

Dr. James Kirkley, Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Joe Cimino, Virginia Marine Resources Commission

Dr. Charlie Wenner, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources

Erin Levesque, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources

Eric Robillard, Georgia Department of Natural Resources

Joseph Munyandorero, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Dr. Doug Vaughan, Southeast Fishery Science Center

Wilson Laney, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Patrick Campfield, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission



## C2.0 Terms of Reference for Weakfish

1. Evaluate biases, precision, uncertainty, and sampling methodology of the commercial and recreational catch (including landings and discards) and effort.
2. Evaluate precision, geographical coverage, representation of stock structure, and relative accuracy of the fisheries independent and dependent indices of abundance. Review preliminary work on standardization of abundance indices.
3. Evaluate the ADAPT VPA catch at age modeling methods and the estimates of  $F$ ,  $Z$ , spawning stock biomass, and total abundance of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty and potential bias of those estimates. Review the severity of retrospective pattern.
4. Evaluate the index based methods and the estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, and time-varying natural mortality of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty of those estimates. Determine whether these techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
5. Evaluate testing of fishing and additional trophic and environmental covariates and modeling of hypotheses using biomass dynamic models featuring multiple indices blended into a single index with and without a Steele-Henderson (Type III) predator-prey extension. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant  $M$  and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
6. Evaluate AIC-based hypotheses testing of fishing and additional predation-competition effects using multi-index biomass dynamic models with and without prey-based, predator-based, or ratio dependent predator-prey extensions. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of  $F$ , ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant  $M$  and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.
7. Review evidence for constant or recent systematic changes in natural mortality, productivity, and/or unreported removals.
8. Estimate biological reference points using equilibrium and non-equilibrium assumptions and evaluate stock status relative to these BRPs.
9. Review stock projections and impacts on the stock under different assumptions of fishing and natural mortality.
10. Make research recommendations for improving data collection and assessment.

### **C3.0 Executive Summary**

#### **C3.1 Major findings for TOR 1 –Evaluate biases, precision, uncertainty, and sampling methodology of the commercial and recreational catch (including landings and discards) and effort.**

Weakfish fishery data were evaluated from four fishery sectors: commercial harvest, commercial discards, recreational harvest, and recreational discards. Commercial harvest data were obtained from state and federal harvest reporting systems. Commercial discards were estimated following the method of de Silva (2004) for key gear-species combinations found to be associated with relatively high rates of weakfish discards. A 100% discard mortality rate was assumed. Recreational harvest and discards were obtained from the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Harvest numbers and weight are directly available; discard numbers were estimated as the number of weakfish released alive times a discard mortality rate of 10% which is based on quantitative studies.

Harvest and discard estimates were stratified by region (north/south), year, and season (early = January to June and late = July to December). Commercial harvest was further stratified by state and gear. Where available, stratum specific biological data (length data and length-weight equations) were used to convert harvest and discard weights to number of weakfish removals at size. Where stratum specific data were not available (some commercial harvest strata), samples were substituted from the next most representative stratum. Numbers at size was then converted to numbers at age using region/year/season specific age-length keys. Numbers at age were summed across strata within a year to develop annual estimates of total weakfish catch at age.

Several sources of potential bias were identified that may result in uncertainty in annual catch at age estimates. These include inaccurate harvest/discard estimates as a result of under/over reporting or inappropriate survey methods; insufficient sample size to characterize length distributions; substitution of data from alternate cells in the catch at size characterization and age-length keys; errors in aging techniques or the scale-otolith age conversion; and others. Several of these sources are generic and not specific to weakfish. Attempts have been made to quantify some of these error sources; however, the extent of uncertainty associated with each of these sources, and their cumulative effect, remains largely unknown. Improvements in data collection from commercial landings have been instituted since 2000 that have greatly increased coverage and reliability of data.

#### **C3.2 Major findings for TOR 2 – Evaluate precision, geographical coverage, representation of stock structure, and relative accuracy of the fisheries independent and dependent indices of abundance. Review preliminary work on standardization of abundance indices.**

Five fishery independent age structured surveys were evaluated for use in the stock assessment. Surveys were evaluated relative to criteria such as geographic coverage, ability to accurately track weakfish abundance, and survey precision, among other factors. Catch per unit effort indices of abundance from three age-structured fishery independent surveys, including the Delaware Bay and SEAMAP trawl surveys and the North Carolina gillnet survey, were found to be suitable for use in the assessment. The North Carolina gillnet survey began in 2001, and this is the first time it has been included as a tuning index for weakfish. The NEFSC fall trawl survey, which has been used as a tuning index in previous weakfish stock assessments, was found to be unsuitable for use because of high interannual variability in catches, limited ability to capture weakfish greater

than 34 cm, and instances of negative mortality in year class catch curves. Similarly, a CPUE index based on two fall cruises of the New Jersey ocean trawl survey was found to provide little information on weakfish stock abundance; however, an alternate index based on the proportion of “positive” (*i.e.* non-zero) tows from the August cruise was found to be a suitable indicator of abundance. Ten young of year fishery independent surveys were also evaluated, one of which (Massachusetts trawl survey) was eliminated from further analysis due to exceptionally large coefficients of variation. Two fishery dependent indices of abundance were also included in the assessment. One is based on total catch per trip in the Mid-Atlantic private boat recreational fishery and encompasses an age aggregate index for ages 2+. The other is based on harvest per trip in the Mid-Atlantic private boat recreational fishery and is separated into age specific indices for ages 3, 4, 5, and 6+.

A team of researchers at Virginia Tech University has recently begun investigating the utility of standardizing weakfish abundance indices relative to spatial, temporal, and environmental factors using GLM and GAM methods. Although further evaluation of the methods and results is required by the Weakfish Technical Committee (WTC), preliminary results of the standardization analyses are presented in this report.

### **C3.3 Major findings for TOR 3 – Evaluate the ADAPT VPA catch at age modeling methods and the estimates of F, Z, spawning stock biomass, and total abundance of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty and potential bias of those estimates. Review the severity of retrospective bias.**

Age structured modeling was conducted using ADAPT VPA. Various runs were conducted using different sets of tuning indices. The different runs were evaluated with respect to model fit, residuals, and retrospective patterns. All runs produced consistent estimates of parameter values for the years 1982 to 2002. Trends in estimated parameters for the years 2003 to 2007 varied widely, and were confounded by a prominent retrospective pattern. Fishing mortality was generally underestimated, while biomass and abundance parameters were over estimated. Model runs that included fishery dependent indices had smaller retrospective bias and better model fit (lower mean squared residual (MSR)) than runs tuned solely with fishery independent indices. Runs that included young of year indices had extended retrospective patterns but inconsistent effect on MSR. The run tuned solely with fishery dependent indices produced the best fit and minimal retrospective pattern; but inclusion of fishery independent indices from New Jersey, Delaware, and North Carolina did not substantially increase the retrospective pattern and produced the second lowest MSR of all runs investigated. This run was therefore selected as the preferred run. These indices correspond well with changes in harvest, abundance, CPUE, and population age structure. Terminal year estimates were estimated as  $F_{2007} = 0.51$  (unweighted, ages 4-5) and  $SSB_{2007} = 7,236$  MT, although these were poorly estimated given the observed retrospective pattern. Attempts to correct for retrospective pattern were conducted but were not specifically endorsed by the WTC. Because ADAPT VPA calculates fishing mortality as  $F = Z - M$ , estimates of F are dependent on input values of natural mortality. The WTC has expressed concern regarding the assumption of constant natural mortality of  $M = 0.25$  across all ages and years. To circumvent the concerns regarding input M, the WTC prefers to combine model estimated F rates and input M values to portray the trend in total mortality, Z. Following record low levels in the mid 1990s, total mortality increased dramatically and exceeded  $Z = 2.6$  in 2003. Z has declined in recent years to  $Z_{2007} = 0.76$ , but values in recent years are likely underestimated given the observed retrospective pattern.

**C3.4 Major findings of TOR 4 – Evaluate the index based methods and the estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, and time-varying natural mortality of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty of those estimates. Determine whether these techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

Because of systematic retrospective bias exhibited in recent F and stock biomass (mt) estimates from the catch-at-age (ADAPT) model, the 2006 Weakfish Assessment (Kahn et al 2006, Uphoff 2006a; Crecco 2006) relied primarily on an index-based (ages 1+) approach to monitor temporal changes in weakfish biomass (mt) and fishing mortality (F) from 1981 to 2003. Given that the index-based approach produced F and weakfish stock biomass (mt) estimates that displayed a similar trend to that from the converged portion (1982-1999) of the 2006 VPA, F and biomass estimates were updated with this approach through 2008 using an annual blended index based on the recreational private boat cpue, as well as on the New Jersey and Delaware trawl indices. The index-based approach was also used to estimate the magnitude and trend in ages 1+ weakfish surplus production from 1981 to 2008.

Biomass weighted fishing mortality (FWt) estimates on ages 1+ weakfish from the index-based approach were high (FWt range: 0.69- 1.16) by most standards from 1981 to 1987. The magnitude of FWt estimates, however, rose even higher to beyond 1.0 from 1988 to 1991, and greatly exceeded our current overfishing threshold for weakfish ( $F_{msy} = 0.53$ ). The magnitude of FWt estimates declined steadily thereafter to below 0.60 in most years from 2000 to 2008. The ages 1+ fishing mortality rates weighted by number (FNt) were almost always lower in magnitude than the corresponding biomass weighted fishing rates. The ages 1+ numbers weighted (FNt) estimates from 1981 to 2008 followed a similar trend over time as the biomass weighted FWt estimates, but unlike the biomass weighted fishing rates (FWt), the FNt estimates fell abruptly after 1991 and remained below 0.30 from 1993 to 2008.

Weakfish ages 1+ biomass levels from the index-based approach exhibited wide contrast from 1981 to 2008. Weakfish ages 1+ biomass (mt) remained relatively high (14,200 and 41,500 mt) from 1981 to 1988 but biomass levels fell steadily to below 10,000 mt from 1989 to 1993. Weakfish coast-wide biomass rose again temporarily from 1994 to 1996, but biomass fell steadily thereafter to the lowest level in the time series in 2008 (1,333 mt). The time series of weakfish ages 1+ surplus production (SURPt) from 1981 to 2008 followed the same general trend as stock biomass. Weakfish surplus production remained relatively high from 1982 to 1986 and again in 1993 and 1994, but SURPt levels fell steadily after 1995 and remained very low in most years from 2001 to 2008 despite relatively low and stable fishing mortality. The unexpected drop in weakfish surplus production after 1999 coincided with a sharp rise in the coast-wide abundance of two potential predators: striped bass and spiny dogfish.

**C3.5 Major findings of TOR 5 – Evaluate testing of fishing and additional trophic and environmental covariates and modeling of hypotheses using biomass dynamic models featuring multiple indices blended into a single index with and without a Steele-Henderson (Type III) predator-prey extension. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and**

**whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

Since the index-based approach produced 1982-1998 ages 1+ F and weakfish stock biomass estimates that were similar to those over the converged portion (1982-1998) of the 2006 VPA, this approach was used to update ages 1+ F and stock biomass through 2008 using the recreational private boat cpue, as well as New Jersey and Delaware trawl indices. In addition, ages 1+ surplus production estimates were derived from 1981 to 2008 from which steady-state overfishing ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) thresholds were derived for Atlantic coast weakfish. Third, the age aggregated (ages 1+) Steele and Henderson (1984) (S-H) production model was updated through 2008 to further examine the joint effects of fishing and predation from striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) and spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*). The results from the S-H model were also used to estimate equilibrium and non-equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds. Fourth, to provide a more thorough examination of the Predation Hypothesis, additional candidate predators such as bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) and summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*) were also considered as candidate predators on weakfish, especially since both finfish predators have risen sharply inshore along the Atlantic coast after 1998. Finally, environmental disturbances have been proposed as a major process governing shifts in finfish production and recruitment (Hollowed et al 2000b), so environmental factors such as decadal shifts in mean sea surface water temperature and deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation Index were also examined as potential explanatory variables.

The preponderance of statistical evidence given here supports the Predation Hypothesis involving enhanced predation by striped bass and spiny dogfish as the primary factor behind the recent and unexpected decline in weakfish productivity. Statistical evidence in support of the Predation Hypothesis consists of a significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) inverse correlation between declining weakfish biomass and surplus production from 1999 to 2008 and striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance from 1982 to 2004. Striped bass abundance along the Atlantic coast rose 10 fold from 1994 to 2006 (Kahn 2005), although the 2008 striped bass abundance estimate fell by over 40% since 2006. Similarly, spiny dogfish abundance has increased 10 fold since 1999 and has remained high thereafter. During this recent period (1999-2008) of declining weakfish productivity, fishing mortality (FW) and discard mortality ( $F_{disc}$ ) rates remained low and relatively stable, indicating that the recent drop in weakfish productivity did not coincide with rising exploitation. The strong positive correlation (Pearson  $r = 0.91$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) between the recent rise in weakfish juvenile mortality ( $Z_0$ ) and rising striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance further suggests that the recent emergence of a weakfish recruitment bottleneck at age 0 was largely due to enhanced predation by these two finfish predators. By contrast, discard mortality rates on small ( $< \text{age } 2$ ) weakfish remained low and stable after 1999 during which juvenile mortality ( $Z_0$ ) rose steadily. Third, the residual patterns in all Logistics and Gompertz model runs that included only fishing effects (landings) produced inordinately low overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ), poor precision around the estimates, and the residuals exhibited a pronounced serial correlation over time, clearly indicating model misspecification. However, when the predation term ( $T_{pred}$ ), reflecting the joint predation by striped bass and spiny dogfish, was added to the models, the fit of the models to weakfish surplus production and biomass dramatically improved, the precision and magnitude of  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  rose to more plausible levels ( $F_{msy} > 0.45$ ), and, most importantly, the direction of the residuals over time shifted to a more random pattern and were therefore free of model misspecification.

When the equilibrium overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy} = 0.72$ ,  $B_{msy} = 17,009 \text{ mt}$ ) from the S-H model are considered, ages 1+ biomass weighted fishing mortality (FW) on weakfish exceeded the

estimated Fmsy threshold of 0.72 in most years from 1981 to 1992. Weakfish coast-wide biomass (mt) exceeded the biomass threshold ( $B_{msy} = 17,009$  mt) in 1981 and 1982, but biomass fell quickly below  $B_{msy}$  thereafter. When more stringent management regulations were enacted after 1991, fishing mortality (FW) fell by 50 to 70% and biomass began to rise toward the  $B_{msy}$  threshold. However, weakfish biomass fell unexpectedly after 1999 to the lowest level in the time series in 2007 despite the fact that fishing mortality rates remained below Fmsy in most years from 1998 to 2008 (exception: 2002).

Although most of the statistical and empirical evidence given here and elsewhere (see TOR #6 this assessment) supports the Predation Hypothesis, other factors such as unreported commercial and recreational landings, disease, toxins and parasitism cannot be ruled out at this time to explain the annual production loss of between 3,000 and 5,000 mt of weakfish. There is no evidence thus far that would link recent increases in disease, toxins and parasitism to the recent failure of weakfish. There has been a recent rise in sea surface water temperatures along the Atlantic coast (Oviatt 2004), but these analyses indicated that water temperature shifts were not significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) linked to recent increases in weakfish juvenile mortality (Z0), nor in the decline in weakfish surplus production and stock biomass. It is possible that an enormous upsurge in unreported weakfish landings and commercial and recreational discards took place between 1996 and 2008 to account for the estimated 3,000 to 4,000 mt annual loss of weakfish surplus production, but a recent upsurge in unreported landings seems unlikely for several reasons. First, if the sources of this rapid upsurge in unreported weakfish landings and discards are thus far unknown, it would be nearly impossible to remove this source of mortality without closing virtually all inshore fishing activity between North Carolina and Rhode Island. Second, if a recent rise in unreported landings and discards resulted in the recent weakfish stock collapse, we would expect that other finfish stocks with a similar temporal and spatial distribution as weakfish (i. e. Atlantic croaker and summer flounder) to be likewise depleted. But Atlantic croaker and summer flounder stocks have either grown or have remained relatively stable from 1998 to 2008. Third, if a recent rise in weakfish unreported landings caused the recent weakfish stock collapse, all of the statistical and empirical evidence presented elsewhere in this assessment on enhanced predation would have to be regarded as a mere coincidence. Finally, unreported landings in the order of 3,000 to 4,000 mt annually are equivalent to about 5 times the current (2007-2008) known landings and estimated discards used in this weakfish assessment. The possibility that such an astronomical rise in unreported landings and discards took place after 1998 and then remain unnoticed by port agents, enforcement and management agencies seems remote. The management implications associated with a rise in predatory mortality on weakfish are also discussed.

**C3.6 Major findings of TOR 6 – Evaluate AIC-based hypothesis testing of fishing and additional predation-competition effects using multi-index biomass dynamic models with and without prey-based, predator-based, or ratio dependent predator-prey extensions. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice.**

The most reliable estimates of trends or values of F from the previous weakfish *Cynoscion regalis* assessment indicated it had been modest since at least 1995, while weakfish abundance and

surplus production declined to low levels, most likely due to increased natural mortality. Hypotheses featuring fishing, environmental conditions, forage abundance, competition, and predation were examined and two strong covariates emerged: Atlantic menhaden *Brevoortia tyrannus* (forage) abundance and predation-competition from striped bass *Morone saxatilis*.

In this 1981-2006 assessment of weakfish, biomass dynamics models were used to test multiple hypotheses about fishing alone or fishing plus interactions with striped bass (alone or influenced by Atlantic menhaden) as the cause of the recent failure of weakfish recovery. Spatial, temporal, and diet overlaps were sufficient for interactions. Logistic and Gompertz production functions were considered and six models were developed for each function. These models considered fishing alone and fishing in combination with five predator-competitor functions; three models considered prey-based Type I, II, and III functional responses, while two explicitly mimicked depensatory mortality by considering additional natural mortality solely as a function of striped bass biomass or as a function of striped bass biomass and the ratio of Atlantic menhaden to striped bass biomass.

We used three exploitable biomass indices (EBI; indices of weakfish 250 mm or greater) to evaluate biomass dynamics during 1981-2006: mid-Atlantic private/rental boat catch per trip (WRI; as biomass and estimated from MRFSS), DE (1990-2006), and NJ (1989-2006) trawl survey EBIs. Biomass dynamic models used total weight of aggregated harvest (NMFS estimates) and discards by both the commercial and recreational fisheries. The Weakfish Technical Committee (WTC) considered all estimated commercial discards to have died and updated ratio-based estimates of commercial discards using the general method of De Silva (2004), but used all years combined rather than annual estimates (latter were variable and imprecise). Discard sampling was not conducted until 1994 and market-related discard ratios estimated for 1994-2002 were used to estimate weakfish discards in prior years. Estimates after 1993 used total discard ratios (market + regulatory). Recreational discard losses were estimated as MRFSS number discarded\*mean weight\*mortality. The MRFSS does not estimate weight of released weakfish and discard mean weight (0.15 kg) estimated from MRFSS 2004-2007 headboat surveys was substituted for harvest mean weight used in the previous assessment. Weakfish hook-and-release experiments produced dichotomous mean mortality estimates ( $\approx 3\%$  or  $15\%$ ) and  $10\%$  release mortality was adopted by the WTC.

We used Akaike information criteria adjusted for small sample size,  $AIC_c$ , to evaluate the 12 hypotheses.  $AIC_c$  indicated a 98% chance that the Gompertz production model with a depensatory function relating  $D_t$  (weakfish biomass lost to striped bass predation-competition) to the biomass of age 2+ striped bass and the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass was best (Gompertz Depensatory Ratio model or GDR) given the data. This model explained 90% of the variation in EBI. Fishing only models were poor choices for describing biomass dynamics of the data, ranking seventh and ninth out of twelve.

Annual (year  $t$ ) estimates of  $F_t$  and  $M_{pt}$  (instantaneous natural mortality rate due to striped bass predation-competition) were combined to estimate  $Z_{pt}$  (total mortality excluding residual  $M$ ). Loss of weakfish biomass per unit of striped bass biomass ( $D_t / P_t$ ) was estimated. Biomass estimates ( $B_t$ ) provided a basis for estimating surplus production and production that accounted for losses due to striped bass predation and competition.

Equilibrium biological reference points (EBRPs) were estimated ( $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$ ) and two approaches were used to estimate predator-competitor reference points (NBRPs) for mortality when predation-competition losses were included: total mortality at maximum sustained yield ( $Z_{msy}$ ) and non-equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  (or  $F_{psyt} = F_{msy} - M_{pt}$ ). The former simply involved renaming equilibrium

estimates of  $F_{msy}$  as  $Z_{msy}$  in models with predator-prey terms and comparing it to  $Z_{pt}$ . Although biomass dynamic models do not provide SSB thresholds explicitly, the early maturity of weakfish allowed  $B_t / K$  to serve as a proxy for MSP to compare to the target and threshold. Amendment 4 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish (ASMFC 2002) lists SSB that is 20% of an unfished stock as a maximum spawning potential (MSP) threshold and 30% as a target.

BRPs were  $F_{msy}$  or  $Z_{msy} = 0.48$  and  $B_{msy} = 18,941$  mt based on  $r = 0.48$ ,  $K = 51,521$  mt. Jackknifing and bootstrapping indicated all parameters were precisely estimated and parameter values of the base run were very close to their medians, indicating minimal bias. Several approaches were used to investigate sensitivity of model parameters and estimates of  $Z_t$ ,  $F_t$ , and  $B_t$ . Estimates of  $B_t$  were standardized to  $K$  ( $B_t / K$ ) and estimates of  $Z_t$  and  $F_t$  were standardized to  $Z_{msy}$  in sensitivity analyses. Sensitivity of model parameters to data from the beginning or ending of the time-series was tested by removing blocks of data and rerunning the model. Biomass estimated in 1981 for the 1981-2006 time-series was greater than  $K$  and we ran a version of this model with  $B_{1981}$  constrained to be less than  $K$  for comparison. Sensitivity to different assumed recreational discard mean weights was tested as well because of their importance in estimating WRI.

Overall, differences in  $B_t / K$ ,  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$ , and  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  stabilized by 1983 among all initial time-block removal treatments. Biomass dynamics of weakfish were portrayed similarly. We chose to keep the results of the unconstrained GDR (all years), but removed 1981 and 1982 estimates from consideration. Removing up to three years from the end of the time-series or changing mean weight of recreational discards had little impact.

Biomass dynamic modeling indicated weakfish biomass in 2006-2007 was depleted well below its threshold, the stock was not overfished based on equilibrium  $F_{msy}$ , but was subject to high natural mortality that eroded the safe level of fishing. The proxy for MSP (2007 MSP = 6%) was far below the 20% threshold in Amendment 4, while high negative values of  $F_{psyt}$  (non-equilibrium  $F_{msy}$ ) and surplus production indicated that complete (and unlikely) elimination of harvest and bycatch would not be sufficient to end the decline. Production persisted at a modest level in recent years, although it was falling gradually. Depensatory mortality, driven by high striped bass biomass and a low ratio of Atlantic menhaden to striped bass (an indicator of low feeding success on striped bass' main prey), appeared the most likely explanation for increasing natural mortality that undermined recovery given the data, hypotheses, and models developed. The GDR indicated that as menhaden have become less abundant and striped bass more-so, striped bass searching has led to increasing encounters with vulnerable-sized weakfish (up to 400 mm) searching for smaller prey-fish (anchovies and age 0 menhaden) that are also found in diets of the largest striped bass. High natural mortality of weakfish in recent years was derived from very low loss per striped bass applied over a large striped bass biomass and was independent of weakfish biomass over the years modeled. Fishing played a secondary role in recent biomass dynamics. Striped bass predation-competition dominated weakfish biomass dynamics after overharvesting had been controlled in the early 1990s. Predation-competition from striped bass has increasingly eroded weakfish surplus production and  $F_{msy}$  reference points and there seems little chance of restoring weakfish by manipulating its fisheries alone because  $F$  has become a low fraction of total mortality (20% by 2006). At this time, leverage for manipulating weakfish may mostly reside in the menhaden to bass ratio; however, it can be difficult to predict the effects of fishing or culling policies from fairly simple representations of predation processes.

Additional regression analyses reinforced the high potential for striped bass, menhaden, and weakfish linkage. Predicted mean weight of weakfish at 340 mm had undergone a significant decline during 1992-2006, and was negatively related to striped bass biomass and positively related



to the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass. This would be consistent with the expected effects of intense competition. Estimates of  $D_t/P_t$  were strongly related to field-based estimates of feeding success of striped bass in coastal VA and NC during winter. During 1959-2006, weakfish commercial harvest and the DE PSD Q+ length quality index closely followed the ratio of Atlantic menhaden to striped bass and correlations were strong ( $\rho \approx 0.82$ ). These associations indicated that this ratio was important in dynamics of weakfish beyond the period covered by the GDR.

Additional Gompertz biomass dynamic models mimicked various commercial bycatch scenarios (additional losses increasing as functions of time, a constant multiple of bycatch estimates, or constant additional weight) that imposed additional losses after 1995 to reflect regulatory discards. Best models of bycatch scenarios invoked about the same additional biomass loss as estimated by GDR. The failure of recovery since the late 1990s cannot be attributed to overfishing unless bycatch and under-reported catches were much greater than estimated, growing from about 3-4 times the estimates in 1996 to 15-20 times by 2006. If results of hypothetical bycatch scenarios are taken at face value, then weakfish regulations created this massive boost in discards and represent a colossal management failure. Implementation of further conservation measures short of a coast-wide moratorium on all Atlantic coast fisheries would not minimize this nominal discard problem. There is no evidence available thus far of an Atlantic coast fishery capable of generating additional unreported weakfish losses of this magnitude.

### **C3.7 Major findings of TOR 7 –Review evidence for constant or recent systematic changes in natural mortality, productivity, and/or unreported removals.**

During development of the 2006 weakfish stock assessment, the WTC noticed an unexpected decline in stock size at low levels of fishing mortality that had previously resulted in stock growth. Further investigation indicated that weakfish had been experiencing increased predation/competition that could be a major driving force in stock dynamics. This section presents updates on analyses investigating these multispecies hypotheses and evaluates additional sources of data that provide support for the theory that decreased production has contributed to recent stock declines.

One of the major concerns the WTC has expressed regarding the age structured modeling is the assumption of constant natural mortality across all ages and years. As an alternative, the WTC has investigated trends in relative fishing mortality which is not influenced by assumptions regarding  $M$ . Relative  $F$ , calculated as the ratio between annual harvest and an annual index of abundance, was rescaled to instantaneous rates using a scalar vector based on a short time series of  $F$  rates from the converged portion of the ADAPT VPA. Rescaled relative  $F$  follows a similar pattern to VPA estimated  $F$  from 1982 to 1998. Following 1998, however,  $F_{VPA}$  follows a nearly exponential increase while relative  $F$  remains stable at moderate levels. This discrepancy suggests that estimates of natural mortality in the ADAPT input are inaccurate.

In addition, biomass dynamic modeling was conducted to investigate possible environmental and ecosystem covariates that might be influencing weakfish stock dynamics. Two similar but independent analyses were pursued using simple (fishing only) and extended (fishing plus ecological covariates) production models. Production models incorporating only fishing effects provided poorer model fits and greater parameter uncertainty relative to the extended models. Of the extended models, the “predation” model indicated that weakfish natural mortality had increased during the last decade as the biomass of two predators (striped bass and spiny dogfish) had increased, while the “forage” model concluded that increased striped bass abundance in conjunction with a decline in their primary forage (menhaden) had resulted in increased weakfish mortality. In

both cases, the increased losses from predation/competition eroded weakfish productivity while fishing mortality remained relatively low.

Finally, the WTC investigated additional data sources that could indicate changes in weakfish productivity. Commercial landings, as a proxy for weakfish abundance, were correlated with the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, a time series of sea surface temperatures from the North Atlantic that exhibit a 65 to 70 year oscillation. Strong correlations between the two time series over more than 70 years suggest that weakfish abundance may be influenced by environmental parameters such as temperature. Qualitative analysis extends the association several more decades. Weakfish food habit data obtained from the NEFSC Food Habits Database showed a shift in prey items from forage fish and large invertebrates to smaller invertebrates and an increased incidence of empty stomachs during the 1990s. The incidence of empty stomachs is strongly correlated with total mortality estimated by ADAPT VPA. These data are consistent with shifts in weakfish diets observed during the same period in the Chesapeake Bay, and suggest that weakfish productivity may have been compromised during the 1990s as primary prey items were less available.

Taken as a whole, there are several pieces of evidence that suggest that weakfish productivity underwent a shift during the 1990s, either directly (*e.g.* predation) or indirectly (*e.g.* shift in environmental conditions).

### **C3.8 Major findings of TOR 8 – Estimate biological reference points using equilibrium and non-equilibrium assumptions and evaluate stock status relative to these BRPs.**

Weakfish are currently managed relative to reference points developed under Amendment 4 of the Weakfish Fishery Management Plan. Reference points were updated for this assessment using a spreadsheet based model using age-specific input values and length-weight-age relationships. Fishing mortality reference points were found by solving for F rates that provided spawning stock biomass of 30% (target) and 20% (threshold) relative to unfished stock. Assuming constant natural mortality of  $M = 0.25$  and partial recruitment equal to the average of the most recent three years estimated by ADAPT, new fishing mortality reference points were estimated as  $F_{\text{target}} = F_{30\%} = 0.28$  and  $F_{\text{threshold}} = F_{20\%} = 0.42$ , a decrease of 10% and 16% respectively relative to Amendment 4 reference points. Similarly threshold biomass declined nearly 10% to the new estimate of  $SSB_{20\%} = 10,179$  MT. Comparison of VPA based parameter estimates to these reference points indicates that weakfish are overfished and overfishing is occurring.

The WTC has expressed concern with a few aspects of the ADAPT VPA, including a prominent retrospective pattern in recent years and the use of a constant input natural mortality rate, both of which could affect reference point estimation. The retrospective pattern generally overestimates abundance for the last five years, resulting in underestimated partial recruitment. Using a partial recruitment vector from a more stable portion of the time series (1999 to 2001) decreased F reference points even further relative to Amendment 4. In addition, recent analyses indicate that natural mortality has increased substantially over the last decade to values approaching  $M = 1.0$  or higher. Reference points calculated using an input of  $M = 0.8$  and the more stable partial recruitment values provides estimates of a fishing mortality target of  $F_{30\%} = 0.78$ , and a fishing mortality threshold of  $F_{20\%} = 1.20$ . Under these assumptions,  $F_{2007}$  is below the target mortality rate, but is likely underestimated given the observed retrospective pattern.

In addition to the equilibrium reference points calculated based on ADAPT output, both of the biomass dynamic models investigated during this assessment produced estimates of equilibrium and

non-equilibrium MSY reference points. The full Steele-Henderson model with predation terms provided estimates of equilibrium  $F_{MSY} = 0.72$  and  $B_{MSY} = 17,009$  mt. The best fit model evaluated under the forage hypothesis resulted in equilibrium reference points of  $F_{MSY} = 0.48$ , and  $B_{MSY} = 18,941$  MT. Nonequilibrium reference points calculated by both models indicate that  $F_{MSY}$  has declined in recent years as predation/competition has eroded the amount of weakfish productivity “available” to fishing. Total biomass (as proxy for SSB) has declined to less than 10% of MSY thresholds in 2007 for both models.

### **C3.9 Major findings of TOR 9 – Review stock projections and impacts on the stock under different assumptions of fishing and natural mortality.**

Projections were conducted for each of the three main models investigated. Relative to output from the ADAPT VPA, biomass was projected for 25 years using the AgePro (version 3.1) module of the NFT Toolbox. Multiple runs were conducted assuming a range of fishing and natural mortality values assuming recruitment followed an empirical distribution of Age 1 numbers estimated through the full time series of the VPA. All projection runs resulted in increased biomass over time but reached different asymptotic values depending on assumptions regarding  $F$  and  $M$ . Under the assumption of constant  $M = 0.25$  and a harvest moratorium, SSB is projected to increase to more than 275,000 MT by the year 2032; however, increasing mortality to  $M = 0.75$  results in a biomass projection of 45,000 MT by 2013. Projections at given  $M$  values are lower if harvest is allowed.

For the predation hypothesis model, weakfish relative spawning stock biomass (TSSB) projections were made from 2010 to 2020 following the imposition of a simulated coast-wide moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) to harvest beginning in 2009. Given the uncertainty surrounding the current and future trend in natural mortality ( $M$ ) estimates, the following three scenarios that bracket a wide range of possibilities were examined with the weakfish Harvest Control Model (HCM) following a simulated 2009 moratorium to harvest: 1)  $M$  is fixed at 0.25 throughout the time series (1980-2020) as in ADAPT, there is no recent rise in trophic impacts on weakfish productivity, and recent (1999-2008) fishing mortality ( $F$ ) has remained high ( $F > 1.0$ ) as per ADAPT; 2) there is a moderate rise in  $M$  (from 0.25 to 0.65) from 1999 to 2020 due to predation but the magnitude of predatory mortality is less than predicted by the Steele-Henderson Model, and recent (1999-2008)  $F$  estimates have risen to moderate (0.7 to 1.0) levels; and 3)  $M$  on weakfish after 1997 has risen four-fold in magnitude (from 0.25 to 1.0) as per the Steele-Henderson Model, and fishing mortality ( $F$ ) rates have remained relatively low ( $F < 0.50$ ) from 1996 to 2008 as per the Index-based Analysis. In Scenario #1 under a relatively low and fixed natural mortality ( $M = 0.25$ ) throughout the time series (1980-2020), the HCM predicted that a moratorium to all weakfish harvest ( $F = 0$ ) enacted in 2009 and thereafter would lead to rapid TSSB recovery that would approach the  $B_{msy}$  threshold by 2020. In scenario #2 under the assumption of a moderate rise in  $M$  from 0.25 to 0.65 after 1997, the HCM predicted that a moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) enacted in 2009 would result in some measurable TSSB rebuilding by 2020, but the magnitude of stock growth would fall far short of the  $B_{msy}$  threshold. In scenario #3 under a pronounced rise in  $M$  from 0.25 to 1.0 ostensibly due to enhanced predation, the HCM predicted that a moratorium to harvest in 2009 and thereafter would result in little if any TSSB rebuilding by 2020.

For the forage hypothesis model, jackknife and bootstrap estimates of parameter estimates from the best fit model and biomass in 2007 were projected to evaluate the effect of fishing restriction scenarios through 2015. Three fishery management scenarios were portrayed: an

approximation of the minimum F reduction in Amendment 4 ( $F_{\text{recover}}$ ),  $F = 0.2$  (a literal interpretation of Amendment 4), and a moratorium.

Stock recovery was not possible under  $F_{\text{recover}}$  and  $F = 0.2$ , and there was about 1.4% chance of recovery under moratorium conditions for bootstrap runs and 0% chance for jackknife moratorium scenarios. It should be noted that estimates of F since 2003 have been at or below  $F_{\text{recover}}$ . Jackknifing and bootstrapping indicated greater than 90% chance that weakfish biomass would fall to zero by 2015 even under a moratorium if trophic conditions prevailing in 2006 continued. These projections are excessively grim and are considered a worst case scenario.

### **C3.10 Major findings of TOR 10 – Make research recommendations for improving data collection and assessment.**

The list of prioritized research recommendations presented in the 2008 Weakfish Fishery Management Plan Review was updated by the WTC. Several recommendations were identified as completed or under investigation, while several new recommendations were identified and added to the list.

#### **C4.0 Introduction**

This is the first update to the weakfish stock assessment since 2006 when the assessment was peer reviewed through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) External Peer Review process. The 2006 assessment updated the stock through the 2003 fishing season. The current assessment includes harvest data and survey indices through 2007.

#### **C4.1 Management Unit Definition**

Weakfish stocks on the U.S. Atlantic coast are managed through the ASMFC Interstate Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for Weakfish. Under this FMP, weakfish are managed as a single unit stock throughout their coastal range. Historically, all states from Massachusetts through Florida had a declared interest in the species. Currently, however, Massachusetts, Connecticut, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida maintain *de minimus* status, and are therefore exempt from certain regulatory and monitoring requirements.

#### **C4.2 Management History**

The following is a brief review of the history of weakfish fishery management through the ASMFC. Additional details are provided in the various amendments and addenda to the original Weakfish Fishery Management Plan, which are available online at [www.asmfc.org](http://www.asmfc.org).

The first fishery management plan for weakfish was implemented by ASMFC in 1985 to address stock declines, bycatch concerns, the lack of sufficient data for management, and interstate user conflicts (Mercer 1985). The management measures under the FMP were voluntary, and no state implemented the full set of management provisions outlined in the FMP.

Amendment 1, adopted in 1991, established a target fishing mortality rate of  $F_{20\%} = 0.34$  (Seagraves 1991). This target was to be achieved by a 52% reduction in directed harvest over the course of four years, as well as a 50% reduction in bycatch mortality in the penaeid shrimp fisheries by 1994. Although adoption of turtle excluder devices (TEDs) in the shrimp fishery led to bycatch reductions, none of the states with directed fisheries adopted the full complement of regulations recommended in the amendment.

Continued concern regarding the status of the weakfish stock was a major impetus for the development and passage of the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act (1993),

which made compliance with ASMFC fishery management plans mandatory for member states. Following the Act's passage, the ASMFC approved Amendment 2 to the Weakfish FMP for implementation in April 1995 (ASMFC 1994). The provisions of Amendment 2 were mandatory and included harvest control strategies such as a 12" (305 mm) total length (TL) minimum size, maintenance of existing minimum mesh sizes, and a 50% shrimp trawl bycatch reduction requirement by 1996. Fishing mortality would be reduced in a stepwise fashion, with a 25% reduction in weakfish fishing mortality in 1995 followed by a 25% reduction in exploitation in 1996.

Following implementation of Amendment 2, below average fishery catch rates and spawning stock biomass continued, along with a lack of older fish. In response, Amendment 3 was developed to reduce fishing mortality to  $F = 0.50$  by the year 2000, restore an expanded age structure, and restore fish to their full geographical range (ASMFC 1996). Commercial fisheries were regulated by a combination of season and area closures, mesh regulations to minimize harvest of fish less than 12" TL, and stricter requirements for bycatch reduction devices (BRDs). The minimum recreational requirements were a 12" TL minimum size limit and four fish possession limit. States were allowed to implement alternate size and bag limit regulations if they were conservationally equivalent to the minimum requirements. Bag limits were not required for minimum sizes of 16" TL or greater.

In 2000, a peer review of a stock assessment with data through 1998 indicated that weakfish biomass was high and fishing mortality rate was below the target of  $F = 0.50$ . Despite being ahead of schedule, it was recommended that low fishing mortality rates be continued to maintain an appropriate spawning biomass and promote expansion of stock size and age composition. Also as a result of the assessment, the WTC recognized several inconsistencies between management practices and stock dynamics. These could only be addressed through the development of a new FMP amendment. In the meantime, however, Addendum I to Amendment 3 was passed to maintain existing regulations until approval of the new amendment.

Weakfish stocks on the U.S. Atlantic coast are currently managed under Amendment 4 to the FMP (ASMFC 2002). Reference points established in Amendment 3 were too high to ensure sufficient spawning stock biomass, and the reference period used to develop recreational management measures represented an overexploited stock (insufficient abundance of older, larger individuals). In response to these concerns, Amendment 4, implemented in July 2003, established new fishing mortality and spawning stock biomass reference points, and adjusted the reference period to a period of greater stock health (1981 to 1985). Amendment 4 established new reference points: a fishing mortality target of  $F_{\text{target}} = F_{30\%} = 0.31$ ; a fishing mortality threshold of  $F_{\text{threshold}} = F_{20\%} = 0.5$ ; and a spawning stock biomass threshold of  $SSB_{\text{threshold}} = SSB_{20\%} = 14,428$  metric tons (MT; 31.8 million pounds). A fishing mortality rate greater than  $F = 0.5$  constitutes overfishing, and the stock is considered overfished if SSB is less than 14,428 MT. If it is determined that the weakfish stock is overfished, Amendment 4 requires ASMFC to implement measures to rebuild the population within six years (1½ generations).

Several addenda have been passed to improve management capabilities under Amendment 4. Addendum I was passed in December 2005 to modify biological sampling targets. Addendum III (May 2007) modified bycatch reduction requirements to maintain consistency with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Of greater significance was passage of Addendum II in February 2007. A stock assessment conducted in 2006 showed a significant turn of events from previous assessment results (see full discussion in Section C4.3, **Assessment History**). Model results indicated that weakfish stocks were at historic low levels, and that fishing mortality was a relatively minor component of total mortality. Projection analyses indicated that even with a full moratorium on harvest, stock rebuilding would occur slowly at best without a significant decrease in

other sources of mortality. To minimize overall mortality without unduly penalizing fishermen, and to prevent expansion of the fishery in the event the stock begins to rebuild, Addendum II required that all states: 1) maintain current minimum sizes, 2) implement a recreational six fish bag limit (except South Carolina which was in the process of implementing a 10 fish limit), and 3) impose a 150 pound commercial bycatch trip limit (except *de minimus* states). Addendum II also established landings-based triggers to re-evaluate these criteria.

### C4.3 Assessment History

Early stock assessment analyses for weakfish were conducted using a variety of virtual population models, such as the Murphy VPA (Vaughan et al 1991) and CAGEAN. The first peer reviewed assessment analyzed data through 1996 using Extended Survivor Analysis (XSA). The peer review was conducted in 1997 by the Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC) at the 26<sup>th</sup> Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (SAW; NEFSC 1998a). The SARC had concerns with the XSA model runs and requested updated runs as well as exploratory CAGEAN and ADAPT model runs. These were conducted during the SAW, but there was insufficient time to fully review the results. As such, the SARC did not endorse the point estimates of  $F$  and SSB. Regardless, all models used indicated that SSB was increasing rapidly and fishing mortality rates were decreasing rapidly. SSB had increased an average of 22.5% per year since 1991, while  $F$  had decreased an average of 21.4% per year since 1990 (NEFSC 1998a). The SARC concluded that continuation of low fishing mortality rates and good recruitment would allow for age expansion to a point comparable to that observed in the early 1980s.

The subsequent assessment, including data through 1998, was peer reviewed at the 30<sup>th</sup> SAW/SARC in 1999 (NEFSC 2000). The stock was assessed using the ADAPT VPA as recommended by the 26<sup>th</sup> SARC. Ages in recent years were taken from otoliths, which required a conversion of scale-based ages from earlier years to otolith-based ages. The approved VPA run included only indices from the core abundance area (New York to North Carolina). The model indicated that fishing mortality rates had declined to 0.21 in 1998, well below both  $F_{MAX} = 0.27$  and  $F_{MSY} = 0.6$ . In addition, SSB had increased to about 39,000 MT, approximately 55% of an unfished stock. The SARC did observe a noticeable retrospective pattern, which overestimated stock size and underestimated fishing mortality in the last few years. Regardless, the SARC concluded that results of the ADAPT VPA could be used to calculate biological reference points, and that figures illustrating the expanded size and age composition of weakfish would be useful for developing management advice.

A stock assessment update was conducted in 2002 (with data through 2000) using the SARC approved methodology (ADAPT VPA with tuning indices from the core area; Kahn 2002). The assessment showed that estimates of fishing mortality decreased further to  $F = 0.12$ , while SSB increased to over 50,000 MT. Although this assessment was not peer reviewed, the WTC expressed concern about a strong retrospective pattern that resulted in high levels of uncertainty in recent year estimates. The WTC recognized poor biological sampling of commercial catches, commercial discards, and recreational discards as a likely source of much of this error, especially when coupled with the assumption of error-free catch at age estimates used by ADAPT. Estimates of  $F$  and SSB were “corrected” by multiplying each parameter by the average amount each parameter changed in recent years with the addition of more data. Even so, the corrected estimate of  $F = 0.23$  was substantially below  $F_{Target} = 0.31$ , and corrected SSB = 35,000 MT was more than double SSB<sub>Threshold</sub> = 14,428 MT.

In 2003, the Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee (WSAS) began preparation for a

2004 peer review through the 40<sup>th</sup> SAW. Model results using the SARC approved methodology still exhibited a strong retrospective pattern, and results from both ADAPT VPA and biomass dynamic models indicated the stock was at very high levels (carrying capacity in the case of the biomass dynamic model; see Uphoff 2005c) with very low fishing mortality. The WTC was concerned that these results were not consistent with low catch rates and diminishing size structure being observed by commercial and recreational fishermen targeting weakfish.

For these reasons, the WSAS deemed the ADAPT VPA methodology as insufficient to characterize the weakfish resource and proceeded to investigate alternative assessment methods. Although the revised weakfish assessment was incomplete at the time of the 40<sup>th</sup> SAW, the SARC agreed to review the work and provide guidance on issues that were impeding the progress of the assessment (such as the inconsistency between survey indices and fishery-dependent indices of abundance and catch at age).

The SARC agreed with the WSAS that the results of the work in progress, although using the same approach as the SARC-approved assessment in 1999, were not suitable for management (*e.g.* Cook 2005). The SARC indicated that it felt the problem was conflicting data, and expressed skepticism about the reliability of some survey indices, especially the Northeast Fishery Science Center Fall Survey. Recommendations from the SARC proved to be useful, and some were incorporated into the stock assessment. The assessment was also expanded to include some alternative approaches previously explored by the WSAS in the 2002 update process (ASMFC 2006a, Part A).

The stock assessment was completed in February 2006 and submitted to ASMFC for evaluation through the ASMFC External Peer Review process. The Peer Review Panel consisted of four fisheries biologists with expertise in population dynamics and stock assessment methods. The Panel did not endorse the statements regarding weakfish stock status and identified several issues that required additional work or attention by the WTC before the report would be suitable for management purposes (ASMFC 2006a, Part B). In particular, the Panel had concerns regarding stock structure, age composition data, and fishery discards.

The Weakfish Management Board directed the WTC to address the issues identified by the Peer Review Panel. Specifically, the Management Board tasked the WTC to further investigate stock structure and discards; determine agreements and disagreements among the assessment report, the peer review panel report, and the 40<sup>th</sup> SARC report; and provide an account of the implementation of recommendations from the 40<sup>th</sup> SARC.

In August 2006, the WTC provided a response to these tasks (ASMFC 2006a, Part C). Based on these responses, the WTC's analyses, and significant evidence, the Management Board accepted the following five points for management use:

1. The stock is declining;
2. Total mortality is increasing;
3. There is little evidence of overfishing occurring;
4. Something other than fishing mortality is causing the stock decline, and;
5. There is a strong chance that regulating the fishery will not, in itself, reverse the stock decline.

In December 2008, the NEFSC held the 2008 Northeast Data Poor Stocks Workshop (DPSW) to evaluate reference points for stocks with limited data. Although weakfish is not considered a data poor stock, the current assessment was reviewed as a work in progress. The intent of the review was

not a formal evaluation of the work (*i.e.* not a “Pass/Fail” evaluation), but a cursory review of the general data, methods, and preliminary results to provide guidance on ways to improve the analysis.

The review panel expressed several concerns with the analysis, particularly with input data and lack of empirical data to support the species interaction hypotheses (Miller et al 2009). The WTC has reviewed the report and made appropriate modifications to the analyses for this final product. The weakfish portion of Miller et al (2009), along with the WTC’s responses is provided in Appendix C-1.

#### **C4.4 Life History**

Weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, are estuarine dependent members of the drum family (Sciaenidae). Commonly occurring from Massachusetts to Florida, weakfish are most common in the Mid-Atlantic region from North Carolina to New York (Wilk 1979). Common migration patterns for weakfish include spring spawning movement into estuaries and bays and reverse movements out of the estuaries in the fall either offshore and/or to more southern regions to overwinter (Bigelow and Schroeder 1953, Wilk 1979). The spawning season is protracted and begins in the spring taking place in coastal estuaries and bays. Weakfish mature early (age-1) and the maximum recorded age using otoliths is seventeen years.

##### *C4.4.1 Reproduction*

Weakfish spawn in the nearshore and estuarine areas of the coast. In North Carolina, the spawning season occurs from March to September and peaks from April to June (Merriner 1976). Spawning further north occurs later and is less protracted. In Chesapeake Bay, spawning has been documented to occur from May to August (Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1996). From Delaware Bay to New York spawning occurs from May to mid-July (Shepherd and Grimes 1984).

Early to mature, weakfish spawn multiple times in a season and have indeterminate fecundity (Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1996). Reproductive work in Chesapeake Bay during 1991 and 1992 found that 90% of age-1 weakfish were mature. Batch fecundity ranged from 75,289 to 517,845 eggs/female and significantly increased with both total length and somatic weight (Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1996). During 1999 and 2000, a study conducted in Delaware and Chesapeake Bays noted no increase in the size at maturity (168 mm) from that previously estimated despite a marked increase in the overall population size (Nye and Targett 2008). Similarly, most (97%) age-1 fish were mature. Both studies indicated that spawning frequency and batch fecundity vary by year and that these two variables act jointly to determine total egg production (Nye and Targett 2008). Nye and Targett (2008) also noted that despite maturing early, age-1 weakfish spawned less frequently, arrived later to the estuary and had lower batch fecundity than did older fish, likely resulting in an overly optimistic assumption about the contribution of age-1 fish to the overall reproductive success of the stock. This is currently amplified by the fact that larger, older fish comprise a small proportion of the overall population.

##### *C4.4.2 Feeding Habits*

Spatial and temporal variation in juvenile weakfish diet has been observed in studies conducted in Delaware Bay and Chesapeake Bay (Hartman and Brandt 1995, Greco and Targett 1996, R. Latour, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, pers.comm). In Delaware Bay, Greco and Targett (1996) found mysid shrimp to dominate the diet of juvenile weakfish collected in 1986, while the bay anchovy dominated the diet of juvenile weakfish collected in the Chesapeake Bay in the early 1990s. Latour et al. (*in review*) examined the diet of weakfish from the Chesapeake Bay



from 2002 to 2004 and found that mysid shrimp were an important component of the diet not only in juvenile weakfish but also for adults in contrast to earlier diet studies of Chesapeake Bay weakfish (Hartman and Brandt 1995).

Older weakfish typically have been shown to become increasingly piscivorous with age, with Atlantic menhaden or other clupeids comprising a significant portion of the diet of older weakfish (Merriner 1975, Hartman and Brandt 1995). Recently, Latour et al (*in review*) found mysids and bay anchovy to comprise a significant portion of the diet of all age weakfish in Chesapeake Bay, with Atlantic menhaden comprising only a small portion of the diet of age-5+ weakfish. Differences in the two studies were attributed to different sampling methods or temporal changes in the abundance of prey items between the time periods of the two studies. The low prevalence of other sciaenids, spot and croaker, in light of high commercial landings of those species was also noted (Latour et al. *in review*). Section C10.0 of this report examines changes in reported weakfish diet in detail.

#### C4.4.3 Age and Growth

Weakfish growth is rapid during the first year, and age-1 fish typically cover a wide range of sizes, a result of the protracted spawning season. After age-1, length becomes much less reliable as predictor of age due to an increasing overlap in lengths occurring over several age groups. Lowerre-Barbieri et al. (1995) found length at age to be similar between sexes with females attaining slightly greater length at age than males. Pooled across sexes, they reported observed TL's for weakfish collected in the spring (1989-1992) from Chesapeake Bay to be 176, 311, 412, 510, 558, and 631 mm for ages 1-6 respectively. Growth was described using the Von Bertalanffy growth model ( $r^2 = 0.98$ ;  $L_\infty = 919$ ;  $K = 0.19$ ;  $t_0 = -0.13$ ). The  $L_\infty$  reported for other regions were similar: 893 mm TL for Delaware Bay (Villoso 1990) and 917 mm FL for North Carolina (Hawkins 1988) with the exception of Shephard and Grimes (1983) which reported lower  $L_\infty$  estimates for Chesapeake Bay (686 mm TL) and North Carolina (400 mm TL). The historical maximum age recorded using otoliths is 17 years. The fish was collected from Delaware Bay in 1985. The maximum age used in previous assessments considers  $T_{max}$  to be 12 years (Kahn 2002). The world record weight for hook-and-line was recently captured on May 6, 2008 off of New York (8.67 kg). Weakfish have undergone large fluctuations in landings since the late 1800s, and there are reports from New England in the 1700s of decadal-scale abrupt shifts in abundance (Cushing 1982). Similar to landings, historic changes in the maximum size and age have been reported with weakfish typically obtaining their maximum size and age during periods of higher landings (Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1995). More recent growth rates have slowed to the point that mean lengths at age of adults are several centimeters shorter than they were in the early 1990s (Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1995, Kahn 2002). Weakfish weight at age plummeted in the 1990s by nearly half for 3-5 year-old weakfish.

#### C4.4.4 Natural Mortality

The 26<sup>th</sup> SARC recommended that  $M = 0.25$  be used in modeling constant natural mortality and this value was used in prior assessments on weakfish (NEFSC 2000, Kahn 2002, ASMFC 2006a, Part A). A recent review of indirect, life history based methods to estimate natural mortality was conducted for weakfish along the Atlantic coast. This review found age-independent  $M$  rates ranging from 0.25 to 0.68 using various methods (Munyanorero 2008). The majority of the estimates ranged from 0.25 to 0.38. Where applicable,  $T_{max}$  was set to age-12. Age-dependent estimates using the Lorenzen method resulted in  $M$  estimates ranging from 0.44 to 0.13\*year<sup>-1</sup> for age-1 to age-8 fish respectively.

The most recent age-structured VPA utilized data through 2003 and was run under the

assumption of constant  $M$  (0.25). Kahn et al. 2006). During the mid-1990's weakfish underwent a series of regulatory changes through Amendment 3 to the ASMFC weakfish FMP. After this period, the stock had an initial positive response including an increase in abundance, an expansion in the number of older fish in the population and an increase in the maximum observed age (up to age-12). Since that time, weakfish stocks have declined with landings currently at historic lows in both the recreational and commercial fisheries. These declines have occurred in spite of increased regulations to protect the fishery and no apparent increasing trend in either the effort of directed fisheries or the occurrence of discards. As a result, the WTC investigated possible causes for the recent decline in weakfish landings and age-structure. While the cause of the decline is not readily apparent, it does not appear that fishing mortality is not likely the primary culprit. Relative  $F$  estimates for the most recent years showed that fishing mortality had been low and stable from 1995 through 2003, in sharp contrast to the ADAPT estimates of a consistent increasing trend in  $F$  over that period. Consequently, the WTC does not support all results of the age-structured VPA under constant  $M$  assumptions, although the WTC does consider the VPA results with the reconstructed total mortality (based on adding the input  $M$  to the annual estimates of fishing mortality) to be reasonably accurate, along with the estimates of declining biomass through 2000. However, due to a retrospective bias extending back three years from the terminal estimate, the WTC regarded estimates for the last three years (2001-2003) as unstable and unreliable for management purposes. As a result of these analyses and conclusions, the WTC determined that the assumption of constant  $M$  was violated. Several investigations into possible systematic changes in  $M$  have been explored.

#### *C4.4.5 Stock Definitions*

The weakfish range extends along the Atlantic coast from Massachusetts to southern Florida, although strays are occasionally found as far as Nova Scotia, Canada and into the eastern Gulf of Mexico. Primary abundance occurs between New York and North Carolina. Within their range there is evidence of multiple stocks. Munyandorero (2006; see ASMFC 2006a, Part C) provides a concise but thorough overview of available information on weakfish stock structure. The following is an excerpt.

Investigations of weakfish population structure along the US Atlantic coast have been undertaken through tagging, meristic, morphological, life history, genetic and otolith chemistry. The conclusions reached are conflicting. While Crawford et al. (1988), Graves et al. (1992) and Cordes and Graves (2003) did not detect genetic differentiation within the weakfish population, Chapman et al. (unpublished report) found that weakfish are made up of a series of overlapping stocks, without complete panmixia. Non-genetic studies found evidence of existence of multiple weakfish sub-populations (e.g., Nesbit 1954; Shepherd & Grimes 1983, 1984; Scoles 1990) or important spatial structure of the weakfish population (Thorrold et al. 1998, 2001). Mark-recapture, meristic, morphological and life-history studies (e.g., review by Crawford et al. 1988) indicated that weakfish could be partitioned into sub-stocks...

Crawford et al. (1988) recommended that weakfish be managed as separate northern and southern stocks, while Graves et al. (1992) recommended management of a single unit stock. The WTC reviewed the available information and reached the following conclusions.

- Evidence of stock structure exists
- Data is inadequate to define stock structure, and there is enough potential mixing that pinpointing the location of a north/south split is not possible at this time
- If a north to mid-Atlantic subpopulation is in serious decline, this does not warrant a north-south split based on conservation concerns (ASMFC 2006a, Part C).

Based on those recommendations, the ASMFC Weakfish FMP continues to manage Atlantic coast weakfish as a single unit stock throughout their coastal range.

#### **C4.5 Habitat Description**

Weakfish are found in shallow marine and estuarine waters along the Atlantic coast. They can be found in salinities as low as 6 ppt (Dahlberg 1972) and temperatures ranging from 17° to 26.5° C (Merriner 1976).

Like many other North Atlantic species, weakfish exhibit a north-inshore/south-offshore migration pattern, although in the southern part of their range they are considered resident. Shepherd and Grimes (1983) observed that migrations occur in conjunction with movements of the 16-24° isotherms. Warming of coastal waters during springtime triggers a northward and inshore migration of adults from their wintering grounds in the Mid-Atlantic. The spring migration brings fish to nearshore coastal waters, coastal bays, and estuaries where spawning occurs.

Weakfish spawn in estuarine and nearshore habitats throughout their range. Principal spawning areas are from North Carolina to Montauk, NY, although spawning and presence of juveniles has been observed in the bays and inlets of Georgia and South Carolina (Lunz and Schwartz 1969, Mahood 1974, and Powles and Stender 1978, all as cited in Mercer 1985). Larval and juvenile weakfish generally inhabit estuarine rivers, bays, and sounds, but have been taken in freshwater (Thomas 1971) and as far as 70 km offshore (Berrien et al 1978). Mercer (1983) found that juveniles are most prevalent in shallow bays and navigation channels and are commonly associated with sand or sand/grass bottoms.

Weakfish form aggregations and move southward and offshore as temperatures decline in the fall. Important wintering grounds for the stock are located on the continental shelf from Chesapeake Bay to Cape Lookout, North Carolina (Merriner 1973, as cited in Mercer 1985).

#### **C4.6 Fishery description**

##### *C4.6.1 Overview of fisheries*

##### *C4.6.1.1 Commercial Fishery*

Records of commercial weakfish landings are available back to 1950 through the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) website. From 1950 through the 1960s commercial landings ranged from about 2,000 to 4,000 metric tons (MT) per year (Figure C4.6-1). Beginning in 1970, reported landings exhibited a dramatic increase to a record high of more than 16,000 MT in 1980. From 1982 to 1988, landings fluctuated between approximately 8,000 and 10,000 MT. Since 1989, landings have declined continuously, except for a brief increase to about 4,000 MT in the mid- to late-1990s. Estimated commercial harvest in 2007 is the lowest on record at approximately 388 MT.

The general pattern for the commercial fishery is that in the winter, most landings occur in North Carolina as that state's fishery targets the overwintering aggregation off the North Carolina

coast. This seasonal fishery has accounted for the largest proportion of the commercial landings on the Atlantic coast. In spring, weakfish migrate back to spawning areas, primarily estuaries in North Carolina and the Mid-Atlantic states. Fishing occurs on the migrating fish along the coast and then concentrates on estuaries for the remainder of spring and summer, from Pamlico Sound in North Carolina through Peconic bay on eastern Long Island, New York. In mid-summer, some larger fish arrive in southern New England, including Rhode Island and Connecticut. With fall, weakfish leave estuaries and begin their fall migration south to the overwintering grounds, and are targeted as they move down the coast.

Three states - New Jersey, Virginia, and North Carolina - have consistently accounted for 70 to 90% of the coastwide commercial harvest since 1950 (Table C4.6-1; Figure C4.6-2). North Carolina has predominated with nearly 37% of the coastwide harvest over the last ten years, while Virginia and New Jersey have averaged 25.6% and 17.0% respectively. During this same time period, New York has accounted for nearly 10% of coastwide harvest.

From the mid 1950s to the early 1980s landings from the trawl fishery generally accounted for 50 to 70% of commercial landings (Figure C4.6-3). Beginning in the early 1980s, harvest from trawlers began a gradual decline, and recently have accounted for approximately 20% of total harvest. Conversely, between 1979 and 1987, landings from gillnets increased from around 10% of annual harvest to 45% of annual harvest, and have remained relatively stable since that time. Over the entire time period, pound nets and haul seines have each averaged between 10 and 20% of total harvest annually, despite declining trends.

Discarding of weakfish by commercial fishermen is known to occur, and discard mortality is assumed to be 100%. The first quantitative analysis of weakfish discards is provided in de Silva (2004). Most discarding occurs in conjunction with two gears (trawls and gillnets) and a limited number of target species. Prior to 1994, discards are assumed to have occurred for non-regulatory reasons because few regulations were in place to limit the fishery. Since 1994, both regulatory and non-regulatory discarding has occurred. Regardless, population removals as a result of commercial discarding appear to be minor relative to harvest, even in recent years as harvest has decreased.

From 1982 to 1990, estimates of biomass of discarded weakfish generally declined from around 600 MT to 200 MT, where it remained stable for several years (Table C4.6-2). With the implementation of state specific regulations in 1993, and mandatory coastwide measures in 1995, estimated discards increased dramatically to near 1,000 MT in the mid 1990s. Except for the time series maximum of approximately 1,150 MT in 2001, discards decreased steadily from 1996 to 2004, and have remained stable around 200 MT since that time. From 1982 to 1999, age 1 fish generally dominated the discards, with a few exceptions in the mid 1990s when age 0 fish outnumbered age 1 fish. Since 2000, however, discards of age 2 and 3 fish have exceeded those of age 1.

Changes in catch per unit effort (CPUE) over time can be indicative of changes in abundance/availability or a shift in target species. Where available, commercial weakfish CPUE was examined to evaluate trends in fishery performance over time. Data were evaluated for all trips where weakfish were harvested, as well as only trips that harvested more than 150 pounds (68 kg) of weakfish, in an attempt to include directed trips during an open season.

North Carolina has historically been the largest commercial harvester of weakfish, and CPUE data are available back to 1994. When all positive weakfish trips (only trips where weakfish were caught) are considered, all but two (flounder trawl and haul seine) of the eight fisheries exhibited a strong decline in CPUE (Figure C4.6-4). When only trips harvesting 150 or more pounds are considered, CPUE typically declines, though generally less severely than when trips with bycatch

allowances were included (Figure C4.6-4). In Virginia, commercial weakfish CPUE has fallen since the late 1990s, particularly since 2002 (Figure 4.6-5). Delaware gillnet fishery CPUE (positive trips) declined in the early 1990s, rebounded in the late 1990s, and has declined steadily since 2000 (Figure C4.6-6). Data are available from the Potomac River pound net fishery for 1976 to 1980 and 1988 to 2007 (Figure C4.6-7). Between 1976 and 1980, CPUE was high. By 1988, CPUE had dropped to less than one-third of peak levels, dropping below 20% of the 1980 peak between 1988 and 1993. CPUE rebounded to between 20 and 40% of the time series peak during 1994-2002 and then fell sharply (Figure C4.6-7).

Although there is some regional and temporal variability, commercial CPUE generally present a consistent pattern of recovery during the late 1990s and then a severe decline in the early 2000s. Commercial CPUE since the mid to late 1990s corresponds well with model estimates of population trends, fishery independent and fishery dependent abundance indices, and observed size and age structure. The WTC are not aware of any changes in regulations or fisherman behavior that would explain the recent decline in CPUE.

#### *C4.6.1.2 Recreational Fishery*

Recreational harvest statistics for the weakfish fishery are available on the NMFS Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS) website for the period 1981 to 2007 ([www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/](http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/)). From 1981 to 1988, the number of weakfish caught and the number harvested fluctuated without trend between 2 million and around 11 million fish; however, during this same time period, harvested weight generally declined from around 7,259 MT to 2,722 MT (Figure C4.6-8). Nearly 90% of all fish caught were retained during these years.

From 1989 to 1993, catch (numbers) and harvest (numbers and weight) remained relatively stable. Catch fluctuated between 1.6 and 2.2 million fish, while harvest ranged between 0.95 and 1.8 million fish and 499 to 998 MT. Percentage of total catch that was harvested during this period decreased from around 90% to less than 50%.

In 1994, weakfish catches increased and averaged around 6 million fish until 2000. Harvest numbers increased to a lesser extent and fluctuated between approximately 1.5 and 2.5 million fish. Harvest weight also increased to 1,814 MT during this period. By 2003, catches and harvest had declined to at or near time series minimum and have remained relatively stable. In 2007, total catch was 2.01 million fish, with a harvest of 0.58 million fish and 313 MT. Since 1994, harvest has accounted for approximately 20-40% of all fish caught.

Recreational harvest has been dominated by the five Mid-Atlantic states between New Jersey and North Carolina (Table C4.6-3; Figure C4.6-9). New Jersey dominated landings in most years, averaging 35% of coastwide harvest across the time series. Virginia consistently produced greater than 20% of coastwide landings from 1981 to 1992 but has since declined, averaging about 10% over the last five years. Since 1995, several states have each had periods of substantial landings, with Delaware contributing 20-30% of total harvest for 1995-1998, Maryland accounting for approximately 25% from 1999 to 2001, and North Carolina averaging 22.5% from 2003 to 2007.

Recreational discard mortality is assumed to be 10% of all discarded fish based on catch-and-release experiments with weakfish and the closely related spotted seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*; e.g. Murphy et al 1995, Malchoff and Heins 1997, Swihart et al 2000, Duffy 2002, Gearhart 2002). Weakfish hook-and-release experiments produced dichotomous mean mortality estimates, either near 3% or 15%, and 10% release mortality was adopted by the WTC. From 1981 to 1989, harvested weakfish averaged 89% of total catch (numbers). Even with high landings, discard losses during this period were lowest of the time series, with all but one year having fewer than 100,000

fish discarded coastwide (Figure C4.6-10). Between 1989 and 1995, harvest fell to 27% of catch, and discard losses increased to more than 400,000 in 1995. Harvest rebounded slightly to 41% of catch in 1997 and 1998, but dropped back to between 20-40% since 1999. Despite relatively stable release rates since 1995, discard losses have varied greatly due to large interannual fluctuations in catch. Discard losses peaked at approximately 500,000 fish in 1996 and 2000, but have since decreased along with catch. For the last five years, discard losses have ranged between 135,000 and 225,000 fish.

Throughout the time series, total removals have been dominated by commercial and recreational harvest (Figure C4.6-11). Removals were greatest during the early portion of the time series, averaging 13,500 MT between 1981 and 1988. Between 1989 and 1993, removals dropped off quickly to 4,000 MT. The next few years showed a slight rebound to a peak of 6,500 MT in 1998. Since then, removals have declined continuously to the time series minimum of only 852 MT in 2007. Combined commercial and recreational discard losses were generally less than 5% of total removals prior to 1993. Discarding increased rapidly following implementation of management measures. Regardless, discard losses have averaged less than 20% of total removals since 1994.

#### **C4.7 Current status**

Throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, weakfish stocks experienced unsustainably high fishing mortality rates, which led to a decline in abundance into the 1990s. Fishing mortality rates declined during the early 1990s, and an increase in biomass was evident during the mid to late 1990s. The 2006 stock assessment indicates that fishing mortality has remained low under Amendment 4, yet weakfish biomass had dropped back to near historic low levels by 2003. Available evidence indicates that factors other than fishing mortality were the primary cause for biomass decline (ASMFC 2006a, Part A). A peer review of the stock assessment did not endorse the statements regarding weakfish stock status and identified several issues that required additional work or attention by the WTC before they would support its use for management purposes (ASMFC 2006a, part B). In particular, the review panel had concerns regarding stock structure, age composition data, and fishery discards. In August 2006, the WTC responded to the peer review panel's concerns (ASMFC 2006a, Part C). Based on these responses, the Technical Committee's analyses, and significant evidence, the Weakfish Management Board accepted the following five points for management use:

1. The stock is declining;
2. Total mortality is increasing;
3. There is little evidence of overfishing occurring;
4. Something other than fishing mortality is causing the stock decline, and;
5. There is a strong chance that regulating the fishery will not, in itself, reverse the stock decline.

#### **C5.0 Evaluate biases, precision, uncertainty, and sampling methodology of the commercial and recreational catch (including landings and discards) and effort. (TOR #1)**

##### **C5.1 Commercial**

###### *C5.1.1 Landings*

Commercial landings data were taken from two sources. Where available, state-specific

harvest records collected through a mandatory reporting system were considered the most reliable source for landings. Unfortunately, not all states require mandatory reporting of weakfish harvest. In such cases, landings estimates were obtained from the NMFS commercial landings database, available through the NMFS Office of Science and Technology, Fisheries Statistics Division website (<http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/>). Although estimates are available from NMFS, it is not mandatory to report weakfish harvest to NMFS, so these records (like those of most species) may be incomplete. Discrepancies between NMFS reported harvest and state reported harvest under mandatory reporting suggest that NMFS harvest estimates for weakfish are a potential source of uncertainty. In an attempt to quantify the uncertainty between the two reporting systems, state reported landings from Delaware and Virginia were compared to federally reported landings in these two states for the period 2004 to 2006. Combined across all gears, NMFS reported landings for a given year differed from state landings by less than 10% in all instances except Virginia in 2006, when the difference exceeded 23% (Figure C5.1-1). However, when evaluated at the gear level, more than one-third of all year/state/gear combinations differed by more than 20%, and in three cases exceeded 100% (Figure C5.1-2). Generally speaking, then, annual estimates of weakfish harvest reported by state and federal agencies are relatively consistent when combined across all gears, but the allocation of landings by gear are less certain. Lack of state landings data and discrepancies between state and federal estimates are not confined to just weakfish, but are observed in most state managed species.

#### *C5.1.1.1 Biological samples*

Commercial biological samples include lengths, weights, and ages from state-specific port sampling programs. Commercial samples were combined with similar data from recreational and fishery independent sources to develop length-weight relationships and age-length keys (ALK) for use in the estimation of commercial catch at age.

#### *Lengths*

Commercial length data were used for two primary purposes: the development of length-weight equations and characterizing the distribution of commercial catches by length and age. Because a combination of both total length and fork length data were available, lengths were standardized to fork length measurements. A conversion factor was developed using data pooled across all sources in 2004 to 2006 that reported both total length and fork length. Total length (mm) was converted to fork length (mm) using the equation

$$FL = (TL + 5.8106) / 1.0437$$

Length-weight equations were developed as in the 2006 assessment (ASMFC 2006a, Part A). Length and weight data from all sources were pooled, and relationships were developed by region/year/season. Sample sizes and parameter estimates are presented in Table C5.1-1.

Characterization of fishery catch at size was conducted using similar procedures as the 2006 assessment (ASMFC 2006a, Part A), following methods described by Quinn and Deriso (1999). Commercial harvest estimates and length samples were stratified by region/year/season/state/gear. Landings not identified to specific gear were pooled at the region/year/season level and classified as "Other." In addition, fisheries (state-gear combination) with minimal landings (< 1% of region/year/season total) generally had insufficient sample size (see below) to characterize that fishery. These cells were also classified as "Other."

For northern region cells with significant landings ( $\geq 1\%$  of region/year/season total) and sufficient sample size, harvest weight was converted to harvest number at size using predicted weight at length (from region/year/season specific length-weight equations) and observed length frequency distributions. Mean weight at length was estimated using the appropriate length-weight equation. Sample weight at length (average weight at length multiplied by number of samples at length) was then divided by total sample weight (weight at length summed across lengths) to determine weight distribution by size. These proportions were then multiplied by total harvest weight for that state/gear/season to determine harvest weight at length. Harvest weight at length was then converted to number at length by dividing weight by average weight at length.

For cells with significant harvest and insufficient sample size, the same methods were employed using length data borrowed from an appropriate substitution cell with sufficient sample size. Finally, the “Other” category was split into harvest from states with a 12” minimum size and states with a 16” minimum size. For each region/year/season/minimum size category, all available samples greater than the minimum size from the respective states were used to convert “Other” harvest weight to harvest number at size.

For the southern region, characterization of the fisheries was done slightly differently. Commercial sampling in North Carolina includes collection of both lengths and weights, so it was possible to develop an average fish weight by gear and season for each fishery. The average weight was divided into the harvest weight to estimate number harvested. The number harvested was then partitioned to catch at size using the length frequency distribution of the samples. Florida, the only other southern region state with commercial landings, collects no biological samples. Biological sample data from North Carolina were used as proxy information for Florida landings.

Results of the fishery specific catch at size analyses were combined across states and gears within a region to develop estimates of commercial harvest number at size by region/year/season.

Uncertainty in estimated harvest number at size could be introduced from two primary sources: 1) sample size of fish used to characterize a fishery, and 2) substitution of data from alternate strata for fisheries with insufficient sample size. These are discussed in more detail below.

Sample size and ratio of samples per metric ton of landings were used to evaluate adequacy of sampling intensity (Table C5.1-3). It was determined that a minimum sample of 30 lengths per stratum (region/year/season/state/gear) was required to adequately characterize a fishery. The minimum of 30 samples is much lower than sample sizes suggested in the literature for characterizing a population (Miranda 2007; Vokoun et al. 2001). Insufficient sampling would tend to introduce uncertainty into the catch at size estimates; however, these studies recommend sample sizes necessary to meet an objective (characterizing entire population) much different than the current analysis (characterizing harvest of specific gear). However, Miranda (2007) notes that distributions with a smaller size range require a smaller sample size. Considering minimum size limits and gear selectivity, the sample size required to characterize a fishery is likely lower than those to characterize an entire population. For example, Burns et al (1983) indicate that 100 fish per 200 MT of landings appears adequate to characterize many of the northeast U.S. groundfish stocks. ASMFC (2005) requires states to collect a minimum of 6 weakfish lengths per MT of landings, although not all states have been able to comply with this due to staff/funding constraints and difficulty obtaining samples. For this assessment, there are 141 cells (defined as region/year/season/state/gear combination with significant landings) that require expansion. All have more than 0.5 fish per MT (*i.e.* 100 fish per 200 MT), and only 13 (9.2%) have fewer than 6 fish per MT of landings. Sample size in the cells with less than 6/MT ranges from 30 to 419 fish. Also, 41 of the 141 cells have fewer than 30 samples and require substitution from alternate strata.



A higher minimum sample size requirement would increase the number of cells that require substitution, which could increase uncertainty in length and age distributions for those cells. Therefore, a sample size of 30 fish is considered an appropriate compromise between adequate lengths to fully characterize a fishery and the need to substitute data.

For strata with insufficient (< 30) length samples, data were usually substituted from the same region/year/season, but were sometimes substituted from another state and/or gear (Table C5.1-2). Care was taken to minimize differences in gear selectivity, and when necessary substituted data were truncated to account for differences in minimum size requirements between the two states.

Regardless, the WTC recognizes that substituted data are not always representative of the stratum to which they are applied, resulting in uncertainty in the length frequency distribution of the catch. Of greatest concern are the geographic differences in fish size, coupled with the general lack of samples north of Delaware. Minimum size limits and average size of harvested fish were much larger in the northern portions of the range. When commercial samples from these states were insufficient and data were substituted from more southern states, the effect was an underestimation of the proportion of large fish in the harvest. In 2006, New Jersey began collecting biological samples from their commercial fisheries. By estimating length and age distributions of New Jersey commercial harvest using New Jersey data and data substituted from other cells, Brust (2009) shows that data substitution resulted in fish ages 1 to 5 being overestimated in the coastwide CAA by less than 5%, but fish ages 6 and older were underestimated by up to 52%. The 6+ plus group as a whole was underestimated by 9.9% in 2006 and nearly 32% in 2007 (Brust 2009). Improved sampling in the northern region since 2005 will better characterize landings from this region, decreasing uncertainty in catch at size estimates.

### *Ages*

The principal use of age data is in the development of ALKs. Sample sizes of ages by year, season, and source are provided for recent years in Table C5.1-3. During the 1980s, ages were based on scale samples. During the 1990s, otoliths became the principal method for aging weakfish. For the 1998 stock assessment, scale-based ages in previous years were converted to otolith-based ages using a scale-otolith conversion matrix (similar to an ALK) based on direct comparison of approximately 2,300 samples (Daniel and Vaughan 1997; NEFSC 1998b). Uncertainty in either aging method, as well as in the scale-otolith conversion matrix would be propagated through the catch-at-age matrix.

Age-length data from all available sources (commercial, recreational, fishery independent) were pooled by region/year/season to develop stratum specific age-length keys (four keys per year) as described by Vaughan (2000). Length intervals with missing information in the keys were filled by either averaging age distribution for lengths above and below, substitution from another stratum, or interpolation. These filling procedures could lead to uncertainty in catch at age if the substituted age distributions are not representative of the cells into which they are substituted.

Once the age-length keys were complete, catch at size estimates by region/year/season were converted to catch at age using the appropriate age-length key. Catch at age estimates were pooled across regions and seasons to develop annual estimates of commercial catch at age.

### *C5.1.2 Discards*

Discard mortality of weakfish by commercial fisheries was assumed to be 100%. The first quantitative analysis of weakfish commercial discards was provided by de Silva (2004). Most discarding occurs in conjunction with two gears (trawls and gillnets) and a limited number of target

species. Several methods to estimate discards were investigated, including effort based estimates, regression analysis, and ratio extrapolation. Effort data were not available for all states and years to develop effort based estimates. Regression estimation was conducted, but the predictive models fit poorly ( $r^2 \sim 0.08$ ) and were considered inappropriate for use in the assessment. Ratio estimates work best when there is evidence of a positive linear relationship between the response and explanatory variable. Although there was no evidence of such a relationship in several of the gear-species combinations evaluated, it was determined that ratio extrapolation provided the most reliable estimates of discards from the methods investigated. With this method, discards were calculated using seasonal, annual, and multi-year (all years combined) ratios. It was determined that the multi-year estimates provided the most reliable estimates, and this method was selected as the final estimation methodology. Discards in the southern region (North Carolina to Florida) were considered insignificant, so commercial discards were only evaluated for the northern region. A full description of the methods is provided in de Silva (2004) and summarized below.

Data from the NEFSC observer database (1994 to present) were queried to obtain haul level estimates of weakfish discard weight and target species harvest weight for each gear/target species combination. Discard and harvest weight estimates were pooled across all years by gear and target species to develop gear/species specific weakfish discard ratios (calculated as summed weakfish discard weight divided by summed target species harvest weight for each gear and target species). The gear/species specific ratios were then applied to annual harvest estimates of that gear/species combination (from the NMFS commercial harvest website) to estimate total weakfish discard weight in that fishery. Weakfish discard length frequency data by gear (all species combined) were used to convert discard weight to discard numbers at size. Annual discard estimates by gear were partitioned into seasonal estimates by using the proportion of annual landings by season and gear from the NMFS landings database. Gear-species-season discards at size were summed across gears and species to determine total seasonal discards at size.

Prior to 1994, discards are assumed to have occurred for non-regulatory reasons only because few regulations were in place to limit the fishery. Unfortunately, observer data are not available prior to 1994. As such, data from 1994 forward were subset by regulatory and non-regulatory discards, and the method described above was used to develop discard ratios for non-regulatory discards only for 1994 forward. These ratios were applied to annual estimates of gear/target species harvest for 1981 to 1993 to estimate non-regulatory discards during this time period.

For the current assessment, commercial discard estimates were updated for 1994 forward in order to include additional years of data and significant updates to data used in the 2006 assessment.

Using the general method of de Silva (2004), haul level data for the same gear and target species combinations were used to evaluate annual, multiyear (5 and 7 year), and all-year (1994 to 2007) weakfish discard ratios. Because of concerns with high interannual variability and uncomfortably large standard errors with estimates based on short time groupings, the all-year ratio estimation method was selected. Ratio-based estimates of weakfish discard weight were made for butterfish, long-fin squid, summer flounder and weakfish for trawl gear, and Atlantic croaker, bluefish, spiny dogfish, and weakfish in the gillnet fishery. Discard weight was converted to numbers at size using observed and re-sampled length frequencies, then converted to discard number at age using the appropriate region/year/season age-length key described in section **C5.1.1 Landings**. Catch at age estimates were summed across regions and seasons to determine annual commercial discard catch at age.

There are several potential sources of uncertainty with the commercial discard estimates. Sample size of observed hauls with weakfish discards is low in many years for some gear-species

combinations (Table C5.1-4), and discard ratios vary greatly (see *e.g.* Table 13 in de Silva 2004). Combining data across years improves sample size but may mask temporal trends in discarding. In addition, in order to convert discard weight to number, biological data from discarded fish were pooled across species for a given gear type, and/or resampled from observed fish to attain a minimum sample size (30 fish). For both concerns, larger sample sizes would provide more reliable estimates of discard rates.

Another source of uncertainty is the gear-species combinations used. The initial analysis found 14 gear-species combinations with substantial weakfish discards (de Silva 2004). However, many of these species are often captured together. To minimize the potential for duplicate counting of discards when discard ratios were multiplied by total harvest of each of the gear-target species combinations, principal component analysis was conducted to identify species groupings. Discard ratios were then multiplied by harvest of only one of the species within a group. Selecting a different species from the group would result in different estimates of total discards.

During the NEFSC DPSW in December 2008, reviewers were concerned that the methods used to estimate discards could result in substantial uncertainty. However, the reviewers could not agree on the direction of the bias. At least one reviewer was concerned that discards were overestimated because multiplying a discard ratio for a given target species by total harvest of that species includes harvest when that species was not the target species (*i.e.* harvest estimates applied to ratios were overestimated). This was addressed to some degree by minimizing the number of gear-species combinations through PCA. On the other hand, a second reviewer was concerned that the number of gear-species combinations was too limited and may have missed historic fisheries with large weakfish discards. The WTC is aware of these potential sources of bias. Unfortunately, the methods used to estimate weakfish commercial discards are constrained in many ways by the amount of available data. The methodology has been used in other ASMFC assessments (*i.e.* Atlantic croaker) and is a more comprehensive analysis than most assessments attempt at quantifying discards.

## **C5.2 Recreational**

### *C5.2.1. Landings*

Recreational landings data were obtained from the NMFS Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS) database, which is available through the NMFS Office of Science and Technology, Fisheries Statistics Division website (<http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/>). MRFSS provides estimates for three subcategories of catch, including observed harvest (Type A), unobserved harvest (*e.g.* filleted before observation, discarded dead; Type B1) and discarded alive (Type B2). Estimates of harvest were developed for each region/year/season combination as a sum of observed and unobserved harvest (Type A + B1). Because sand seatrout and weakfish are indiscernible except through genetic analysis, MRFSS estimates in Florida are for the *Cynoscion* complex of weakfish, sand seatrout, and their hybrids. Estimates for true weakfish in Florida were found by multiplying MRFSS estimates by the proportion of true weakfish observed by Tringali et al. (2006) before combining with other southern region states.

Precision in recreational catch and harvest estimates are calculated as a percent standard error (PSE). Lower values indicate better precision than higher values, and most commonly caught species generally have PSEs less than 20% (NMFS 1999). As such, estimates with PSE values less than 20% are generally considered “acceptable” (NEFSC 1998b). Estimates of weakfish harvest were relatively precise (Table C5.2-1), with PSEs less than 15% for most years since 1982

(numbers) or 1983 (weight). Estimates of the number of weakfish discarded were less precise in the beginning of the time series, but PSEs have been below 20% for all but one year since 1986. However, a recent review of the survey identified several potential biases and inadequacies of the sampling and estimation methodologies (NRC 2006; see [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11616](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11616)). These include the inability to interview anglers at private access sites; the increasing use of household cell phones which are unavailable to the telephone sampling frame; reliance on unverified assumptions; and differences in statistical properties of data collected through different survey methods. The effects of these biases on estimates of recreational catch, harvest, and discards can not easily be quantified, leading to uncertainty in MRFSS recreational estimates. This uncertainty applies to all catch types over the entire time series, which has been collected using the same general methodology throughout.

#### *C5.2.1.1 Biological samples*

Biological samples collected by MRFSS include lengths and weights of a subsample of Type A fish. No ages are collected from the recreational fishery. Recreational length-weight data were combined with similar data from commercial and fishery independent sources to develop length-weight relationships (see section **C5.1 Commercial**). Length data were also used to partition harvest into harvest at size. Because of small sample sizes (Table C5.1-3), length observations were pooled by region/year/season to expand harvest estimates at the same level of stratification. Unlike commercial data, estimates of recreational harvest in numbers are directly available from the MRFSS website. Catch at size was estimated as the proportion measured at size by stratum multiplied by the estimated harvest (number A+B1 fish) for that stratum. Number at size was converted to number at age using the appropriate region/year/season age-length key described in section **C5.1.1 Landings**. The number of length samples collected by MRFSS is above the criterion of 100 lengths per 200 MT of landings (Burns et al 1983).

#### *C5.2.2 Discards*

Estimates of the number of recreational weakfish discards (Type B2 fish) were obtained from the MRFSS database. Estimates in Florida were corrected for weakfish-sand seatrout hybridization using ratios reported by Tringali et al. (2006). In previous assessments, discard mortality was assumed to equal 20% of all discards. However, based on a review of available data, the WTC has decreased the discard mortality to 10% (e.g. Murphy et al 1995, Malchoff and Heins 1997, Swihart et al 2000, Duffy 2002, Gearhart 2002).

Prior to 2004, discarded fish were not sampled. Since 2004, MRFSS has collected lengths of discarded fish from the for-hire sector (party and charter boats). As such, this is the first assessment for which recreational discard length frequencies are available. Observed length frequencies were applied to discard mortality estimates to estimate the number of dead discards at size. For the northern region, this was done by year and season. Due to low sample size, southern region samples were pooled across seasons to develop annual length frequencies. Number at size was converted to number at age using the appropriate region/year/season age-length key described in section C5.1.1 Landings.

### **C5.3 Catch at Age Matrix**

The catch-at-age matrix for 2004-2007 was developed using the same general procedures as previous assessments. Catch at size from the four major sources of removals (commercial harvest, commercial discards, recreational harvest, recreational discards) were converted to catch at age

using the appropriate region/year/season age-length key. Results were pooled across regions, seasons and sectors to estimate total annual removals at age (Table C5.3-1).

As described in each of the pertinent sections, there are several potential sources of uncertainty in the overall catch at age estimates. These include inaccurate harvest/discard estimates as a result of under/over reporting or inappropriate survey methods; insufficient sample size to characterize length distributions; substitution of data from alternate cells in the catch at size characterization and ALKs; errors in aging techniques or the scale-otolith age conversion; and others. Attempts have been made to quantify some of these error sources; however, the extent of uncertainty associated with each of these sources, and their cumulative effect, remains largely unknown. A persistent cumulative trend in either direction would result in inaccurate catch at age estimates and may influence assessment results. However, the sources of potential error and the methodologies used to develop the catch-at-age matrix in this assessment are similar to those used for other ASMFC species assessments that have passed peer review.

## **C6.0 Evaluate precision, geographical coverage, representation of stock structure, and relative accuracy of the fisheries independent and dependent indices of abundance. Review preliminary work on standardization of abundance indices. (TOR#2)**

### **C6.1 Aged fishery independent surveys**

#### *C6.1.1 NEFSC Bottom Trawl Survey*

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northeast Fishery Science Center (NEFSC) conducts seasonal trawl surveys between Nova Scotia and Cape Hatteras. Stratified random sampling is conducted using a #36 Yankee otter trawl equipped with roller gear and a 1.25 cm mesh codend liner. The survey covers a large portion of the geographic range of weakfish, including their “core” distribution area (NEFSC 2000) of New Jersey to North Carolina. Despite the extended latitudinal range, the survey is not capable of sampling in shallow waters, and few sites are conducted in waters less than 9 m. In addition, the survey does not sample the South Atlantic portion of the range.

Weakfish are infrequent in the winter, spring, and summer surveys, but are commonly intercepted in the fall during their offshore migration. Because weakfish are rarely caught in this survey north of New Jersey, the 30<sup>th</sup> SAW/SARC recommended developing an index of weakfish abundance using only strata from the south end of Long Island to Cape Hatteras during the fall survey. Indices at age are developed by applying annual survey specific length frequency data to the annual mean catch per tow and then applying either survey specific ALKs (when available) or the pooled northern region late season ALK (see section **C5.0**). Because this survey occurs in the fall, true ages are increased by one year to develop an index of abundance on January 1 of the year following the survey (*e.g.* fall 1997 age 0 fish are treated as January 1, 1998 age 1 fish).

The annual mean catch per tow appears nearly cyclical, with relative peaks in abundance generally every 4 to 6 years (Figure C6.1-1). From 1982 through the mid 1990s, mean catch per tow cycled without trend, generally ranging between 40 and 120 fish per tow. Beginning in the mid 1990s, abundance gradually increased to a time series maximum of approximately 500 fish per tow in 2004. During 2005 – 2007, abundance decreased to about 200 fish per tow, but increased in 2008 to over 300 fish per tow. Standard errors (SE) follow a similar pattern as CPUE, with an overall cyclical pattern and a gradual increase beginning in the mid 1990s. During the early portion of the time series, SE varied between approximately 10 and 50, increasing to a peak of 90 in 2004.

Coefficient of variation (CV; SE as a ratio of the mean) has varied without trend between approximately 10 and 40% since 1990.

The survey index is dominated by age 1 fish (age 0 fish progressed to age 1), although fish have been observed out to age 6 (Figure C6.1-1). Age distribution was greatest in the early 1980s, but was truncated to predominantly ages 1-3 by the early 1990s. Age distribution expanded somewhat during the late 1990s as the stock began rebuilding as a result of management measures, but has since declined to primarily ages 1-4.

The WTC evaluated many of the age aggregated survey indices and found the NEFSC weakfish index performed poorly compared to others (see section C10.0 of this report for a summary of the analyses). The timing of the survey, along with the highly contagious distribution of weakfish, leads to high variability between years and between tows within a year. Proportional stock density analysis indicates that the survey's ability to capture large weakfish, even when they are present, is poor. Using correlation analysis, it was found that the index was not well correlated with the other indices or the converged portion of the VPA, and was negatively correlated with harvest trends. Finally, catch curve analysis determined abundance of several year class increased over time (*i.e.* negative mortality; see Table 3 of ASMFC 2006a, Part A). Efforts to develop a more representative index of weakfish abundance (*e.g.* geometric mean, percent positive tows, etc.) were unsuccessful. Although the survey has several advantages, such as being the longest running and widest ranging fishery independent survey, the WTC concluded that the NEFSC fall survey is not suitable for use as an index of relative abundance in the assessment.

#### *C6.1.2 New Jersey Ocean Trawl Program*

New Jersey has conducted a stratified random trawl survey in nearshore ocean waters (to 27 meters depth) from Ambrose Channel (entrance to New York Harbor) to Cape Henlopen Channel (entrance to Delaware Bay) since 1988. The survey originated as bi-monthly cruises, but since 1991 has consisted of five cruises per year (January, April, June, August, and October). Strata are nearly identical to those used by NEFSC in this region (New Jersey's northern- and southern-most strata are truncated at New Jersey state boundaries). The gear used is a two-seam trawl with a 25 m headrope and 6.4 mm bar mesh codend liner. Due to funding constraints, several different vessels have been used to conduct the survey.

The geographic range of the survey is limited to nearshore ocean waters of the species distribution within the northern and southern borders of New Jersey. The survey occurs within the region sampled by the NEFSC trawl survey. The use of a smaller vessel, however, allows the New Jersey survey to provide better coverage in shallow waters.

The majority of weakfish are observed during the June, August and October cruises, although catches in June are inconsistent. During previous assessments, an index of weakfish abundance was developed using the August and October cruises. However, recent work has shown that the August-October index is a poor indicator of weakfish abundance (see section C10.0 of this report). As with the NEFSC index, tow-level and annual mean catch rates show great variability, abundance of some year classes was shown to increase over time based on year class catch curves, and CPUE is not well correlated with harvest, other weakfish indices, or the converged portion of the VPA. Unlike the NEFSC index, however, the New Jersey index is capable of capturing large weakfish when present. Efforts to develop a more suitable index found that the percent of tows during the August cruise that captured weakfish was coherent with other indicators of weakfish abundance. For the current assessment then, the New Jersey index is based on the proportion of positive tows (PPT) from the August cruise. The index was aged using a combination of survey specific proportion at age data for

1995 to 1997 and DNREC 30-foot trawl survey proportion at age data from August cruises (supplemented with July and September data as needed) in all other years.

PPT was greatest between 1994 and 1997, with two-thirds of all tows containing weakfish in three of those years (Figure C6.1-2). PPT dropped precipitously to 28% in 1998 and remained generally between 25 and 50% until 2002. In 2003, PPT again dropped precipitously to the time series low of just 10.3%. Since then, PPT has rebounded slightly, with 32 to 35% of tows containing weakfish in three of the last four years. Binomial confidence intervals (90%) indicate the upper and lower CI differ from the mean by approximately 7 to 16% in all years.

Indices at age document the occurrence of strong 1993 and 1996 year classes as they appear in 1994 and 1997 and move through the age structure (Figure C6.1-2). As these cohorts increase in age, the proportion of fish ages 4 to 6+ was increased and exceeded 40% in three years between 1997 and 2000. Since 2002, however, the survey has been dominated ( $\geq 73\%$ ) by age 1 and 2, with 4+ fish making up less than 5% of the annual catch.

Detailed investigation into the New Jersey Ocean Trawl Survey provides evidence that the percent of positive tows from the August cruise provides a reliable index of weakfish abundance. The WTC has therefore determined that the New Jersey trawl survey index is acceptable for use in the stock assessment.

### *C6.1.3 Delaware DFW Delaware Bay Trawl Survey*

The Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife has conducted a trawl survey within the Delaware Bay intermittently since 1966 (1966-1971, 1979-1984, and 1990 – present). The survey collects monthly samples (March through December) at nine fixed stations throughout the Delaware portion of the Bay. The net used has a 30.5 foot headrope and 2" stretch mesh codend. For the current assessment, only the 1981-1984 and 1990-present time series are evaluated. Weakfish abundance is calculated as an average number of age 1+ fish per nautical mile for June to October cruises, and the index is treated as a mid-year abundance (*i.e.* not progressed forward to January 1). Since 1991, length frequencies have been aged using survey specific age-length keys.

The geographic range of this survey is limited to the Delaware Bay, a very small portion of the weakfish stock range; however, Delaware Bay is known to be a major spawning ground for weakfish on the Atlantic coast (Nye et al 2008). As the survey occurs monthly for a large portion of the year, fish from a wide size and age distribution are available to the survey, from young of year to large older spawners.

Weakfish abundance was moderate in the early 1980s and early 1990s, ranging between approximately 15-30 fish/nm (Figure C6.1-3). Beginning in 1992, abundance increased sharply to a time series high of over 230 fish in 1996. Abundance decreased by more than half in 1997, and has exhibited a generally declining trend since that time. CV of the composite index showed relatively high variability from 1991 to 1995, ranging from 20 to 60%. Interannual variability in CV stabilized in 1995 and generally ranged from 19 to 26% until 2001. Since 2001, CV has shown a slight increase, estimated at 33% in 2006.

Age structure advanced from primarily age 1 and 2 fish in the early 1990s to include ages 7 and 8 in 1998-2000 (Figure C6.1-3). Abundance of age 4+ fish accounted for 30 to 35% of the total index in 1997 and 1998 as the large 1993 year class moved through. Abundance of older ages has since declined to levels observed in the early 1990s, with 4+ fish accounting for less than 1% of the total.

The Delaware 30-foot trawl survey occurs in one of the major weakfish spawning areas and has been shown to capture a wide size and age range of weakfish throughout the year. Trends in

abundance correspond well with anecdotal and observed information from commercial and recreational fisheries and are coherent with other indicators of weakfish abundance. The WTC has determined that the Delaware 30-foot trawl survey provides a reliable index of weakfish abundance.

#### *C6.1.4 SEAMAP Fall Survey*

The Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (SEAMAP) has conducted three seasonal trawl surveys since 1989 between Cape Hatteras, NC and Cape Canaveral, FL. A stratified random design is employed to sample inner (4.6 to 9.1 m) and outer (9.1 to 18.2 m) depth strata using twin 75-foot (22.9 m) highrise mongoose trawls towed behind a double rigged St. Augustine shrimp trawler. The geographic range of the survey encompasses nearshore ocean waters south of Cape Hatteras, and SEAMAP is the only fishery independent survey conducted in the southern portion of the weakfish range. Unfortunately, catches of weakfish south of North Carolina are extremely small and of little value as an index of abundance. An index of abundance is therefore generated using only strata off North Carolina during fall cruises. Catch is aged using survey specific length and age data (where available) or southern region late season ALKs, which are primarily North Carolina data. Fall aged fish are progressed one age to estimate January 1 abundance in the following year.

From 1990 to 2001, the survey ranged from approximately 5 to 30 fish per tow, with the exceptions of 1992 with an index of less than 1 fish per tow, and 1993 and 1994 with indices of approximately 44 and 52 fish per tow (Figure C6.1-4). From 2002 to 2004, the index increased to between 35 and 60 fish per tow, before jumping drastically to nearly 500 fish per tow in 2005. In 2006, the index dropped back down to 45 fish per tow. Removing 2005 as an outlier, the index has increased gradually throughout the time series. CV for the survey is relatively high, ranging from 24% in 1996 to 76% in 1997, with an average of nearly 48% over the time series.

Age structure is truncated in the survey catch-at-age matrix, and the survey is driven primarily by age 1 and age 2 fish (Figure C6.1-4). Barring the 2006 (lagged year) index value, strongest recruitment (age 1) events occurred in 1995 and 2003. The 2006 index is anomalously high, with an age 3 index greater than the age 1 index in most years. Age 4+ fish generally constitute less than 1% of the total catch, with a maximum of 11.2% in 1998 and 7.7% in 1999 as the strong 1995 recruits moved through.

The SEAMAP survey index is highly variable, with CV's greater than most other available weakfish indices. Regardless, this is the only offshore survey in the southern region of the weakfish range, and the WTC determined that it should be considered for inclusion in stock assessment analyses.

#### *C6.1.5 Pamlico Sound Independent Gillnet Study (PSIGNS)*

In May 2001, the NCDMF began a gillnet survey in Pamlico Sound to provide fishery independent relative abundance indices for key estuarine species. This is the first weakfish stock assessment for which a sufficient time series has been available from this survey.

The survey is conducted throughout the year, providing a mean index of abundance in the survey year (*i.e.* indices at age are not progressed to January 1). Sampling uses a stratified random design based on area and water depth. Twice per month a deep-water and shallow-water sample are collected from each of 8 areas using a gillnet consisting of eight 27.4 m segments of 7.6, 8.9, 10.2, 11.4, 12.7, 14.0, 15.2, and 16.5 cm (3.0" to 6.5" by half inch) stretched mesh gill net. Nets are typically deployed within an hour of sunset and retrieved the next morning, for approximate soak



times of 12 h. This sampling design results in a total of approximately 32 gill net samples (16 deep and 16 shallow samples) being collected per month across both the Rivers and Sound. Catch rates of target species are calculated annually and expressed as an overall CPUE along with corresponding length class distributions. The overall CPUE provides a relative index of abundance showing availability of each species to the study, while the length distribution and aged CPUE estimates show the size structure of each species for a given year. The overall CPUE was defined as the mean number captured per sample and was further expressed as the number at length per sample, with a sample being one array of nets fished for 12 hours. Due to disproportionate sizes among stratum and region, the final CPUE estimate was weighted. For weakfish, the CPUE at age was calculated for 6-month periods (Jan-Jun and Jul-Dec) in the same manner as was done for the harvest catch at age (see section **C5.1**).

Total CPUE showed a decline for the first few years of the survey, stabilized for a few years, and declined again in the last years (Figure C6.1-5). CPUE in 2007 was approximately one-third of the value in the first year of the survey. No estimates of precision were provided for this survey.

Age 1 fish are not fully recruited to the gear, and in most years it appears age 2 are also under represented as the index for age 3 fish is generally equal to or greater than the index for age 2 in the previous year (Figure C6.1-5). One prominent feature of this survey is the tracking of an apparent strong 1999 year class as it progresses through the first years of the survey.

Although the time series is short and no estimates of survey variability are available, the survey appears to adequately track abundance of weakfish across years. The WTC accepted the survey for use in the stock assessment.

## **C6.2 Young of year fishery independent surveys**

### *C6.2.1 Massachusetts DMF Trawl Survey*

The Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries conducts a stratified random trawl survey in six depth zones (0-9.1, 9.1-18.3, 18.3-27.4, 27.4-36.6, 36.6-54.9, and >54.9 m) and five geographic regions within the state. Sampling has been conducted twice per year (May and September) since 1978. Survey gear consists of a two-seam whiting trawl with a 11.9 m headrope and a 12.7 mm stretch mesh codend liner. Weakfish, primarily young of year, are most commonly observed during the fall survey in the three regions south of Cape Cod. Arithmetic mean catch per tow is used as an index of young of year abundance in the survey year.

The MA DMF trawl survey area encompasses nearshore ocean and estuarine areas within Massachusetts state boundaries. Like the New Jersey trawl survey, the survey area overlaps a portion of the NEFSC trawl survey area, but a smaller vessel allows more comprehensive sampling of shallow waters. Although large numbers of weakfish have been observed in Cape Cod Bay and Massachusetts Bay (Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002), these waters are generally considered the northern extent of the weakfish range.

Mean annual catch per tow is consistently under 2 fish, with only three exceptions since 1981 (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-1). Abundance generally declined from 1981 to 1984. In 1985, abundance increased more than 100-fold to the time series high of more than 15 fish per tow. Recruitment was again relatively high in 1986 (2.7 fish per tow), before dropping back to near zero levels for 1987 to 1994. Since 1994, abundance has shown a general upward trend, while at the same time exhibiting greater interannual variability. The second highest index value of 2.9 fish per tow occurred in 2006, before dropping back to just 0.2 fish per tow in 2007.

Standard errors were high and exhibited a similar trend as mean abundance. The CV was

generally greater than 60%, and exceeded 90% in eight years. Because of the low catch rates and high variability, the WTC has determined that this index provides little information on the abundance of weakfish. The survey was not used in the assessment.

### *C6.2.2 Rhode Island Trawl Survey*

The Rhode Island Division of Fish and Wildlife seasonal trawl survey was initiated in 1979 to monitor recreationally important finfish stocks in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Sound, and Block Island Sound. The survey employs a stratified random design and records aggregate weight by species, frequency, individual length measurements, and various physical data. In 1990, a monthly component was added to the survey, which includes 13 fixed stations in Narragansett Bay. Sampling is conducted using a two seam trawl net with a 12.2 m headrope and 6.4 mm codend liner. Calibration studies have been conducted to ensure continuity of the catch series when changes in vessel and gear were required. An index of weakfish abundance is calculated as the geometric mean number per tow.

CPUE was relatively high in 1981 and 1982, but dropped off in 1983 and remained below 2.5 fish per tow until 1995 (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-1). In 1996 and 1997, YOY abundance increased to more than 6 fish per tow, before dropping off to previous levels for 1998 to 2002. Since 2003, recruitment has shown great interannual variability, ranging from the time series high of 16.5 in 2003 to the second lowest value of 0.17 in 2006. CV of the log mean values are generally between 10 and 30%, with only two values (1995, 2006) exceeding 40%.

The RI survey occurs in a very small portion of the weakfish range and is outside the core area described by NEFSC (2000). However, several episodes of strong recruitment have been observed, and CV is moderate. For these reasons, the WTC has determined that the Rhode Island YOY survey is suitable for use in the assessment.

### *C6.2.3 Connecticut DEP Long Island Sound Trawl Survey*

Since 1984, the Connecticut DEP has conducted spring and fall trawl surveys in the Connecticut portion of Long Island Sound between the New York/Connecticut border in the west and New London, CT in the east. Survey effort consists of three spring cruises conducted during April, May and June, and three fall cruises during September/October. Stratified random sampling is employed based on four depth zones and three bottom types. Survey gear consists of a 14 x 9.1 m high-rise otter trawl with 5 mm codend mesh. The survey catches mostly YOY and age 1 weakfish as defined by examination of length frequencies. Indices of abundance for age 0 and age 1+ are developed as geometric mean catch per tow, but only the YOY index was considered for this assessment.

Sampling is limited to Long Island Sound. The Sound encompasses a very small portion of the weakfish range, but may serve as a primary nursery habitat in this region.

From 1984 to 1998, the YOY index varied without trend, and generally ranged from approximately 3 to 10 fish per tow, with relatively strong year classes (10-15 fish per tow) occurring in five years (Table C6.2-1; Figure C6.2-2). In 1999, recruitment increased sharply and has remained above 30 fish per tow in all years except 2005 and 2006. Time series highs of more than 63 fish per tow occurred in 2000 and 2007, while minimum catches of approximately 1 fish or less occurred in 1984, 1986, and 2006. CV of the YOY index has exhibited a generally negative trend over the time series.

NEFSC (2000) recommended that this survey not be used as an index of abundance because it occurs outside the core area of weakfish abundance. However, large recruitment events have been

observed in this area over the last ten years, suggesting it may provide prime nursery habitat. In addition, precision of the YOY catches is strong. For these reasons, the WTC concluded that the Long Island Sound YOY index was suitable for use in the assessment.

#### *C6.2.4 NYDEC Peconic Bay Juvenile Trawl Survey*

The New York Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources has conducted a juvenile trawl survey in the Peconic Bay estuary of Long Island since 1985. Weakfish was the primary target species when the survey was initiated, and Peconic Bay was selected for the survey area because of its importance as a weakfish spawning ground. Random sampling occurs weekly between May and October using a semi-balloon shrimp trawl with a 4.9 m headrope and 12.7 mm stretch mesh codend liner. The survey samples mainly young of year weakfish, and a YOY index has historically been calculated as a geometric mean catch per tow over all sampling months. In 2005 and 2006, technical difficulties constrained sampling to May – July (2005) and July – October (2006), so a revised index using only July and August has been calculated. The two indices (all months and July-August) show a similar increasing trend and are well correlated ( $r = 0.96$ ). The July-August index provides higher estimates of abundance and appears to be more variable between years, although CV is lower for the July-August index than for all months combined.

The July-August index ranges from less than one to more than 30 fish per tow (Table C6.2-1; Figure C6.2-3). Despite large interannual variations, there appears to be a gradual increase in recruitment over the time series. Strong year classes occurred in 1991, 1996, and 2005 (time series high). Standard error of the catch has increased over the time series as well; however, 95% confidence limits around the mean are moderate. The lower bound averages approximately 35% less than the mean value, while the average upper bound is approximately 50% larger than the mean.

Because this survey is conducted outside the apparent core area, NEFSC (2000) recommended that this survey not be used as an index of abundance. However, the survey was developed specifically to monitor trends in weakfish populations on an important spawning ground, and some strong year classes have been observed. Precision of the survey is acceptable. For these reasons, the WTC has used the Peconic Bay YOY survey in the assessment.

#### *C6.2.5 Delaware DFW Delaware Bay Juvenile Trawl Survey*

In addition to their 30-foot trawl survey, the Delaware DFW conducts a fixed station survey in Delaware Bay targeting juvenile finfish. Sampling is conducted monthly from April through October using a semi-balloon otter trawl. The net has a 5.2 m headrope and a 12.7 mm stretch mesh codend liner. Weakfish are a significant component of the catch, with the greatest majority of these weakfish (more than 99% in some years) being young of the year. A YOY index is calculated as the geometric mean number per tow during the June to October cruises.

As with the Delaware 30-foot trawl index, the survey is restricted to Delaware Bay. Although this encompasses only a small portion of the geographic range of weakfish, Delaware Bay is known to provide significant spawning and nursery habitat for the species.

Throughout this time series, recruitment indices have generally fallen between 5 and 15 fish per tow, with only 2 values below and three values above this range (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-3). Weak recruitment occurred in 1983 and 1988, with less than 5 fish per tow, while the two strongest recruitment events of 20.1 and 16.8 fish per tow occurred in 1991 and 2005, respectively. Average recruitment over the time series has been approximately 10.8 fish per tow. The index indicates three general stanzas in recruitment since 1981. From 1981 to 1990, recruitment was generally below the long term average. In 1991, recruitment increased to the time series high, beginning a decade of

above-average recruitment. In 2001, recruitment dropped below average and has remained there for five of the last seven years. Estimated means appear precise, with 95% confidence limits typically only 25% to 35% larger or smaller than the mean value.

The Delaware young of year survey occurs within the core area of weakfish abundance and encompasses a major spawning/nursery area for the species during months when weakfish are present. The survey has captured the occurrence of several strong year classes with good precision. The WTC has used this survey in the stock assessment.

#### *C6.2.6 Maryland DNR Chesapeake Bay and Coastal Bays Juvenile Trawl Surveys*

The Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts two juvenile trawl surveys: one in the lower eastern region of Maryland's portion of Chesapeake Bay from 1980 to the present, and one in the Atlantic coastal bays from 1972 to the present. Both surveys sample fixed stations using a 4.9 m semi-balloon otter trawl with a 12.7 mm stretch mesh codend liner. The coastal bays project samples monthly from April through October, while the Chesapeake survey runs monthly from May through October. Due to non-standardized survey methods during the early portions of both surveys, only data from 1989 onward are used to calculate YOY abundance indices. Indices are calculated as geometric mean catch per tow.

Both surveys are confined to Maryland state waters which constitute only a small portion of the weakfish range. Regardless, both survey areas are sheltered estuarine environments and may provide suitable spawning and nursery habitat for the species.

The Chesapeake index steadily increased from 0.4 fish per tow in 1989 to the time series high of 8.1 fish per tow in 2001 (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-4). The index has steadily declined to less than 2 fish per tow in 2007. The coastal bays index appears stable between 0.9 and 1.9 fish per tow during 1989-1994. In 1995, recruitment increased to 4.4 fish per tow and then decreased gradually to 2.6 in 2001. During the period 1989 to 2001, interannual variability was minor with few exceptions. Beginning in 2001, interannual variability increased dramatically. The weakest recruitment of the time series occurred in 2002, followed in 2003 by the time series high of 5.6 fish per tow. Coefficients of variation have ranged from 3-22% for the Chesapeake Bay survey and 4-15% for the coastal bays survey (except 30% in 2008).

Both surveys occur within the core region of weakfish abundance during months when weakfish would be present. Precision is uncertain, but the WTC has determined both are suitable for use in the assessment.

#### *C6.2.7 Virginia Institute of Marine Science Chesapeake Bay Trawl Survey*

The Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) has conducted a trawl survey in lower Chesapeake Bay since 1955. Over time there have been several changes to sampling strategy and survey area. Currently, sampling is conducted using a 9.1 m semi-balloon otter trawl with a 6.4 mm codend liner. Sampling occurs monthly throughout the year using stratified random sampling in the mainstem bay and fixed stations in tributaries. Young of year are identified through examination of length frequencies (monthly ranges), and an index of recruitment is computed as the geometric mean catch per tow during August to October from the three major tributaries.

The geographic region covered by the survey includes the Virginia portion of the Chesapeake Bay and lower portions of its three main tributaries (James, York, and Rappahannock Rivers). Although sampling does occur in the main stem, catches of weakfish are generally minimal in the Bay, so the index is limited to the three tributaries. Few large weakfish are present year round, but the estuaries provide suitable nursery grounds for juveniles.

Recruitment varies widely over the time series, ranging from less than 5 fish per tow to more than 35 fish per tow (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-4). Interannual variability is often large, particularly in the early portion of the time series, with the maximum and minimum indices occurring in consecutive years (1985, 1986). From 1986 to 1990, the survey shows a rapid increase from 4.7 to 30.0 fish per tow, followed by a sharp drop back to 7.0 fish per tow by 1994. Recruitment rebounded slightly through 1999, but generally has been declining since.

No estimates of survey variability are available for the current index; however, 95% CIs for an index that includes Bay and River stations (data not shown) indicate good precision which has improved as the survey progressed. Since 1989, CIs have generally been within 25 to 40% of the observed mean value. It could be expected that precision of the “river only” index would be greater, as catches of weakfish are less variable in the rivers than the Chesapeake Bay.

The VIMS trawl survey occurs within the core region of weakfish abundance during months when weakfish would be present. Precision is uncertain, but proxy data indicate low to moderate variability. The WTC has determined that this survey is suitable for use in the assessment.

#### *C6.2.8 North Carolina DMF Pamlico Sound Juvenile Trawl Survey*

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries conducts a juvenile trawl survey in Pamlico Sound. Sampling is conducted in June and September using a stratified random design. Survey gear consists of twin 9.1 m mongoose trawl nets with 19.1 mm codend mesh. Data from these surveys are used to develop an ages 1+ index (June) and a YOY index (September), both based on length frequency analysis. Indices are calculated as geometric mean catch per tow.

Between 1987 and 1999, the YOY index ranged from approximately 1 to 60 fish per tow. Catch was characterized by large interannual fluctuations, but shows a consistent increase over that period from the time series low in 1987 to the time series high in 1999 (Table C6.2-1, Figure C6.2-5). From 1999 to 2002, recruitment dropped rapidly from 60 to 4 fish per tow. Since 2002, the index indicates a modest rebound to approximately 13 fish per tow in 2007. Since 2000, interannual variability is much less pronounced than in the early portion of the time series.

From 1987 to 1999, the ages 1+ index varies without trend between approximately 5 and 20 fish per tow. The index does capture some of the larger year classes observed in the YOY index, and peaks in 2000 (one year after the YOY peak) at 51.5 fish per tow. The index drops rapidly back to less than 5 fish per tow and remains stable for the remainder of the time series except for the 2006 index of nearly 30 fish per tow.

Variability for both indices was moderately large, with 95% CIs in many years deviating by more than 40% from the mean value. For the YOY index, variability decreased as abundance increased. For both surveys, variability has increased in recent years.

The survey area encompasses only a small portion of the weakfish range and survey variability for both indices is moderate. However, the survey occurs within a prime weakfish spawning/nursery ground and provides the only recruitment index in the southern portion of the range. The WTC has included both the YOY and 1+ indices in the assessment.

### **C6.3 Other fishery independent surveys**

In addition to the fisheries independent surveys listed above for consideration as tuning indices, weakfish biological data are also obtained from two other trawl surveys in the Mid-Atlantic region. The Chesapeake Bay Multispecies Monitoring and Assessment Program (ChesMMAAP) is a large mesh trawl survey that began in 2002 (Bonzek et al 2007). Sampling is conducted bi-monthly from March through November, targeting juvenile to adult finfish throughout the main stem of the

Chesapeake Bay. The Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (NEAMAP) Trawl Survey is a nearshore ocean trawl survey operating between Cape Hatteras, NC and Montauk, NY (Bonzek et al 2008). The intent of this survey is to sample nearshore ocean waters which have typically been under represented in NEFSC trawl surveys. A pilot survey was conducted in 2006, and bi-annual (spring and fall) cruises have occurred since.

Although the time series from these surveys are not yet sufficient to provide trends, weakfish biological data collected during survey cruises have been made available for use in the stock assessment. When a sufficient time series has been attained, the WTC will evaluate these surveys as candidates for tuning indices.

Recently, information was obtained on weakfish juvenile abundance collected through the Georgia Coastal Resources Division Ecological Monitoring Trawl Survey (EMS). Sampling occurs at 43 fixed stations throughout six coastal sounds using a 12.2 m flat otter trawl equipped with 4.8 cm stretch mesh in the codend. The weakfish index is calculated from sound and creek strata during monthly cruises between July and October. Juveniles are identified by monthly length cutoffs. The survey began in 2003, so the time series is currently too short. When additional years of data are available, the WTC will re-evaluate this survey.

#### **C6.4 Fishery dependent surveys**

Historically, a fishery dependent index of weakfish abundance was developed using recreational catch per “directed trip” (trips where weakfish was identified as a target species; *cf.* NEFSC 1998b, 2000). During the review of the 2000 assessment, the SARC expressed concerns about fishery dependent indices, and they were removed from the assessment. Potential sources of bias in fishery dependent indices include non-random distribution of effort, and hyperstability of the index (Hilborn and Walters 1992).

In 2006, a revised recreational index was developed that the WTC feels largely addresses the concerns expressed by the 30<sup>th</sup> SARC. Estimates of catch include all weakfish (A+B1+B2) captured by the recreational private/rental boat mode in state waters of the mid-Atlantic region (New York to Virginia). As described in Crecco (2005a), the private/rental mode is highly mobile and capable of catching weakfish over a large range of sizes. Catches were constrained to the mid-Atlantic region because private/rental boat catches from this region have accounted for greater than 60% of annual recreational catch. Two estimates of effort were used to convert catch to CPUE. The first uses all private/rental boat trips in state waters of the mid-Atlantic region (Crecco 2005a). The second, detailed by Brust (2004), estimates effort as the number of private/rental boat trips in mid-Atlantic state waters that captured any of a suite of species typically associated with catches of weakfish. The two indices were highly correlated ( $r > 0.98$ ). Although the 2006 assessment used the index based on the suite of associated species, the current assessment uses the index based on all mid-Atlantic private/rental boat trips because of its ease of calculation without loss of information, and because it provides consistency between assessment methodologies.

The methods described above provide an index of total catch per trip, including both harvested and discarded fish. Based on assumptions regarding availability to the fishery (gear and area) at size, this index is considered to represent ages 1+. Age specific indices for harvested fish were developed by dividing total harvest by the effort index (Mid-Atlantic private/rental boat trips) and applying the age structure of the recreational harvest of 2+ fish. When the index is lagged forward, this method provides indices at age for 3 through 6+.

Both indices (age aggregated 1+ and age specific 3 to 6+) are developed using data from mid-Atlantic state waters. This region encompasses the primary distribution of weakfish within its

range. Although all sizes and ages of weakfish are present in this region, younger fish are not considered to be captured or harvested by the fishery, so the indices are only representative of mature fish.

CPUE of all ages varied greatly from 0.2 to 0.8 during 1981 to 1988 (Figure C6.3-1). From 1989 to 1993, CPUE was stable between 0.15 and 0.2, following which it increased rapidly to a peak of 0.61 in 1996. Since that time, CPUE has exhibited a consistent decline to the time series minimum of 0.09 in 2007.

During the early portion of the time series, age structure of harvested fish was dominated by fish aged 2 and 3 (Figure C6.4-1). By the mid 1990s, minimum size limits and expanding age structure increased the influence of older fish, and 4 year old fish were the most prevalent age group between 1996 and 1999, with 5 year olds dominant in 2000. Since 2001, older ages have fallen off to near zero levels, and harvest consists mostly of ages 2 and 3.

Estimates of precision are available for the different components of the indices (catch, harvest, and effort); however, there are no direct estimates of survey precision. Discussions on uncertainty in catch and effort estimates are presented in section **C5.2**.

Fishery dependent indices were employed in some of the early stock assessments, but were dropped in subsequent years due to concerns over their reliability. During the 2006 assessment, the WTC developed a new recreational index that covers the entire core area of the population range based on a highly mobile fleet whose effort is not specific to weakfish. The index covers the entire core area of the population range, is highly mobile, but effort is not specific to weakfish. Results are coherent with other indicators of weakfish population size, as well as harvest and the converged portion of the VPA (see Section **C10.0** of this report). The WTC has therefore determined that the fishery dependent indices are suitable for use in the stock assessment.

## **C6.5 Discussion**

Of all surveys reviewed, only NEFSC and MA YOY were excluded from further analysis due to concerns over information content. The remaining indices include age specific indices from four fishery independent surveys (NJ, DE, NC gillnet, SEAMAP), nine fishery independent young of year surveys, and age specific indices from the recreational fishery. Although previous peer reviews recommend limiting indices to the core population area, the WTC has determined that three YOY surveys from outside the core area provide reliable information on weakfish recruitment, and these surveys have been included in modeling investigations.

The informative value of different tuning indices have received a lot of consideration during recent reviews of the weakfish assessment, either as a work in progress (SAW 40, 2008 DPSW) or the completed work (ASMFC 2006a). Each review panel had varying opinions of the indices, but a common recommendation from all three is that the indices need further evaluation. The WTC has attempted to address these concerns as well as possible (*e.g.* ASMFC 2006a, Parts A and C; Technical Committee response to 2008 DPSW panel report (Appendix C-1)), and a summary of recent work is presented in Section **C10.0** of this report. Most recently, the DPSW panel recognized and supported much of the work done by the WTC to address previous concerns, but still identified several issues with the indices (Miller et al 2009, bullets d through f). These concerns are summarized below, as are the WTC's responses to the panel report.

In bullet d) of the panel report, the panel recognizes that decisions to exclude indices were based on "several valid reasons." They continue, however, by stating that the remaining indices may not be indicative of true population dynamics because they "were restricted to limited spatial areas within the overall weakfish stock area." Further, they were concerned that similar trends in

remaining age-aggregate indices could be due to these indices containing little information. The WTC recognizes that the remaining fishery independent surveys are localized; however, the review panel supported the exclusion of the only coastwide index (NEFSC) for “valid reasons.” In addition, the three remaining “aged” fishery independent surveys occur in the state with the most commercial landings (NC gillnet), the largest recreational harvest (NJ), and a principal spawning area (DE 30-foot). When considered on an age-aggregated basis, all three surveys show the same general trend, as does the recreational index which encompasses the entire core region. These findings suggest that the core area is adequately covered. In response to the concern over limited data content, the WTC points out that the trends in indices reflect changes in commercial CPUE, population trends from previous assessments, and observed age structure from fishery dependent and independent sampling.

Bullet e) of the panel report identifies concerns regarding the recreational index. In particular, the Panel expressed concerns that the MRFSS index was one of few that exhibited any clear pattern, which could be due to anglers switching methods as abundance of a more favorable species (striped bass) increased. The WTC responds that the pattern observed in the MRFSS index is coherent with three other aged surveys. Only two aged indices – NEFSC and SEAMAP - showed trends different from MRFSS and the others. Further, NEFSC was found to be uninformative, and the SEAMAP index exhibits moderate to large CVs. Although no alternative estimators were provided in the panel report, one suggestion made during the face to face meeting was found to produce the same general trend as the MRFSS index presented.

In bullet f), the review panel recognizes that although four surveys (NJ, DE, NC gillnet, MRFSS) show coherence when age aggregated, VPA results vary greatly when using only fishery dependent or fishery independent tuning indices. Preliminary evaluation of this issue was presented in the WTC response; however, further work identified incorrect age data in the MRFSS index used for preliminary runs. Additional information on VPA runs is presented in section **C7.0**.

In summary, the WTC recognizes that many of the concerns expressed over the last few years regarding the tuning indices are valid concerns. Significant time has been spent investigating and evaluating each of these concerns. The result is a set of tuning indices that the WTC considers is representative of weakfish population dynamics throughout the core region.

Another topic that has been gaining popularity in fisheries stock assessment is the process of standardizing abundance indices relative to temporal, spatial, and environmental factors. The three most recent weakfish peer reviews have all recommended that available weakfish indices of abundance be scrutinized to better understand their information content. During sampling, factors external to population dynamics may contribute “noise” that, if not accounted for, is generally attributed to fluctuations in population size. Standardizing indices using methods such as generalized linear models (GLM) and generalized additive models (GAM) seeks to identify factors that contribute to survey variability and minimize their influence, in order to better observe the true population signal.

Recently, a team of researchers from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) has begun investigating the use of CPUE standardization for weakfish (Winter et al 2009). Raw data from nearly all abundance indices (fishery independent and fishery dependent) considered by the WTC were analyzed using GLM and (where appropriate) GAM. Preliminary results were presented to the WTC in April 2009. The WTC was encouraged by the results, but many questions remained. For example, indices investigated by Winter et al (2009) were not all directly comparable to indices considered by the WTC, in particular the New Jersey (CPUE all cruises vs percent positive tows during August cruise) and fishery dependent indices (Mid-Atlantic private boat CPUE vs CPUE for all sub-regions and modes). In the case of the fishery dependent



index, factors were included to account for sub-region and mode, but the discrepancies made comparisons difficult. Also, preliminary results did not include summary statistics of the various factors investigated for each index. It was not possible, therefore, for the WTC to evaluate which factors were significant or the proportion of total variability explained by each factor.

The researchers from Virginia Tech were receptive to comments and suggestions from the WTC, and the full report, updated with responses to some of the WTC's concerns (e.g. p-values for different factors), is included with the materials for SAW 48 as a supplementary report for weakfish (entitled "Winter et al 2009 – Weakfish CPUE standardization.doc"). However, given the WTC's concerns regarding the preliminary results, and the short timeline available to complete this assessment for peer review in June 2009, the WTC has determined that there was insufficient time to incorporate standardized indices into the current assessment. The WTC supports continuing this work to address the research recommendation and for consideration in future stock assessments.

### **C7.0 Evaluate the ADAPT VPA catch at age modeling methods and the estimates of F, Z, spawning stock biomass, and total abundance of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty and potential bias of those estimates. Review the severity of retrospective pattern. (TOR #3)**

#### **C7.1 Introduction**

Age structured modeling was conducted using ADAPT VPA (version 2.8, available for download at <http://nft.nefsc.noaa.gov>) as recommended by the 30<sup>th</sup> SARC (NEFSC 2000). Development of catch at age inputs from four fishery sectors (commercial harvest, commercial discards, recreational harvest, and recreational discards) is discussed in detail in section C5.0 (see Table C5.3-1). A total of 38 abundance indices were considered suitable for use in the assessment (section C6.0 and Figures C6.1-1 through C6.4-1), including 24 age specific fishery independent indices (four surveys age 1 to 6+), nine fishery independent young of year surveys, four age specific fishery dependent indices (MRFSS 3 to 6+), and one fishery dependent age aggregated index (MRFSS 2+). Specific configuration of the model, such as biological specifications and options selected, is presented in the supplementary report entitled "Weakfish ADAPT final run output.txt."

Multiple runs were conducted using various combinations of tuning indices and/or modified input values (sensitivity runs). All model runs were reviewed and the preferred model run was selected based on evaluation of model fit, residuals, retrospective patterns, and other considerations.

#### **C7.2 General findings**

Regardless of tuning indices selected, all runs using baseline data (calculated CAA, constant  $M = 0.25$ ) provided consistent, virtually identical results through 2002. Trends in estimated parameters for the years 2003 to 2007 varied widely, as did the magnitude and duration of retrospective patterns. Model runs that included fishery dependent indices produced more conservative results (lower abundance, higher F), lower mean squared residual (MSR), and less severe retrospective patterns than those tuned solely with fishery independent indices (Table C7.2-1; Figure 7.2-1 through 7.2-3). When YOY indices were used to tune the model, the magnitude and duration of retrospective patterns were greater than when YOY indices were excluded, but exclusion of YOY indices did not necessarily result in lower MSR.

Significant consideration was given to selection of tuning indices. Section C10.0 provides a detailed summary of work conducted to evaluate indices based on criteria such as size structure of the catch, and coherence with other indices, landings and the converged portion of the VPA. This

method resulted in the NEFSC fall trawl survey being dropped from consideration, and the New Jersey ocean trawl index being changed from average CPUE to proportion positive tows (PPT). Further work was conducted to investigate combinations of indices that produced consistent results while minimizing the retrospective pattern. Some committee members cautioned that this method of index selection might appear subjective, and recommended an alternate method of index selection. The proposed method developed a list of criteria against which each index could be scored, including survey design, spatial and temporal coverage, and catch characteristics. Indices receiving the highest total scores would be selected as tuning indices. An exploratory implementation of this method selected NEFSC ages 1-2, DE 30 foot trawl age 1, NC gillnet age 1, SEAMAP ages 1-6+, and the RI, CT, NY, DE, MD, and NC YOY indices for use in tuning the model. During the converged portion of the time series (1982 to 2002), ADAPT results using these tuning indices were consistent with results from other runs with other tuning indices (Figure C7.2-4); however, the WTC was concerned that the magnitude and duration of the retrospective pattern in recent years were greater using this method than observed in other runs (Figure C7.2-5), and MSR for this run was among the highest observed (Table C7.2-1). In addition, the WTC was concerned that this method selected two ages from the NEFSC survey, which the WTC had excluded based on poor performance relative to established criteria, and all 6 ages of the SEAMAP survey, which is confounded by large interannual variability and an extreme outlier in 2005 that likely influences estimates in recent years. Based on these concerns, the WTC did not pursue this method any further for this assessment. It is recognized that alternative criteria and/or a different cut-off score for “acceptable” indices might influence the results, but additional work was postponed until completion of the ongoing assessment.

The WTC also investigated the use of tuning indices that were standardized relative to spatial, temporal, and environmental factors using methods such as GLM and GAM (Winter et al 2009; see section C6.5). Exploratory model runs using standardized indices were conducted in ADAPT VPA and compared to results using non-standardized indices. Winter et al (2009) indicate that GAM methods were superior to GLM for modeling weakfish catch rates. Model runs were therefore conducted using GAM standardized indices where possible, and GLM only for those indices that could not be standardized using GAM. Because the MRFSS harvest index was not standardized, comparisons were restricted to runs using only fishery independent indices. Also, indices developed by Winter et al (2009) were not all directly comparable to indices considered by the WTC, in particular the New Jersey (CPUE all cruises vs. proportion positive tows during August cruise). Regardless, ADAPT results using standardized indices were very similar to comparable runs using non-standardized indices and produced somewhat smaller retrospective patterns (Figures C7.2-6 and C7.2-7). As noted in section C6.5, although the WTC is encouraged by these findings, initial results of the index standardization analysis were presented too late in the development of this assessment report to be fully evaluated. The above discussion is based on examples of preliminary work that have not been fully endorsed by the WTC. The WTC will address their concerns regarding the index standardization analyses and continue to investigate the use of standardized tuning indices for future assessments.

The 2008 DPSW panel expressed concern over the inconsistency of model results between runs using only fishery dependent tuning indices and runs using only fishery independent indices. In the preliminary results presented during the 2008 DPSW, the New Jersey, Delaware, North Carolina gillnet, and MRFSS CPUE indices all showed a similar pattern in abundance when aggregated across ages; however, when disaggregated and used to tune the VPA, the fishery dependent results were inconsistent with the results using fishery independent indices. These results suggested that

one or more of the indices performed poorly at tracking weakfish age structure. The DPSW reviewers suggested that the WTC investigate this discrepancy. Preliminary results of these investigations were presented in the WTC response to the review panel's comments (see Appendix C-1). Additional evaluation shows, however, that the results presented at the DPSW were inaccurate due to incorrect age allocation of the fishery dependent indices. Updated results show that runs using only NJ, DE, or MRFSS indices produce consistent results (Figure C7.2-8).

### **C7.3 Preferred model run**

#### *C7.3.1 Model output*

The previous (2006) assessment selected a model run tuned with only the fishery dependent indices, mainly because it produced a greatly reduced retrospective pattern relative to other runs. For this current assessment, the fishery dependent only run still produced the smallest retrospective (Figures C7.2-2 and C7.2-3) and best model fit (Table C7.2-1); however, including indices from the New Jersey ocean trawl, Delaware 30-foot trawl, and North Carolina gillnet surveys produces nearly identical trends in recent years with only marginal increases in the retrospective pattern. MSR nearly doubled relative to the fishery dependent only run, but is still lower than all other runs investigated. Minor improvements were made to the output by expressing index values to four decimal places and including preliminary estimates of abundance in 2008 for all selected tuning indices where available (only NC gillnet data were not). This run is hereafter referred to as the "final" or "preferred" run. Index values are shown in Table C7.3-1. Selected parameter estimates are presented in Figures C7.3-1 and C7.3-2, and the full model output is provided in the supplementary report entitled "Weakfish ADAPT final run output.txt."

Following the 2006 assessment, the WTC received criticism for not including any fishery independent tuning indices. The preferred run for the current (2009) assessment addresses this concern by including fishery independent indices from New Jersey, Delaware, and North Carolina along with the fishery dependent tuning indices. However, another criticism received by the WTC following the 2006 assessment was the selection of indices that produced desired results. As all the tuning indices used in the preferred run of the current assessment exhibit the same trend, this criticism may reappear. The 2008 DPSW suggested that these indices were coherent because they contained little information about weakfish abundance (Miller et al 2009). The WTC argues that these surveys were selected, not because they produce the desired result, but because they most accurately reflect other indicators of stock dynamics. These indices correspond well with changes in harvest, abundance, CPUE, and population age structure. It is doubtful that indices that lack useful information would track these parameters so closely. In addition, parameter estimates derived using tuning indices selected based on scored criteria were nearly identical to results of the preferred run for the years 1982 to 2002. The retrospective pattern based on scored criteria was longer and of much greater magnitude than the preferred run.

Estimates of fishing mortality (unweighted average, ages 4-5) from the preferred run approached or exceeded  $F = 1.5$  in most years between 1982 and 1988 (Table C7.3-2, Figure C7.3-1). Between 1989 and 1994,  $F$  values generally varied around  $F = 1.0$  before dropping rapidly to the time series low of  $F = 0.32$  in 1995. A nearly exponential increase ensued during most of the following decade, peaking in 2003 at the time series high of  $F = 2.39$ . Fishing mortality rates decline after 2003, and the terminal year estimate of  $F_{2007} = 0.51$  (80% CI range 0.38 to 0.82) is the second lowest value in the time series. A prominent retrospective pattern (Figure C7.3-2) indicates estimates since 2003 may be inaccurate (see section **C7.3.2**).

Between 1982 and 1985, spawning stock biomass varied generally between 8,000 and 13,000 MT, increased rapidly to approximately 20,000 MT in 1986-1987, then returned to its previous range during 1988 to 1993 (Figure C7.3-1). A gradual increase followed until SSB reached a relative peak around 19,000 MT in 1997. Since that time, SSB has undergone a gradual decline to the time series low of 1,987 MT in 2005 before rebounding slightly in the last two years. SSB in the terminal year is estimated as  $SSB_{2007} = 7,236$  MT. Bootstrapping indicates an 80% CI range for SSB in 2007 from 5,300 to 10,733 MT. A prominent retrospective pattern (Figure C7.3-2) makes these estimates unreliable.

From 1982 to 1984, total abundance was estimated to range between 80 and 100 million individuals per year (Figure C7.3-1). Abundance increased rapidly to the time series high of 120 million in 1986, then declined by more than 70% in just 4 years to less than 50 million individuals in 1989. A steady increase was observed between 1989 and 1994, peaking at around 90 million. A nearly continuous decline has been observed since that time, with the time series low of just 10.6 million individuals estimated in 2005. Recent years' estimates are slightly higher, and the terminal year is estimated as  $N_{2007} = 32.8$  million with an 80% CI range of 11.95 to 90.05 million. A prominent retrospective pattern (Figure C7.3-2) makes these estimates unreliable.

Recruitment to age 1 followed a similar trend as total abundance (Figure C7.3-1). The time series high of 70.9 million in 1986 was followed by a sharp decrease to just 20.8 million four years later. Recruitment increased steadily to around 49.3 million in 1994 and has since declined, with the time series low of just 4.5 million recruits estimated in 2005. Recent years' estimates are slightly higher, and the terminal year is estimated as  $R_{2007} = 16.4$  million with an 80% CI range of 3.8 to 59.1 million. A prominent retrospective pattern (Figure C7.3-2) makes these estimates unreliable.

Survey residuals tend to show a strong serial pattern, particularly for the younger ages (Figure C7.3-3). Abundance at age of the New Jersey and Delaware trawl surveys is generally overestimated by the model during the early years of the surveys, shifting to an underestimation during the mid to late 1990s. The same pattern is observed for the recreational harvest index of abundance (aggregated ages 2-6+). In contrast, the recreational harvest indices are underestimated by the model during the first decade of the time series, but the early 1990s, residuals have shifted to negative values before increasing back to positive values since 2002.

### *C7.3.2 Retrospective pattern*

As in previous stock assessments (NEFSC 2000, Kahn 2002, ASMFC 2006a, Part A) reliability of estimates in recent years is diminished by the presence of a prominent retrospective pattern. For the current assessment, fishing mortality is underestimated for the most recent five to seven years, while SSB, total abundance, and recruitment are all overestimated (Figure C7.3-2). The degree of error is substantial, with fishing mortality in 2003 increasing 130% from  $F_{2003} = 1.04$  when 2003 is the terminal year to  $F_{2003} = 2.39$  when data through 2007 are included. Similarly,  $SSB_{2003}$  decreases by nearly 75% from 8,282 MT to 2,190 MT between terminal years 2003 and 2007. Improvements to the ADAPT VPA model implemented in 2007 (version 2.6) allow users to combine retrospective analysis with bootstrapping (ADAPT version history, available at <http://nft.nefsc.noaa.gov>). Results of such an analysis further elaborate the degree of uncertainty in recent year estimates. Frequency distributions of bootstrapped estimates of  $F_{2005}$  from terminal year 2005 and terminal year 2007 do not overlap, and those of SSB overlap only slightly (Figure C7.3-4). Estimated 80% confidence intervals do not overlap for either parameter (Table C7.3-3).

Despite a significant retrospective pattern, the 30<sup>th</sup> SARC determined that results from the ADAPT model could be used to establish reference points and provide guidance to management

(NEFSC 2000). Quantitative analysis of the retrospective pattern observed in this assessment shows that estimates differ by more than 100% between the time they are made in the terminal year and five years later when estimates converge (Figure C7.3-2). In addition, bootstrap confidence intervals of terminal year estimates are not sufficient to capture the uncertainty (Figure C7.3-4, Table C7.3-3). The WTC has concluded that ADAPT parameter estimates in recent years are unreliable and should not be used for management at face value. An attempt to correct parameter estimates for the retrospective pattern is presented below. The WTC does not necessarily endorse the corrected estimates, but is presenting them here for review and discussion by the 48<sup>th</sup> SAW/SARC.

An attempt was made to correct parameter estimates in recent years using the observed retrospective pattern. For this analysis, it is assumed that parameter estimates in 2003 using data through terminal year 2007 have “converged” and are robust to additional years of data being added in the future, and that the retrospective pattern observed since 2003 continues into the future. Violation of these assumptions will invalidate the following retrospective correction analysis.

The estimate of  $F_{2003}$  calculated for terminal year 2007 was divided by estimates of  $F_{2003}$  from each of the other terminal years 2003 to 2006 to calculate a ratio of change for each terminal year relative to the year it would converge. Assuming four years of additional data are required for a terminal year estimate to converge, estimates of  $F_{2004}$  to  $F_{2007}$  from terminal year 2007 were multiplied by the appropriate ratio of change before convergence. For example, the ratio of  $F_{2003}$  calculated in 2007 relative to 2005 ( $2.39/2.09 = 1.1460$ ) indicates how much  $F_{2003}$  changed in the last two years before stabilizing.  $F_{2005}$  is expected to converge in terminal year 2009, or two years after the current estimate with data through 2007 ( $F_{2005} = 2.07$ ). A corrected estimate of  $F_{2005}$  in 2009 was calculated by multiplying the estimate of  $F_{2005}$  from 2007 by the ratio of change in the last two years before convergence. Specifically, *converged* $F_{2005} = 2.07 * 1.146 = 2.37$ .

Similar methods were used to correct estimates of SSB, January 1 abundance, and recruitment.

Results of the retrospective correction analysis are presented in Figure C7.3-5. Correcting for the retrospective pattern produces higher estimates of  $F$  and lower estimates of SSB, total abundance, and  $R$  during the period 2003 to 2007. As noted above, these results are dependent on the assumption that estimates from fishing year 2003 have stabilized with data through 2007 and that the observed retrospective pattern continues into the future. There is no way to validate these assumptions without additional years of data.

### C7.3.3 Total mortality

Within ADAPT VPA, calculation of fishing mortality is constructed around the Baranov catch equation (NEFSC 2003). Given abundance of age  $a+1$  in year  $t+1$  and catch of age  $a$  in year  $t$ , total mortality on age  $a$  in year  $t$  is calculated iteratively using the equation

$$\frac{N_{a+1,t+1}}{C_{a,t}} = \frac{Z_{a,t}}{F_{a,t}} * \frac{e^{-Z_{a,t}}}{1 - e^{-Z_{a,t}}}$$

Fishing mortality on age  $a$  in year  $t$  is then estimated as

$$F_{a,t} = Z_{a,t} - M$$

Following this procedure, estimates of fishing mortality are dependent on assumptions regarding natural mortality. Incorrect assumptions (*i.e.* inaccurate input values) for  $M$  would produce inaccurate estimates of fishing mortality. No direct estimates of natural mortality are available for weakfish, so the WTC has historically operated on the assumption of constant  $M = 0.25$  across all years and ages. Alternative assumptions would produce different fishing mortality trends than presented above. If  $M$  is indeed constant but of a different magnitude,  $F$  estimates would follow a similar trajectory but be scaled up or down from the current estimates. Of greater concern is natural mortality that is not constant across time. Assumptions of constant natural mortality when  $M$  is actually increasing over time would lead to overestimates of fishing mortality. Alternatively, a negative trend in  $M$  would result in  $F$  being underestimated.

To circumvent these issues regarding assumptions about  $M$ , it is possible to increase the ADAPT estimated fishing mortality rates by the value of input natural mortality to evaluate trends in total mortality. Since natural mortality was assumed constant at all ages for all years ( $M = 0.25$ ), the trend in total mortality is the same as the trend in  $F$  scaled up by 0.25 (Figure C7.3-1).  $Z$  declines from values between 1.5 and 2.0 in the early 1980s to the time series low of 0.57 in 1995. In the years following,  $Z$  increased nearly exponentially to a peak of more than 2.6 in 2003. Correcting for the retrospective pattern seen in  $F$ , total mortality appears to level off at approximately 2.5 to 2.6 before dropping by about 45% in 2007 (Figure C7.3-5).

#### *C7.3.4 Other age-based models*

ADAPT VPA operates under the assumption that catch at age is known without error. If catch at age is mis-specified in the input data, the errors are carried through to the results of abundance and fishing mortality at age. If errors in the CAA matrix are known or assumed to be large, other age structured models that are more robust to CAA uncertainty should be explored.

For weakfish, there are several known sources of uncertainty in the CAA. These include conversion of scale-based ages from the 1980s and early 1990s to otolith-based ages used since around 1994, and the substitution of commercial length frequency data to characterize fisheries in states with insufficient data (see section **C5.0**). During the development of the 2002 stock assessment update, the WTC began investigating the use of Integrated Catch at Age Analysis (ICA), which incorporates a statistical error model and is not dependent on error-free CAA (de Silva 2002). Due to loss of staff, this methodology was not pursued beyond the initial investigation.

The most recent peer reviews of the weakfish stock assessment, either as a work in progress (SAW 40, 2008 DPSW) or the completed work (ASMFC 2006a), have focused on concerns with input data. The 2008 DPSW review panel recommended the WTC investigate the use of a forward projecting statistical catch at age model which is robust to errors in the CAA (Miller et al 2009). On that recommendation, the WTC has begun investigating the use of the Age Structured Assessment Program (ASAP) available through the NEFSC toolbox. Trends in fishing mortality and SSB generally follow similar patterns as those estimated in ADAPT (Figure C7.3-6). To date, only preliminary runs have been completed, and the results presented should be considered as examples. The WTC has not had sufficient time to fine tune the model inputs, nor evaluate the reasons for, or the implications of, the discrepancies between the two models. The WTC will continue investigating the use of ASAP and/or other age-structured models for use in future stock assessments.

## C7.4 Discussion

Fishing mortality estimated using ADAPT VPA exhibited a generally declining trend between 1982 and 1995, followed a nearly exponential increase during the next decade, and then dropping off in recent years. SSB generally declined through the 1980s, exhibited some rebuilding during the mid to late 1990s, then declined to record lows by 2005. A number of exploratory modeling runs using available data indicate good precision of estimates between 1982 and about 2002. From 2003 to 2007, different sets of tuning indices produced different parameter estimates, and all were compromised by a prominent retrospective pattern. Fishing mortality is generally underestimated, while SSB, January 1 stock abundance, and recruitment are overestimated. Results after 2002 are therefore considered unreliable. An attempt was made to correct for the observed retrospective pattern, but the results have not been endorsed by the WTC.

Implementation of ADAPT for this and previous stock assessments has been conducted under the assumption of constant natural mortality. Violation of this assumption results in inaccurate fishing mortality estimates. The WTC has strong reservations about this assumption and has expressed concern regarding the trend in fishing mortality calculated through ADAPT. As an alternative, the WTC prefers to combine calculated F estimates with input M rates to portray a trend in total mortality, Z. The trend in Z is identical to the trend in F scaled upward by 0.25, and is also influenced by the retrospective pattern in recent years. Regardless, estimates of Z prior to 2002 are not limited by assumptions regarding M and are therefore considered more accurate.

ADAPT VPA has long been the accepted modeling approach for weakfish based on the recommendation of the 26<sup>th</sup> SARC (NEFSC 1998b). The subsequent peer review (NEFSC 2000) determined that estimates based on ADAPT VPA were suitable for management. In recent years, however, the WTC has doubted the utility of ADAPT for a number of reasons. First, the severe retrospective pattern indicates that parameter estimates in the last five years or more are unreliable. A combined bootstrap and retrospective analysis provides evidence that bootstrapping is insufficient to capture the uncertainty in terminal year estimates. As such, the WTC considers 2002 or 2003 as the most recent year of “acceptable” parameter estimates. Estimates that are now more than five years old are of limited utility for determining future management strategies. Secondly, calculations within ADAPT are conditional upon certain assumptions, either hard programmed (*e.g.* error-free catch at age) or user defined (*e.g.* constant M). The WTC is aware of several sources of uncertainty in the weakfish catch at age matrix, including the scale to otolith conversion, substitution of commercial samples, and commercial discards estimates. The extent of error is unknown, but could be substantial, making ADAPT estimates unreliable. In addition, without direct evidence suggesting otherwise, the WTC has historically assumed natural mortality was constant over all ages and years. This assumption was called into question during development of the 2004 stock assessment when it was observed that stock size began declining under low fishing pressure. Additional work (presented in later sections) provides evidence that suggests weakfish productivity has changed over the available time series, which may be affecting our evaluation of the stock and appropriate management strategies.

The WTC has been tasked to evaluate weakfish stock status in order to support sustainable management of the stock. Without an approved alternative analytical method, results of ADAPT VPA modeling are presented for review and discussion by the 48<sup>th</sup> SARC. However, given the concerns presented above, the WTC does not believe the terminal year estimates are suitable for management purposes. Beginning with the 2004 assessment, alternative analytical methods have been (and will continue to be) investigated in an attempt to find a more suitable model that is not constrained by (*i.e.* not dependent on, or at least more robust to violations of) assumptions

underlying the current model. The WTC also intends to continue evaluating available data sources to improve historical and future input data. The WTC welcomes specific comments from the SARC on how to improve the input data and model parameterization, and/or comments on appropriate alternative analytical methods. The goal is to find a suitable method that is capable of accurately depicting recent and historical trends in abundance and mortality rates to allow ASMFC the ability to manage for the long term sustainability of the stock.

**C8.0 Evaluate the index based methods and the estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, and time-varying natural mortality of weakfish produced, along with the uncertainty of those estimates. Determine whether these techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice. (TOR #4)**

**C8.1 INTRODUCTION**

Our ability to assess the current status of Atlantic coast weakfish has been continually plagued by a pronounced retrospective bias associated with all previous ADAPT model runs. Previous ADAPT runs made with trawl-based tuning indices (Kahn et al 2006) exhibited severe systematic retrospective bias that underestimated F and overestimated stock size in the most recent years by as much as 80%. The degree of retrospective bias from ADAPT was so severe that the results gave the false impression that weakfish stock size had actually risen to record high levels by 2002 despite the presence of record low coast-wide landings after 1999. Such a large systematic bias greatly confounds our ability to determine whether or not weakfish abundance has fallen and whether or not the stock is overfished. The degree of retrospective bias from ADAPT was reduced to some extent when the model was tuned specifically to recreational catch-effort data from the MRFSS (Kahn et al 2006).

Because of the aforementioned limitations thus far in the catch-at-age approach, the 2006 Assessment (Kahn et al 2006, Uphoff 2006a; Crecco 2006) relied primarily on an index-based (ages 1+) method to monitor temporal changes in weakfish biomass (mt) and fishing mortality (F) from 1981 to 2003. In the 2006 assessment, relative weakfish abundance was represented solely by the MRFSS recreational cpue from the Mid-Atlantic private boat sector of the recreational fishery. More recently, Uphoff (2008) reported that trends in the MRFSS recreational indices as well as trawl based indices from the States of New Jersey (August data only) and Delaware were highly correlated ( $P < 0.01$ ) with trends in coast-wide landings and with ages 1+ weakfish abundance from the converged portion (1981-2001) of the most recent VPA model run. Since the index-based approach produced a trend in ages 1+F that closely followed the F trend from the converged (1982-2000) portion of ADAPT without having to rely on the often untested assumption of a fixed M (i. e.  $F = Z$ -fixed M), a blended index was derived here based on the recreational cpue, New Jersey and Delaware trawl indices and used to update ages 1+ F and stock biomass estimates (mt) from 1981 to 2008.

Results from the last assessment (Kahn et al 2006) revealed that overfishing ( $F > F_{msy}$ ) had occurred on weakfish from about 1981 to 1991. More stringent fishery regulations were imposed on the weakfish recreational and commercial fisheries in 1992 and 1993 after which fishing mortality (F) rates fell to well below  $F_{msy}$  from 1996 to 2003. Following a drop in F, coast-wide weakfish abundance initially rose from 1992 until about 1998, but stock size dropped unexpectedly thereafter to the lowest levels in the time series by 2007 despite low and stable fishing mortality (F) rates during this period. Because F levels remained relatively low and stable after 1999, additional analyses have begun to find evidence for trophic interactions involving enhanced striped bass



(*Morone saxatilis*) and spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*) predation or a more complex trophic triangle among weakfish, striped bass and Atlantic menhaden (*Brevoortia tyrannus*) (see sections C9.0 through C11.0).

## C8.2 METHODS

### C8.2.1 Recreational Abundance Index

A weakfish relative abundance index in numbers (RelNt) was developed annually from 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-1) as a recreational catch-effort ratio:

$$\text{RelNt} = \text{MIDN} / \text{Effort}. \quad (1)$$

The recreational catches (MIDN, numbers) (type A, B1 and B2) and fishing effort estimates (Effort in millions of trips) in equation (1) were taken from the MRFSS annual surveys from the private boat sector within the Mid-Atlantic subregion (Virginia to New York). Weakfish catch and fishing effort data were confined to the Mid-Atlantic subregion because private boats catches from this subregion represent the major (> 60%) component of the total coast-wide recreational weakfish catches with acceptably high relative precision about the mean catch estimates after 1984 (annual CV values < 0.13). Moreover, the private boat fishery is highly mobile and capable of catching weakfish of all sizes throughout their range.

A second time series (1981-2008) of weakfish relative abundance in weight (RelWt) was also derived as a ratio of recreational catches (A, B1, B2) in weight (MIDW, mt) to fishing effort (Effort) from the Mid-Atlantic private boat fishery (Table C8.2-1). Since the MRFSS has obtained weight (kg) data from only the harvest (A, B1), the average weight of released weakfish (the B2 component) was assumed to be constant (0.15 kg) each year based on length frequencies (cm) of several thousand released weakfish in the coast-wide head-boat fishery from 2004 to 2007. The weakfish lengths (cm) from this fishery were converted to weight (kg) using the coast-wide length-weight equation for weakfish.

The proposed recreational abundance indices for weakfish (RelNt and RelWt) are fishery dependent and thus partially included in the total (sport, commercial and discards) coast-wide landings. However, the problem of colinearity between the recreational indices and total coast-wide landings should be relatively minor for several reasons. First, auto-correlation between the relative abundance indices (RelNt and RelWt) and total recreational and commercial weakfish landings is minimized by the fact that Mid-Atlantic private boat recreational catches (type A, B1 and B2) rather than harvest (type A and B1) was used to derive the RelNt. The recreational catches are usually three to four times higher each year than the harvest after 1990. Second, the private boat catches (A, B1, B2) in the MRFSS were further divided by private boat fishing effort (Et) in which the effort trend from 1981 to 2003 is inversely correlated ( $r = -0.39$ ,  $P < 0.08$ ) with the trend in total coast-wide harvest. Finally, the time series (1982 to 2002) of recreational abundance indices (RelNt, RelWt) was shown to be highly correlated (Pearson  $r = 0.84$ ,  $P < 0.009$ ) with ages 1+ weakfish stock size from the converged portion (1982 to 2003) of the most recent VPA model run (Uphoff 2008).

Additional age 1+ weakfish abundance indices are available in weight (mean kg/tow) and number (mean N/tow) from the New Jersey (NJ DFW) and Delaware (DE FW) inshore trawl surveys (Table C8.2-2). Uphoff (2008) noted that the time series (1990-2007) of Delaware weakfish trawl indices were highly correlated ( $P < 0.01$ ) to the recreational indices (RelWt), to coast-wide weakfish landings and to age1+ abundance from the converged portion (1990-2000) of the most recent

ADAPT VPA model run. By contrast, the New Jersey age 1+ indices from 1989 to 2007 were poorly correlated ( $P < 0.54$ ) to landings and the converged portion of the VPA. Uphoff (2008) found that the New Jersey trawl indices could be made more informative about trends in coast-wide abundance if the August proportion of positive weakfish (converted to a weight index by multiplying by an estimate of mean weight of exploitable sized weakfish) was used instead of the geometric mean number/tow index from August and October. For this reason, the August indices of positive tows from the New Jersey survey were used to index weakfish relative abundance. Given that these trawl surveys spatially overlap the recreational private boat RelNt indices, the most representative coast-wide weakfish abundance index was chosen as a blended (scaled and averaged) index based on the recreational private boat indices (RelNt, RelWt) (Table C8.2-1), the Delaware trawl indices and the revised August New Jersey trawl indices (Table C8.2-2). The rationale for blending the three indices together seemed justified since trends in the weakfish indices from the three surveys were highly correlated from 1981 to 2007 (Figures C8.2-1 and C8.2-2). Before the three data sets indices could be combined into a coast-wide index (**WkNt, WkWt**), the time series from each survey had to be standardized to equivalent abundance units. Equivalent units were established in a three-step process. First, the long-term mean abundance index was derived separately for the recreational, Delaware and New Jersey abundance indices. Second, a scalar was derived as a ratio of the long-term average Delaware and New Jersey indices to the long-term average recreational private boat index (catch/trip). Finally, each annual index from the Delaware and New Jersey time series was then multiplied times the respective scalar, thereby transforming the magnitude of the Delaware and New Jersey trawl indices to relative units of the recreational private boat indices (Table C8.2-3). Note that the Delaware and New Jersey indices began in 1990 and 1989, respectively and are not yet available for 2008. For this reason, the 1981 – 1988 and 2008 recreational private boat indices were used to reflect coast-wide weakfish abundance during those years.

### C8.2.2 Relative Fishing Mortality (RelFt) and Scaled F Estimates

In this analysis, relative fishing mortality estimates (RelFt) were derived on ages 1+ weakfish from 1981 to 2008. The theoretical foundation of the relative F approach is based on a simple rearrangement of the Baranov catch equation (Ricker 1975, page 13, equation 1.17) with respect to F:

$$F = \text{Harvest} / \text{Mean Stock Size}, \quad (2)$$

where: mean relative stock size in equation 2 is typically expressed as the average of relative abundance indices in years t and t+1. In this analysis, RelFt estimates were based on the ratio of coast-wide annual (commercial and recreational landings plus discards) landings (numbers) of ages 1+ weakfish in year t (Catchnt) to the corresponding blended weakfish relative abundance index (WkNt, WkNt+1) in year t and t+1:

$$\text{RelFnt} = \text{Catchnt} / [(\text{WkNt} + \text{WkNt+1})/2]. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) is very similar to the equation introduced earlier by Sinclair (1998) except that he used relative exploitation:

$$\text{Relu} = \text{Catchnt} / \text{RelNt} \quad (4)$$

In this analysis, average (ages 1+) relative fishing mortality rates in weight and number

(RelFnt and RelFwt) (Table C8.2-4) were estimated from 1981 to 2008 via equation (3). RelFwt values were expressed by the ratio of annual total coast-wide (commercial and recreational plus discards) weakfish landings in weight (Catchw, mt) to the blended relative abundance indices in weight (WkWt) (Table C8.2-4). The 1981-2007 coast-wide weakfish landings (Catchn) in numbers ( $N \times 1000$ ) and weight (Catchw) of age 1+ fish were taken directly from age aggregate landings data. The 2008 recreational landings and discard estimates are available from the MRFSS, but the 2008 commercial landings and discard estimates are not yet available. To estimate total commercial and recreational landings and discards (Catchn, Catchw) indirectly in 2008, the 2008 recreational landings were divided by the average ratio of recreational landings to total landings in 2006 and 2007. The same ratio approach was also used to estimate total weakfish discards in 2008.

The relative F estimates from equation 3 do not consider temporal and spatial shifts in the age structure, so this approach is designed only to address average annual shifts in ages 1+ F across time (1981-2008). Thus, the RelFt values are uninformative about year-class and age-specific changes in F over the time series. The strength of the relative F method, however, is in its simplicity and intuitive appeal, allowing scientists to evaluate the relative accuracy of tuning indices and how they might affect the magnitude and trend in F estimates. Most importantly, since RelFt estimates are expressed as a ratio of annual harvest to mean relative abundance, the trends in relative F are not confounded by the often untested assumption of constant natural mortality ( $M = 0.25$ ) used explicitly to derive F estimates ( $F = Z - 0.25$ ) in the ADAPT and Forward Projection models.

The next step in this analysis was to transform the ages 1+ relative fishing mortality rates (RelFnt and RelFwt) from 1981 to 2008 into units of instantaneous fishing mortality (F). This transformation was based on two scalars consisting of the average ratios of F to relative F (RelFnt, RelFwt) across some known time period. The instantaneous fishing mortality (F) rates used for scaling were taken directly from the 2009 ADAPT runs that was configured with tuning indices from the Delaware and New Jersey trawl surveys and North Carolina gillnet survey, as well as from the recreational cpue indices. Since a severe retrospective bias in F was present for all ADAPT runs during recent years (2004-2007), a block of annual F (ages 1+) from 1982 to 1985 was chosen for scaling because the magnitude and trend in F estimates from the converged portion of the model were robust to changes to the tuning indices in ADAPT model runs. Finally, since ages 1+ F estimates for weakfish based on ADAPT were derived assuming a constant natural mortality ( $F = Z - 0.25$ ) across all ages and years, it was assumed that the chosen M of 0.25 on ages 1+ weakfish was a reasonable approximation of average natural mortality over a narrow period (from 1982 to 1985), without having to make the more problematic assumption that M was fixed over the entire (1982-2007) time series.

The first scalar used to transform relative weighted F in numbers (RelFnt) to units of instantaneous F (FNt) consisted of the ratio between the long-term (1982-1985) average numbers weighted F from the most recent ADAPT VPA ( $F_{vpa} = 0.58$ ,  $Se = 0.07$ ) for ages 1+ and the corresponding (1982-1985) RelFn values (Table C8.2-5). The resulting scalar for converting RelFn in numbers to units of FN was 0.0000067. The second scalar from the same ADAPT run was used to convert relative biomass weighted F (RelFw) estimates into units of instantaneous biomass weighted fishing mortality (FWt) (Table C8.2-5). This second scalar consisted of the average biomass weighted F estimates (ages 1+) from 1982 to 1985 ( $F_{vpa} = 0.89$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ). The resulting scalar used to convert RelFw to units of FW was 0.000024. The time series (1981-2008) of fishing mortality (F) rates in weight (FW) and number (FN) (Table C8.2-4) were derived by multiplying the annual relative fishing rates (RelFn, RelFw) by the corresponding fixed scalar.

### C8.2.3 Stock Biomass and Surplus Production

Average stock biomass (Biowt, mt) and average stock numbers (Biont\*1000) of ages 1+ weakfish were estimated from 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-6). The biomass series (Biowt) was derived by dividing the annual coast-wide weakfish harvest and discards in mt (Catchw) (Table C8.2-4) by the average biomass weighted F on age 1+ weakfish (FWt). The coast-wide number of weakfish (Biont) was determined by dividing coast-wide harvest in numbers and discards (Catchn) by the corresponding ages 1+ F in numbers (FNt) (Table C8.2-6).

A time series (1981-2008) of surplus production estimates in year t (SURPt) was also derived (Table C8.2-6). As in Jacobson et al (2002) and more recently in Walters et al (2008), the SURPt values were expressed each year by subtracting weakfish biomass in year t (Biowt) from the biomass in year t+1 (Biowt+1), and then adding the coast-wide harvest (mt) (Catchw):

$$\text{SURPt} = \text{Biowt}+1 - \text{Biowt} + \text{Catchw}. \quad (5)$$

To examine whether or not overfishing has adversely affected weakfish surplus production (SURPt), the average (ages 1+) biomass weighted F estimates (FWt) lagged one year (t-1) (Table C8.2-4) were linearly regressed against surplus production (SURPt) from 1981 to 2008. If overfishing has recently occurred, the slope of the regression should be negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ).

## C8.3 RESULTS

### C8.3.1 Scaled Fishing Mortality (F)

Biomass weighted fishing mortality (FWt) estimates on ages 1+ weakfish were high (FWt range: 0.69- 1.16) by most standards from 1981 to 1987 (Table C8.2-4). The magnitude of FWt estimates, however, rose even higher to beyond 1.0 from 1988 to 1991 (Table C8.2-4, Figure C8.3-1), and greatly exceeded our current overfishing threshold for weakfish ( $F_{msy} = 0.53$ ). The magnitude of FWt estimates declined steadily thereafter to below 0.60 in most years from 2000 to 2008. The ages 1+ fishing mortality rates weighted by number (FNt) were almost always lower in magnitude than the corresponding biomass weighted fishing rates (FWt) (Table C8.2-4, Figure C8.3-1). The ages 1+ FNt estimates from 1981 to 2008 followed a similar trend over time as the biomass weighted FWt estimates (Table C8.2-4), but unlike the biomass weighted fishing rates (FWt), the FNt estimates fell abruptly after 1991 and remained below 0.30 from 1993 to 2008.

Weakfish biomass levels (Biow) have exhibited wide contrast from 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-6, Figure C8.3-2). Weakfish ages 1+ biomass (Biow, mt) remained relatively high (14,200 and 41,500 mt) from 1981 to 1988 but biomass levels fell steadily to below 10,000 mt from 1989 to 1993 (Table C8.2-6). Weakfish coast-wide biomass rose again temporarily from 1994 to 1996, but weakfish biomass fell steadily thereafter to the lowest level in the time series in 2008 (1,333 mt).

The time series of weakfish surplus production (SURPt) from 1981 to 2008 followed the same general trend as stock biomass (Biow) (Table C8.2-6, Figure C8.3-2). Weakfish surplus production remained relatively high from 1982 to 1986 and again in 1993 and 1994 (Table C8.2-6), but SURPt levels fell steadily after 1995 and remained very low in most years from 2001 to 2008 despite relatively low and stable fishing mortality (Figure C8.3-1). The unexpected drop in weakfish surplus production after 1999 coincided with, and may be attributed to, a sharp rise in the abundance of two potential predators: striped bass and spiny dogfish. (Figures C8.3-3 and C8.3-4). Since the

time series of striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance is highly correlated over time (Pearson  $r = 0.87$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ), there is no way to statistically separate their potential predatory effects on weakfish. As a result, a scaled and blended index of striped bass and dogfish abundance (Tpred) (Figure C8.3-4) was developed and used instead of individual striped bass and spiny dogfish indices in the investigation of trophic linkages to weakfish stock dynamics (section C9.0)

#### **C8.4 Management and Scientific Implications**

Like virtually all single-species stock assessments conducted along the Atlantic coast, natural mortality (M) of age 1+ weakfish was initially assumed to be constant ( $M = 0.25$ ) in previous Yield-per-Recruit and VPA model runs. Results from the index-based analysis indicated that ages 1+ F estimates remained low and steady from 1999 to 2008 despite a systematic rise in ages 1+ total mortality (Z) after 1998 as indicated by ADAPT. These conflicting trends between Z and F strongly suggest that natural mortality (M) has recently risen systematically (Figure C8.4-1), and was therefore the primary cause for the recent weakfish stock failure along the Atlantic coast. The management consequences of assuming a fixed M when the annual M values actually rises systematically over time can be serious (Swain and Chouinard 2008). As noted in this weakfish assessment, by holding M constant, the resulting ages 1+ fishing mortality rates (F) on weakfish would have exceeded 1.40 in recent years based on the 2009 VPA run despite the recent precipitous drop in landings and tuning indices. If the constant M assumption and ensuing VPA results were accepted without qualification, we would have concluded falsely that the recent failure in weakfish productivity was due to overfishing. In future assessments here and elsewhere, the assumption of constant M for ages 1+ fish needs to be critically examined. In addition, the impacts of trophic and environmental effects on exploited finfish stocks should be integrated into fisheries models and rigorously tested as a potential alternative hypothesis to the overfishing hypothesis.

**C9.0 Evaluate testing of fishing and additional trophic and environmental covariates and modeling of hypotheses using biomass dynamic models featuring multiple indices blended into a single index with and without a Steele-Henderson (Type III) predator-prey extension. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice. (TOR #5)**

#### **C9.1 INTRODUCTION**

Our ability to assess the current status of Atlantic coast weakfish has been continually plagued by a pronounced retrospective bias associated with all previous ADAPT model runs. Previous ADAPT runs made with trawl-based tuning indices (Kahn et al 2006) exhibited severe retrospective bias that underestimated F and overestimated stock size in the most recent years by as much as 80%. The degree of retrospective bias from ADAPT was so severe that the results gave the false impression that weakfish stock size had actually risen to record high levels by 2002 despite the presence of record low coast-wide landings after 1999. Such a large systematic bias greatly confounds our ability to determine whether or not weakfish abundance has fallen and whether or not the stock is overfished. The degree of retrospective bias from ADAPT was reduced to some extent when the model was tuned specifically to recreational catch-effort data from the MRFSS (Kahn et al

2006).

Because of the aforementioned limitations to the catch-at-age approach, the 2006 Assessment (Kahn et al 2006, Uphoff 2006a; Crecco 2006) relied primarily on an index-based (ages 1+) method to monitor temporal changes in weakfish biomass (mt) and fishing mortality (F) from 1981 to 2003. This index-based approach was used to update ages 1+ F and stock biomass estimates through 2008.

The index-based analysis for weakfish is described in detail in section **C8.0** of this assessment and was used as the foundation for the following biomass dynamic analyses. Many of the tables and figures presented in section **C8.0** are referred to within this section.

Results from the last assessment (Kahn et al 2006) revealed that overfishing ( $F > F_{msy}$ ) had occurred on weakfish from about 1981 to 1991. As a result, more stringent regulations were imposed on the weakfish recreational and commercial fisheries in 1992 and 1993 after which fishing mortality (F) rates fell to well below  $F_{msy}$  from 1996 to 2003. Following a drop in F, coast-wide weakfish abundance initially rose from 1992 until about 1998, but stock size dropped unexpectedly thereafter to the lowest levels in the time series by 2007 despite low and stable fishing mortality (F) rates during this period. Because F levels were low after 1999, other studies (Crecco 2006; Uphoff 2006a) have begun to find evidence that linked enhanced striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) predation to the decline in weakfish productivity after 1998. Striped bass abundance along the Atlantic coast has risen to record high levels after 1998 (Nelson 2007) coincident with the recent failure in weakfish productivity. Larger (> 50 cm) striped bass are known to consume a wide variety of finfish prey including weakfish (Overton et al 2008; Hartman and Brandt 1995; Walter and Austin 2003), and striped bass are known to overlap the temporal and spatial distribution of weakfish north of Cape Hatteras NC (Rudershausen et al 2005). Since predation is generally regarded as a major force structuring marine fish communities (Bax 1991), the age aggregated Steele and Henderson (1984) (S-H) production model was updated through 2008 to further examine the joint effects of fishing and predation on Atlantic coast weakfish. Also, to provide a more thorough examination of the hypothesis of increased predation on weakfish, additional candidate predators such as spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*), bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) and summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*) were also considered, especially since all three finfish predators have risen sharply inshore along the Atlantic coast after 1998. Finally, environmental disturbances have been proposed as a major process governing finfish production and recruitment (Hollowed et al 2000b), so environmental factors such as decadal shifts in mean sea surface water temperature and deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation Index were also examined as potential explanatory variables.

The following analysis focuses on the direct interaction between potential predators and weakfish and is hereafter referred to as the “predation hypothesis” to distinguish it from the more indirect “forage hypothesis” presented in section **C10.0**.

## **C9.2 METHODS**

### *C9.2.1 Recreational Abundance Index*

As described in section **C8.2**, a weakfish relative abundance index in numbers (RelNt) was developed annually from 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-1) as a recreational catch-effort ratio:

$$\text{RelNt} = \text{MIDN} / \text{Effort}. \quad (1)$$

### C9.2.2 Relative Fishing Mortality (RelFt) and Scaled F Estimates

In this analysis, relative fishing mortality estimates (RelFt) were derived on ages 1+ weakfish from 1981 to 2008. The theoretical foundation of the relative F approach is based on a simple rearrangement of the Baranov catch equation (Ricker 1975, page 13, equation 1.17) with respect to F:

$$F = \text{Harvest} / \text{Mean Stock Size}, \quad (2)$$

where: mean relative stock size in equation 2 is typically expressed as the average of relative abundance indices in years t and t+1. In this analysis, RelFt estimates were based on the ratio of coast-wide annual (commercial and recreational landings plus discards) landings (numbers) of ages 1+ weakfish in year t (Catchnt) to the corresponding blended weakfish relative abundance index (WkNt, WkNt+1) in year t and t+1:

$$\text{RelFnt} = \text{Catchnt} / [(\text{WkNt} + \text{WkNt+1})/2]. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) is very similar to the equation introduced earlier by Sinclair (1998) except that he used relative exploitation:

$$\text{Relu} = \text{Catchnt} / \text{RelNt} \quad (4)$$

Additional description of these methods and equations is presented in section C8.2 of this report.

### C9.2.3 Stock Biomass and Surplus Production

Average stock biomass (Biowt, mt) and average stock numbers (Biont\*1000) of ages 1+ weakfish were estimated from 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-6). The biomass series (Biowt) was derived by dividing the annual coast-wide weakfish harvest and discards in mt (Catchw) (Table C8.2-4) by the average biomass weighted F on age 1+ weakfish (FWt). The coast-wide number of weakfish (Biont) was determined by dividing coast-wide harvest in numbers and discards (Catchn) by the corresponding ages 1+ F in numbers (FNt) (Table C8.2-6).

A time series (1981-2008) of surplus production estimates in year t (SURPt) was also derived (Table C8.2-6). As in Jacobson et al (2002) and more recently in Walters et al (2008), the SURPt values were expressed each year by subtracting weakfish biomass in year t (Biowt) from the biomass in year t+1 (Biowt+1), and then adding the coast-wide harvest (mt) (Catchw):

$$\text{SURPt} = \text{Biowt+1} - \text{Biowt} + \text{Catchw}. \quad (5)$$

Additional description of these methods and equations is presented in section C8.2 of this report.

### C9.2.4 Overfishing Thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy)

Surplus production estimates have been used to monitor trends in per capita stock productivity for many exploited finfish populations (Jacobson et al 2002). Walters et al (2008) noted that few stock assessments conducted thus far have examined the temporal trends in surplus production against biomass and how these trends may relate to the degree of density dependence and to the presence of enhanced trophic and environmental effects. Having a time series (1981-2008) of

weakfish surplus production (SURPt) and ages 1+ stock biomass in year t (Biowt) (Table C8.2-6), updated  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds were estimated for weakfish using the dynamic Gompertz external surplus production model (Quinn and Deriso 1999; Jacobson et al 2002). The Gompertz form was selected over the more widely used logistics equation because Yoshimoto and Clarke (1993) reported that, under simulation conditions, the Gompertz model produced more realistic (positive) and stable overfishing thresholds than the logistics model. In the asymmetrical Gompertz model, surplus production estimates (SURPt) from 1981-2008 were regressed against weakfish biomass (Biowt) and the product of the log weakfish biomass and biomass (LogBiowt\*Biowt) in a two variable linear regression model without a y-axis intercept:

$$\text{SURPt} = a * \text{Biowt} + b * [(\text{LogBiowt}) * \text{Biowt}], \quad (6)$$

where:  $K$  – theoretical carrying capacity (mt) =  $\exp(a / b)$ ;  
 $MSY$ - maximum sustainable yield (mt) =  $(-b * K) / 2.72$ ;  
 $B_{msy}$  – stock size (mt) at  $MSY = K / 2.72$ ;  
 $F_{msy}$  – instantaneous fishing mortality at  $MSY = MSY / B_{msy}$ ;  
 $F_{coll}$  – instantaneous fishing mortality at stock collapse =  $F_{msy} * 2.72$ .

Surplus production and stock biomass estimates are often plagued by moderate to high measurement errors (Quinn and Deriso 1999). For this reason, the Gompertz model (equation 6) was fitted as a linear robust regression model using the least trimmed squares regression (LTS) objective function as recommended by Rousseeuw and Van Driessen (2000). The parameter estimates (a, b) and resulting reference points ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $N_{msy}$ ,  $F_{coll}$ ) from the production model (equation 6) were derived from the ROBUSTREG procedure contained in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS 2002). The parameter estimates (a, b) and their standard errors based on least squares (LS) are highly prone to the presence of outliers. With robust linear regression like LTS, outlying observations are identified and automatically down-weighted, resulting in higher precision and more robust parameter estimates (a, b) over those derived from ordinary least squares.

In all model runs with equation 6, residual plots were examined against time (year) to check for the presence of serial correlations. A serial correlation in the residuals would suggest model misspecification, implying that additional biotic and abiotic factors other than fishing may be affecting weakfish surplus production (equation 6). To test for potential joint effects of fishing (F), environmental and trophic variables on weakfish surplus production, additional explanatory variable were added to equation 6 such as striped bass, bluefish, summer flounder and spiny dogfish abundance in a stepwise multiple regression (see section below for details). In these multiple regression models, residual plots across time were also examined to detect for the presence of serial correlations in the residuals. If enhanced predation is adversely affecting weakfish surplus production, the extended production models with predation effects should generate more precise parameter estimates (a, b) in equation (6) and more importantly, the residual plots should exhibit little if any serial correlation over time.

### C9.2.5 Screening for Potential Trophic and Environmental Effects

There is a vast array of potential finfish predators that could prey on weakfish and thus undermine weakfish surplus production and stock size in recent years. Due to the recent and unexpected drop in weakfish stock size since 1999 under relatively low ( $F < 0.32$ ) fishing mortality (Kahn et al 2006), other factors such as enhanced predation or temporal shifts in environmental



factors may have both played a measurable role in the recent decline in weakfish productivity. In this report, a predation hypothesis was tested for weakfish based on the potential trophic interactions among weakfish, and one or more candidate finfish predators. To be included as a candidate predator in this analysis, each potential finfish predator must overlap the temporal and spatial distribution of weakfish, have a documented history of consuming weakfish and, most importantly, the relative abundance of the candidate predators must have been at high abundance during some portion of the time series (1981-2007) in which weakfish abundance is being evaluated. Four finfish predators including striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*), bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) and summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*) were considered as candidate predators on weakfish, especially since all four have risen sharply inshore along the Atlantic coast after 1998. Bluefish, striped bass, summer flounder and spiny dogfish are major inshore finfish predators that have recently risen sharply in abundance along the Atlantic coast coincident with the drop in weakfish productivity. Moreover, these finfish predators overlap the spatial and temporal distribution of weakfish, and all are considered, to some extent, as potential candidate predators on weakfish (Overton et al 2008; Latour et al 2007; Bowman et al 2000). Uphoff (2003) has hypothesized that the predator-prey interaction between striped bass and Atlantic menhaden (*Brevoortia tyrannus*) may play an important role on the degree to which striped bass may have recently switched prey preference from menhaden to weakfish. For this reason, a time series (1981-2007) of menhaden abundance was also included as an additional explanatory variable in the stepwise regressions. Striped bass is regarded as a voracious predator from the Mid and North Atlantic on menhaden, gizzard shad and herring (Hartman 1993). Larger (> 70 cm) striped bass, however, have been reported to eat spot, flounder and weakfish in Chesapeake Bay (Overton et al 2008; Hartman and Brandt 1995; Walter and Austin 2003). A recent study in Chesapeake Bay (Latour et al 2007) reported that medium to large (> 38 cm) summer flounder fed extensively on ages 0 and 1 weakfish. Bluefish and spiny dogfish also prey upon a variety of finfishes including weakfish throughout the Atlantic coast (Bowman et al 2000; Stehlik 2007).

Annual coast-wide abundance of striped bass (ages 8+) in numbers (Table C9.2-1) has been estimated from 1981 to 2006 by the Statistical Catch-at-Age Model (SCAM) (Nelson 2007). Since the striped bass VPA underestimates recent (2004-2006) stock size estimates, a second time series (1981-2008) of coast-wide striped bass abundance (mean catch/trip) was derived as a ratio of striped bass recreational catch from the MRFSS private boat sector to private boat fishing effort (trips) within the Mid and North Atlantic sub-regions (Kahn 2007). This recreational time series is believed to be very informative about trends in coast-wide striped bass abundance since the MRFSS indices were highly correlated to ages 8+ abundance from the converged portion (1982-2001) of SCAM. For this reason, the MRFSS relative abundance indices were scaled to units of ages 8+ striped bass abundance from SCAM and used to reflect striped bass abundance in all subsequent analyses. Annual abundance changes in spiny dogfish, summer flounder and bluefish from 1981 to 2007 were indexed here as catch/trip based on the coast-wide recreational catches in number (A, B1, B2) and coast-wide effort (trips) from the private boat fishery in the MRFSS surveys (Table C9.2-1). These trends in coast-wide recreational cpue of summer flounder, dogfish and bluefish were assumed to be informative about coast-wide trends in these stocks from 1981 to 2008. A time series (1981-2005) of ages 1+ menhaden abundance (numbers) (Table C9.2-1) was taken from the most recent menhaden stock assessment (ASMFC 2006b).

Pearson correlation ( $r$ ) and stepwise multiple regression models were used to screen for several key biotic and abiotic factors that may be linked statistically ( $P < 0.05$ ) to changes in weakfish surplus production (SURPt) as well as to changes in the blended coast-wide biomass

indices (**WkWt**) 1981 to 2008 (Table C8.2-3). To examine whether surplus production and weakfish relative abundance may be linked to trophic and environmental factors, each of the response variables was related to the time series of the four candidate finfish predators (striped bass, spiny dogfish, summer flounder and bluefish) on weakfish (Table C9.2-1) and two environmental variables (deviations in the mean sea surface water temperature and deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation index (NAO)) in the stepwise regression models. Annual deviations in the winter NAO indices from 1981 to 2008 (Table C9.2-1) were taken from the NOAA web site reported in Collie et al (2008). A time series (1976-2008) of average summer (July-September) sea surface water temperatures (C) was taken from a continuous temperature recorder in Long Island Sound located at the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Waterford CT (Table C9.2-1). Temperature effects in the stepwise model (equation 1) were expressed as annual deviations from the long-term (1981-1998) mean temperature (devtemp) recorded prior to 1999.

Since enhanced predation should negatively impact weakfish productivity, the stepwise model selected a candidate predator when the slope (b) for predation effects is negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). The stepwise regression models were run in SAS (SAS 2002) using the PROC REG procedure. Temperature effects in the stepwise model (equation 1) were expressed as annual deviations from the long-term (1976-1998) mean temperature (devtemp) recorded prior to 1999. In addition, deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) index (**Environj**) from 1981 to 2008 (Table C9.2-1) was also included as a potential explanatory variable in a stepwise linear regression model:

$$\text{WkNt} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} * \text{FWt} + \mathbf{c} * (\text{Pred}, \text{Environj}). \quad (7)$$

Unlike enhanced predatory effects that are assumed to be negative on weakfish surplus production, climatic effects such as rising sea surface temperature could have a positive or negative impact on weakfish productivity. Climatic disturbances (**Environj**) in the form of a decadal rise in water temperature have been proposed as a major process restructuring ecological systems in southern New England (Oviatt 2004). A rise in temperature may cause stress and direct mortality or perhaps alter the competitive advantage of weakfish with other finfishes, thereby restructuring the inshore finfish community. Temporal changes in the NAO are thought to influence wind fields and levels of precipitation over the North Atlantic, thus affecting finfish larval drift, their subsequent recruitment and ecosystem productivity (Collie et al 2008).

There has been a coast-wide commercial and recreational fishery on weakfish for at least a hundred years (Kahn et al 2006). Thus, the time series (1981-2008) of ages 1+ biomass weighted (FWt) fishing mortality rates (Table C8.2-4) was also included as an explanatory variable in the weakfish stepwise (equation 7) regression models. Since an assessment of fishing effects on weakfish is an important priority, fishing mortality was always included (INCLUDE statement in PROC REG procedure) in the stepwise regression models regardless of its level of statistical significance. If fishing mortality effects on weakfish is excessive, the slope for fishing mortality effect will be negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ).

Statistical support for the predation and environmental hypotheses would be evident if the slope (c) for predation and environmental effects in equation (7) was negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). This would imply that enhanced trophic and environmental factors have eroded weakfish abundance and surplus production independently of fishery effects. Moreover, if the slope for predation effects is significant, the inclusion of an extra predation term in the Gompertz model (equation 6) can greatly enhance the precision around the (a) and (b) parameters, thus

allowing more precise estimates of  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds. To test for potential joint effects of fishing (F) and trophic interactions on weakfish productivity, residual plots against time were examined for the presence of serial correlations. As a result, a negative and statistically significant slope estimate in equation 8 would imply enhanced predation effects on weakfish surplus production. To test for potential joint effects of fishing (F) and trophic interactions on weakfish productivity, residual plots across time were derived for each production model with and without predation. If predation is an important variable, the plot of residuals from the Gompertz models without predation terms (equation 6) should exhibit a pronounced serial correlation over time, indicating model misspecification. By contrast, the residuals from production models that include predation effects (equation 6) should exhibit no serial correlation over time.

#### *C9.2.6 Age 0 Mortality*

One major problem in quantifying predation or other environmental effects on weakfish is pinpointing the life history period where the highest predation risk takes place. A temporal shift in predation mortality can occur across many weakfish ages (ages 0+) or may be confined mainly to a single age group (i. e. age 0 mortality). Since age 0 weakfish rarely exceed 18 cm TL, juvenile weakfish are particularly at risk to an array of potential finfish predators. Several recent predation studies (Beck 1997; Wahle 2003) have shown that a systematic rise in mortality during the juvenile stage may produce a demographic bottleneck that can constrict the flow of recruitment to older ages. If this bottleneck is severe and persists over time, prey abundance will eventually cascade downward, resulting in a stock collapse emanating from the youngest to the oldest ages (i. e. bottom-up effect). To examine whether or not a demographic bottleneck has occurred for age 0 weakfish, a time series of relative weakfish juvenile mortality ( $Z_0$ ) was derived for the 1981 to 2006 year-classes. The  $Z_0$  estimate by year-class was expressed by a log ratio between coast-wide age 1 abundance ( $N_{1t+1}$ ) in year  $t+1$  to the mean coast-wide juvenile abundance index ( $N_{0t}$ ) in year  $t$ :

$$Z_0 = - \log (N_{1t+1} / N_{0t}). \quad (8)$$

Weakfish juvenile abundance surveys ( $N_0$ ) have been conducted along the Atlantic coast from Rhode Island to North Carolina from 1981-2007 (Table C9.2-2). Eight juvenile surveys (Table C9.2-28) were used to construct average coast-wide juvenile indices ( $N_0$ ) from 1981 to 2007. Details of the various surveys are presented in section C6.0. Note that juvenile weakfish indices are not yet available in 2008. The abundance indices were expressed as the geometric mean catch per tow, resulting in indices of varying magnitude. As a result, before the indices from the eight surveys were combined into a coast-wide average index ( $N_0$ ), the relative abundance values for each survey had to be standardized to equivalent abundance units. Equivalent units were established in a three-step process. First, the long-term (1982-2007) geometric mean abundance index was derived annually for the recruitment time series of each of the nine surveys. Second, a scalar for each data set was derived as a ratio of the long-term average index to the long-term average New Jersey index. Each annual index from each data set was then multiplied times the respective scalar, thereby transforming the magnitude of the eight indices into units of the New Jersey indices (Table C9.2-2). Finally, the coast-wide geometric mean index ( $N_0$ ) was derived as the grand mean across the scaled indices from 1982-2004 (Table C9.2-3).

A time series (1982-2007) of weakfish age 1 abundance (in millions of fish) used in the numerator of equation (8) was taken directly from the preferred 2009 ADAPT VPA model run (Table C9.2-3). The  $N_1$  estimates were derived independently of the relative juvenile abundance

estimates (Table C9.2-2) since none of the juvenile indices were used to tune the VPA. Note that the juvenile abundance indices in the denominator of equation (8) are expressed in relative units so that the juvenile total mortality rates (Z0) are expressed as relative mortality estimates. Also, note that the current VPA generated age 1 abundance estimates (t+1) for the 1981 to 2006 year-classes during the years 1982 to 2007. The age 1 abundance (N1) values from the VPA were larger than the coast-wide juvenile index (Table C9.2-2) resulting in some negative values of mortality (Z0) via equation (8a). To generate positive juvenile mortality rates (Z0), all age 1 abundance data (N1) were reduced in magnitude by dividing N1 by an arbitrary value of 100.0.

To examine the hypothesis that the recent emergence of a recruitment bottleneck between age 0 and age 1 was linked to shifts in trophic and environmental factors, a time series of candidate predators such as striped bass, bluefish and spiny dogfish and summer flounder abundance (Table C9.2-1) were included as explanatory variables in a stepwise regression where the time series of Z0 estimates was the response variable (Table C9.2-3). In addition, environmental variables such as mean summer sea surface water temperature and deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) index (envirom term) from 1981 to 2007 (Table C9.2-1) were also considered as additional explanatory variables in the stepwise model. Finally, a recent rise in juvenile mortality (Z0) could be due to a rise in weakfish discards from the commercial and recreational fisheries. To test this hypothesis, the annual contribution of fishing mortality due to discards number (Fdisn) was derived as the fraction of annual discards in number to total weakfish landings in number times the current numbers weighted F (FN) (Table C8.2-4). The time series (1981-2007) of Fdisn estimates were included in the stepwise model as a final explanatory variable.

#### *C9.2.7 Stock-Recruitment Effects*

In this report, the shape and residual pattern of the weakfish stock-recruitment (S-R) relationship was explored with the Ricker (1975) model:

$$\text{Rec0} = A * \text{Biow} * \exp(B * \text{Biow}), \quad (9)$$

where: A = the magnitude of compensatory reserve;

B = the coefficient of compensatory density-dependent mortality;

Rec0 = blended coast-wide index of weakfish age 0 recruits (Table C9.2-3);

Biow = average weakfish biomass (mt) (Table C8.2-6).

The parameter estimates (A, B) from the S-R model (equation 9) were derived from the NLIN procedure (Marquardt Algorithm) contained in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS 2002).

Given the likely presence of outliers in the S-R data, the Ricker S-R model was fitted as a nonlinear robust regression using the iterative reweighted least squares method outlined by Holland and Welsch (1978). The algorithm and rationale for this approach is described in SAS (2002). This re-weighting scheme is designed to detect outliers, thereby allowing the down weighting of S-R data from certain years in the model where model residuals, regardless of direction, exceeded a previously defined threshold level. As indicated by Holland and Welsch (1978), the choice of a threshold is subjective and always represents a trade-off between minimizing the variances around the parameters (A, Kp) and at the same time generating globally converged parameter estimates. As suggested by Holland and Welsch (1978), a range of threshold estimates was used initially and the final threshold value was selected that satisfied the trade-off between global convergence of all parameter estimates and parameter estimates with maximum precision and minimum variance. The

two-step re-weighting approach always produced converged estimates (global estimates) that were within 10% of the parameter estimates (A, K<sub>p</sub>) derived by the nonlinear least squares approach. However, the standard errors about the estimates based on iterative re-weighting were always 30 to 45% lower than the standard errors from the least squares method.

To examine for potential predatory and environmental effects on the weakfish S-R model, the nonlinear Ricker S-R model (equation 9) was linearized and included in the stepwise model that included an additional exponent (c) reflecting potential predation (pred) and environmental (environ) effects:

$$\text{Log (Rec0/Biow)} = A * \text{Biow} * \exp(B * \text{Biow}) * \exp(c * \text{pred, environ}). \quad (10)$$

As in the surplus production analyses, potential explanatory variables included striped bass, summer flounder, bluefish and spiny dogfish abundance (Table C9.2-1) as well as environmental variables (environ) including annual sea surface water temperature and deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) index (Table C9.2-1). Statistical evidence consistent with predation would exist if additional exponents (c) for predation effects in equation (10) were negative and statistically significant (P < 0.05). Further statistical support for the predation hypotheses would be evident, if the serial correlation in residuals evident in the basic Ricker S-R model (equation 9) was minimized following the addition of predation effects to the linearized S-R model (equation 10).

#### *C9.2.8 Steele-Henderson (S-H) Production Model*

The last weakfish assessment (Kahn et al 2006) reported statistical evidence of a strong linkage between enhanced striped bass predation and the recent unexpected decline in coast-wide weakfish. As a result, the age aggregated Steele-Henderson (S-H) production model (Steele and Henderson 1984) was updated to link fishing and predation effects to the recent drop in weakfish productivity. The S-H model has extensive theoretical appeal since it incorporates the compensatory stock dynamics of the prey (weakfish) with fishing effects, plus a sigmoid foraging response by the predatory finfish that may lead to critical depensation at low prey abundance (Spencer and Collie 1997b). The Steele-Henderson (S-H) model incorporates compensatory stock dynamics of the prey with fishing effects plus a sigmoid type III functional response by the predator. The Type III response adds a degree of realism to the model since it may lead to either prey stability at low to intermediate predator abundance, or to critical depensation of the prey at low prey abundance (Spencer and Collie 1997b; Collie and DeLong 1999). The age aggregated Steele-Henderson (S-H) production model was used to estimate equilibrium and time varying overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $N_{msy}$ ) for weakfish in the presence of a significant (P < 0.05) predatory response. The S-H model assumes the existence of compensatory density-dependent mortality for finfish populations, a position widely held by most fish population ecologists (Wahle 2003). All of the weakfish population dynamics processes (somatic growth, natural mortality and recruitment) in the S-H model are subsumed in the intrinsic rate of population increase (r) and to a lesser extent in the carrying capacity (K) parameters. Like all production models, successful fitting (precise and robust parameter estimates) of the S-H model requires a high degree of contrast in the time series (1981-2007) of stock sizes. The S-H model was originally configured as a logistics production model with an added sigmoid function that reflected the foraging response by the predator. Previous simulation studies (Yoshimoto and Clarke 1993) have indicated that the Gompertz asymmetrical model produced more realistic (positive values of  $F_{msy}$ ) and robust parameter estimates than the logistics model. As a result, the surplus production portion of the S-H model was converted from the logistics to the

Gompertz form:

$$\text{Biowt}+1 = \text{Biowt} + \log(K) * r * \text{Biowt} * (1 - (\log(\text{Biowt}) / \log(K))) - \text{Catchw} - \frac{(c * \text{Pred} * (\text{Biowt})^{**2})}{(A^{**2} + (\text{Biowt})^{**2})} \quad (11)$$

where: **Biowt+1** = weakfish stock biomass (mt) in year t+1 (Table C8.2-6);

**Biowt** = weakfish stock biomass (mt) in year t (Table C8.2-6);

**Pred** = abundance of the selected predator during year t (Table C9.2-1);

**Catchw** = harvest and discards (mt) of weakfish in year t (Table C8.2-4);

**K** = estimated carrying capacity of weakfish biomass;

**r** = intrinsic rate of weakfish population increase;

**c** = per capita consumption rate of the predator;

**A** = weakfish biomass (mt) at which predator satiation takes place.

All parameter estimates (r, K, c and A) from the S-H model (equation 11) were derived from the NLIN procedure (marquardt algorithm) contained in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS 2002).

The S-H model was fitted to weakfish biomass (Biowt, Biowt+1) (Table C8.2-6) and the abundance of one or more predators (Pred) by nonlinear least squares regression methods. The choice of one or more predators in equation (9) depends on the outcome of the stepwise regression procedure. Given the likely presence of measurement errors in the input data, the S-H model was fitted as a nonlinear robust regression using the iterative reweighted least squares method outlined by Holland and Welsch (1978).

As indicated by Spencer and Collie (1997b), the S-H model (equation 11) represents the merger of two models; one is a conventional Gompertz discrete time dynamic production model with only fishing effects (Catchw) present:

$$\text{Biowt}+1 = \text{Biowt} + \log(K) * r * \text{Biowt} * (1 - (\log(\text{Biowt}) / \log(K))) - \text{Catchw} \quad (12)$$

whereas the other model expresses additional predatory effects via the Type III functional response:

$$\frac{(c * \text{Pred} * (\text{Biowt})^2)}{(A^2 + (\text{Biowt})^2)} \quad (13)$$

To more fully examine whether or not fishing mortality ( $F_t$ ) alone might account for the systematic decline in weakfish abundance, the discrete time Gompertz portion (equation 12) of the full S-H model (equation 11) was fitted separately to weakfish stock sizes (Biowt, Biowt+1) from 1981 to 2007 using nonlinear robust regression methods. If fishing effects are largely responsible for the current decline in weakfish, the predicted stocks sizes should closely follow the observed abundances (high coefficient of determination), the resulting parameter estimates (r, K) from the discrete Gompertz model (equation 12) should differ significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) from zero, and the resulting equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  threshold estimate (r) should at least approximate previous  $F_{msy}$  estimates for weakfish based on previous stock assessment (Kahn et al 2006). If the discrete time model fails in this regard, then the full S-H model with predation effects (equation 11) was then applied to

determine whether or not the extended model could fulfill all three of the aforementioned requirements.

Uphoff (2006) noted that if the predation parameter estimates ( $c$ ,  $A$ ) from the S-H model are sufficiently robust and precise, then a time series of weakfish biomass consumed ( $Dt$  in mt) annually by predation ( $Pred$ ) can be derived in the form:

$$Dt = [(c * Pred * (Biowt)^2) / (A^2 + (Biowt)^2)] \quad (14)$$

Once ( $Dt$ ) is estimated via equation (14), the weakfish instantaneous consumption rate associated with predation ( $Mpt$ ) can be derived annually for an annual predator:

$$Mpt = Dt / [(Biowt + Biowt + 1) / 2] \quad (15)$$

In the dynamic Gompertz production model without predation (equation 12), the equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  threshold is solely expressed by the intrinsic rate ( $r$ ) parameter, whereas  $B_{msy}$  is expressed by the carrying capacity ( $K$ ) divided by 2.72 (Quinn and Deriso 1999). Since temporal shifts in striped bass predation are absent from the traditional dynamic models, the overfishing definitions ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) in these models are fixed in time. However, in the non-equilibrium S-H model (equation 11) the ability to identify steady-state conditions is far more difficult because predation effects are transient over time. In the non-equilibrium S-H model, weakfish surplus production and predation-induced mortality ( $Mpt$ ) can vary greatly across years, resulting in time varying  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds. The degree of temporal variation in  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  depends on the magnitude and trend in predator abundance, the predator consumption exponent ( $c$ ) and on the prey stock size ( $A$ ) at which the consumption threshold of predation takes place in equation (11). Thus, the annual  $F_{msy_t}$  values from the S-H model are not fixed in time but rather are a function of the fixed intrinsic rate ( $r$ ) minus the time varying predator consumption rate ( $Mpt$ ):

$$F_{msy_t} = r * \exp(- Mpt) \quad (16)$$

Similarly, the weakfish biomass threshold ( $B_{msy}$ ) can vary over time depending on the amount of weakfish biomass consumed annually by the predator ( $Dt$ ):

$$B_{msy} = [K - Dt] / 2.72 \quad (17)$$

Although weakfish overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy_t}$ ,  $B_{msy_t}$ ) derived from the S-H model are time varying, equilibrium reference points can be approximated as the long-term (1981-2007) mean  $F_{msy_t}$  and  $B_{msy_t}$ .

## C9.3 RESULTS

### C9.3.1 Scaled Ages 1+ Fishing Mortality ( $F$ ), Biomass and Surplus Production

Estimates of rescaled relative  $F$ , weakfish stock biomass, and weakfish surplus production

are presented in section **C8.3** of this report.

#### *Juvenile and Age 1 Abundance Including Juvenile Mortality (Z0)*

The relative magnitude of weakfish juvenile indices varied greatly across the eight surveys for the 1981 to 2007 year-classes (Table C9.2-2). When the eight juvenile data sets were scaled and blended into a mean coast-wide index (Rec0) (Table C9.2-3), the coast-wide index (Rec0) showed a fairly persistent rise after 1995 (Figure C9.3-1). Although coast-wide average recruitment (Rec0) remained high in most years from 1998 to 2007, a pronounced drop in weakfish ages 1+ abundance (Nvpa) from the 2009 VPA was clearly evident from 1998 to 2006 (Table C9.2-3). Abundance of age 1 weakfish (Nvpa) from the most recent VPA run varied without trend from 1982 to about 1998, then age 1 abundance fell steadily thereafter in sharp contrast to the general rise in juvenile recruitment after 1995 (Figure C9.3-1). The resulting weakfish juvenile mortality (Z0) estimates increased in magnitude for the 1999 to 2006 year-classes (Table C9.2-3), and were positively correlated (Pearson  $r = 0.88$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) to the blended predation index (Tpred) consisting of striped bass and spiny dogfish (Figure C9.3-2). These findings strongly suggest that recent rise in juvenile natural mortality since 1998 is consistent with the recent emergence of a trophic bottleneck that may have interfered with the flow of recruitment from age 0 to ages 1+.

#### *C9.3.2 Correlation Matrix and Stepwise Regression*

The time series of weakfish surplus production (SURPt) (Table C8.2-6), age aggregated biomass index (WkW) (Table C8.2-3) and weakfish juvenile mortality (Z0) from 1981 to 2008 (Table C9.2-3) was examined in a correlation matrix against each of the ten potential explanatory variables (Table C9.2-1). The correlation matrix revealed that striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance were always inversely related ( $P < 0.001$ ) to weakfish surplus production and weakfish biomass and positively related to juvenile mortality (Z0) (Table C9.3-1, Figure C9.3-2). The time series of menhaden abundance, a major finfish prey of both striped bass and spiny dogfish, was positively related ( $P < 0.001$ ) to weakfish surplus production and weakfish biomass and inversely related to juvenile weakfish mortality (Table C9.3-1), suggesting that a recent drop in menhaden abundance may have enhanced the predation risk of weakfish by spiny dogfish and striped bass. None of the other potential explanatory variables, including fishing mortality (FWt) and discard effects, were correlated across all three (SURPt, WkW, Z0) response variables. These findings strongly suggest that the recent failure in weakfish productivity after 1998 was linked mainly to enhanced predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish, the magnitude of which appeared to be enhanced by the recent coast-wide decline in Atlantic menhaden.

The time series of weakfish juvenile mortality rates (Z0) for the 1981 to 2006 year-classes (Table C9.2-3, Figure C9.3-2) were used as a response variable in the stepwise regression model against the blended striped bass and dogfish abundance index (Tpred) as well as with the five additional explanatory variables (Table C9.2-1). The stepwise model selected only the blended predation index (Tpred) as the most significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) explanatory variable that was closely tied (Pearson  $r = 0.84$ ) to the rise in weakfish juvenile mortality (Z0) (Table C9.3-2, Figure C9.3-2). No other explanatory variable was selected at the  $P < 0.05$  level in the stepwise model. It is important to note that estimated weakfish coast-wide discards (Disn) and discard-related fishing mortality (FDisn) (Table C8.2-4) were included in the models but were not positively correlated ( $P < 0.05$ ) to juvenile mortality (Z0). These findings suggest that fisheries-related activities were not tied directly to the recent rise in weakfish juvenile mortality. The emergence of an age 0 recruitment bottleneck after 1996 appeared to be linked mainly to enhanced predation from striped bass and



spiny dogfish and rather than to enhanced fisheries discards.

Weakfish surplus production (SURP) and coast-wide relative biomass (WKW) (Tables C8.2-3 and C8.2-6) from 2001 to 2008 were also related to six explanatory variables in stepwise regression models where biomass weighted fishing mortality (FWt) effects were always included (Table C9.3-2). Once again, the stepwise model always selected the blended predation index (Tpred), comprised of striped bass and spiny dogfish, as the most significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) explanatory variable (Table C9.3-2). The Tpred variable was inversely related (Pearson  $r = -0.80$ ) to the post 1999 decline in weakfish surplus production (Figure C8.3-3) and biomass. Although biomass weighted fishing mortality effects (FW) were independent ( $P < 0.45$ ) of weakfish surplus production (SURP), FWt were negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.007$ ) on weakfish relative biomass (WKW) but only in the presence of predation (Tpred) (Table C9.3-2). The biotic mechanism(s) behind the apparent negative interaction of predation and fishing mortality on weakfish biomass are not clear at this time. Most of the statistical evidence given thus far suggests that the recent (1999-2008) failure in weakfish surplus production and stock biomass was due primarily to enhanced predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish.

#### *C9.3.4 Gompertz Production Models With and Without Predation Effects*

The external Gompertz surplus production model (equation 6) was fitted by linear robust regression to weakfish stock biomass in year  $t$  and  $t+1$  (Biot, Biot1) (Table C8.2-6). This model with only fishing effects (Catchw) did provide a reasonably good fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.54$ ) to the biomass time series with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$  and  $K$  parameter estimates (Table C9.3-3). The resulting overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy) of 0.26 and 57,388 mt, respectively, were much different than earlier estimates (Fmsy = 0.41, Bmsy = 25,400 mt) based on the Steele-Henderson model in 2005. Moreover, the resulting production model consistently over predicted weakfish surplus production from 1998 to 2008 by 20% to 350% (Figure C9.3-3), indicating the presence of a distinct serial pattern in the residuals. This systematic trend in the direction of the residuals usually indicates that the model is lacking an informative parameter(s).

When the blended predation parameter (Tpred) was added to the basic Gompertz model, the fit to surplus production greatly improved ( $r^{*2} = 0.84$ ) and the parameters ( $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $C$ ) were estimated with much higher precision than the production model without predation (Table C9.3-3). The slope representing predation effects ( $C$ ) was negative and statistically significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) which is consistent with the significant inverse relationship (Pearson  $r = -0.87$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) between weakfish surplus production and blended predation from 1981 to 2008 (Figure C8.3-4). The resulting equilibrium overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy) from the extended Gompertz model were 0.54 and 19,289 mt, respectively (Table C9.3-3). Moreover, unlike the strong serial correlation in the residuals noted from the basic Gompertz model (Figure C9.3.3), there is little if any systematic residual pattern from the extended Gompertz model that includes predation effects of striped bass and spiny dogfish (Figure C9.3-4).

#### *C9.3.5 Stock –Recruitment Effects*

The Ricker S-R (equation 9) model was applied to relative coast-wide juvenile recruitment (Rec 0) (Table C9.2-3) and weakfish biomass (Biow, mt) (Table C8.2-6) from 1981-2007 using iterative re-weighted nonlinear least squares regression. The dome-shaped Ricker stock-recruitment (S-R) model was a good fit ( $r^2 = 0.52$ ) to the S-R data from 1981 to 2007 (Figure C9.3-5). The steep ascending limb and pronounced dome indicated the strong presence of density-dependent mortality and the ability of weakfish to compensate for relatively high levels ( $F < 0.8$ ) of fishing mortality.

The resulting parameter estimates were precise ( $A = 0.016$ ,  $SE = 0.004$ ,  $B = -0.00015$ ,  $SE = 0.000027$ ), both of which differed significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) from zero (Table C9.3-4). However, the residual plot over time indicated the presence of a distinct serial correlation (Figure C9.3-6). The residuals were mostly negative from 1981 to 1994 but the direction of the residuals shifted abruptly in a positive direction thereafter (Figure C9.3-6), indicating model misspecification.

When the linearized version of the Ricker S-R model (equation 10) was fitted to several candidate predators (blended predators, summer flounder and bluefish) and environmental factors (deviations in summer sea surface temperatures and deviations in the NAO index) the stepwise model chose the blended predators (tpred) as the only significant explanatory variable to the S-R model. When tpred was added as a second explanatory variable to the S-R model, the extended model explained 81% of the recruitment variation, all three parameter estimates (A, B, c) became highly significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) (Table C9.3-4) and, most importantly, the anomalous residual pattern seen in the basic Ricker S-R models virtually disappeared when Tpred was added to the model (Figure C9.3-7). These findings are consistent with the Predation Hypothesis, indicating that the transmission of age 0 weakfish recruits to the adult stock has been recently impeded due to enhanced predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish.

#### *C9.3.6 Steele-Henderson Model*

The discrete version of the Gompertz surplus production model with only fishing effects (equation 12) was fitted by nonlinear least squares and iterative re-weighted least squares regression to weakfish stock biomass in year  $t$  and  $t+1$  (Biowt, Biowt+1) (Table C8.2-6). Like the results from the Gompertz external model (Table C9.3-3), this model provided a good fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.68$ ) to the biomass data with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$  and  $K$  parameter estimates (Table C9.3-6). The resulting overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy) for weakfish of 0.32 and 25,259 mt, respectively, were similar in magnitude to previous estimates. However, this production model consistently over predicted weakfish biomass from 1998 to 2008 by 10 to 250% (Figure C9.3-8), indicating that the basic Gompertz model was plagued by substantial process error. The model (equation 12) applied by iterative reweighting least squares substantially improved the fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.82$ ) and enhanced precision around the parameter estimates ( $r$ ,  $K$ ) and overfishing definitions (Fmsy, Bmsy) (Table C9.3-6), but severe process error nevertheless persisted in the residuals from 1998 to 2008. Even when the Logistics form of the surplus production model was used instead of the Gompertz, the same serial residual pattern persisted over time, indicating that the residual problem was not due to the configuration of the production model. Given the clear residual problem associated with the basic Gompertz and Logistics models, the surplus production models without predation were not used to estimate overfishing thresholds for weakfish.

The full Steele-Henderson (S-H) production model (equation 11) was applied to weakfish stock biomass in year  $t$  and  $t+1$  (Biot, Biot1) and to the blended predators (Tpred) by iterative re-weighting (Tables C9.3-5 and C9.3-6). The S-H models provided a very good fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.84$  for unweighted and 0.94 with iterative reweighting) to the biomass and predation data (Figure C9.3-10) with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $c$  and  $A$  parameter estimates (Table C9.3-6). Overall, the S-H models was not only a better fit to weakfish biomass than the Gompertz model with only fishing effects (Table C9.3-6), but the  $r$  and  $K$  parameters were estimated with much higher precision. The resulting weakfish equilibrium overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy) from the nonlinear least squares S-H models for weakfish was 0.72 and 17,009 mt, respectively (Table C9.3-6). Moreover, unlike the severe residual pattern evident from 1998 to 2008 based on the basic Gompertz models (Figure C9.3-3), there is little if any systematic residual pattern from the S-H model fitted by iterative re-

weighting (Figure C9.3-9). Finally, the time series (1981-2008) of predation-based natural mortality ( $M_p$ ) from striped bass and spiny dogfish ( $T_{pred}$ ) was derived via equations (14) and (15) (Table C9.3-5). The predatory mortality rates ( $M_p$ ) rose two to four fold in magnitude after 1997 coincident with a steady drop in weakfish biomass and surplus production. This inverse relationship between  $M_p$  and weakfish biomass is consistent with the presence of depensatory density-dependent predation mortality and, if persistent over time, could be highly destabilizing to future weakfish stock rebuilding. These findings strongly suggest that the recent rise in weakfish ages 1+ natural mortality (MWT) coupled with the failure in weakfish productivity (SURPt) are tied directly to the increase in striped bass and spiny dogfish predation mortality ( $M_p$ ).

The estimated instantaneous consumption rates ( $M_p$ ) of weakfish by striped bass and spiny dogfish rose steadily in magnitude from 0.22 in 1986 to 1.64 in 2002 and then remained relatively high thereafter (Table C9.3-5, Figure C9.3-11). The estimated biomass (mt) of weakfish consumed ( $D_t$ ) annually exceeded 4000 mt in most years from 1995 to 2008 during which weakfish biomass fell by 80% after 2000 (Table C9.3-5). Despite the systematic decline in weakfish biomass after 1999, the magnitude of weakfish biomass ( $D_t$ , mt) consumed by striped bass and spiny dogfish remained relatively high, equal or exceeding the weakfish coast-wide biomass after 2001 (Table C9.3-5, Figure C9.3-11). Moreover, weakfish biomass consumed ( $D_t$ ) annually and the instantaneous consumption rates ( $M_p$ ) from 1997 to 2008 (Table C9.3-5) were 30% to 300% higher than the coast-wide landings and fishing mortality (F) rates, respectively, on weakfish during those years (Table C9.3-7, Figure C9.3-12). The effects of enhanced predatory consumption ( $M_p$ ) coupled with moderate fishing mortality (FW) on weakfish from 2000 to 2008 easily exceeded the  $F_{msy}$  threshold, resulting in the systematic decline in weakfish surplus production and biomass from 2001 to 2008 (Figure C8.3-2).

When the equilibrium overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy} = 0.72$ ,  $B_{msy} = 17,009$  mt) from the S-H model (Table C9.3-6) are considered, ages 1+ biomass weighted fishing mortality (FW) on weakfish exceeded the estimated  $F_{msy}$  threshold of 0.72 in most years from 1981 to 1992 (Figure C9.3-13). Weakfish coast-wide biomass (mt) exceeded the biomass threshold ( $B_{msy} = 17,009$  mt) in 1981 and 1982, but biomass fell quickly below  $B_{msy}$  thereafter (Figure C9.3-14). When more stringent management regulations were enacted after 1991, fishing mortality (FW) fell by 50 to 70% (Figure C9.3-13) and biomass began to rise toward the  $B_{msy}$  threshold (Figure C9.3-14). However, weakfish biomass fell unexpectedly after 1999 to the lowest level in the time series in 2007 (Figure C9.3-14) despite the fact that fishing mortality rates remained below  $F_{msy}$  in most years (Figure C9.3-13) from 1998 to 2008 (exception: 2002).

Because predatory consumption rates ( $M_p$ ) on weakfish increased about five fold after 2000 (Figure C9.3-10), the overfishing definitions ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) did not remain fixed over time (Table C9.3-5). The non-equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  levels via equation (16) remained relatively stable around 0.60 to 0.78 from 1981 to 1989 during which weakfish biomass and surplus production remained high and stable (Figure C8.3-2). However, when predatory consumption rates ( $M_p$ ) rose after 1997 (Figure C9.3-11) and surplus production dropped, annual  $F_{msy_t}$  thresholds dropped sharply from around 0.60 to 0.70 in the 1980's to below 0.30 after 2000 (Table C9.3-5) in concert with a steep rise in striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance (Figure C8.3-3) and predation related mortality rates ( $M_p$ ) (Figure C9.3-11). In contrast, non-equilibrium biomass thresholds ( $B_{msy}$ ) were more robust to rising  $M_p$  (Table C9.3-5). The  $B_{msy}$  thresholds remained relatively stable at between 14,000 and 15,000 mt from 1995 to 2008 despite rising  $M_p$  and  $D_t$  (Figures C9.3-11 and C9.3-12).

#### C9.4 Scientific and Management Implications

The preponderance of statistical evidence given here supports the Predation Hypothesis involving enhanced predation by striped bass and spiny dogfish as the primary factor behind the recent and unexpected decline in weakfish productivity. Statistical evidence in support of the Predation Hypothesis consists of a significant ( $P < 0.0001$ ) inverse correlation between declining weakfish biomass and surplus production from 1999 to 2008 and striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance from 1982 to 2004. Striped bass abundance along the Atlantic coast rose 10 fold from 1994 to 2006 (Kahn 2005), although the 2008 striped bass abundance estimate fell by over 40% since 2006. Similarly, spiny dogfish abundance has increased 10 fold since 1999 and has remained high thereafter. During this recent period (1999-2008) of declining weakfish productivity, fishing mortality (FW) and discard mortality (Fdisc) rates remained low and relatively stable, indicating that the recent drop in weakfish productivity did not coincide with rising exploitation. The strong positive correlation (Pearson  $r = 0.91$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) between the recent rise in weakfish juvenile mortality (Z0) and rising striped bass and spiny dogfish abundance further suggests that the recent emergence of a weakfish recruitment bottleneck at age 0 was largely due to enhanced predation by these two finfish predators. By contrast, discard mortality estimates of small ( $< \text{age } 2$ ) weakfish remained low and stable after 1999 during which juvenile mortality (Z0) rose steadily. Third, the residual patterns in all logistics and Gompertz model runs that included only fishing effects (landings) produced inordinately low overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Bmsy), poor precision around the estimates, and the residuals exhibited a pronounced serially correlation over time, clearly indicating model misspecification. However, when the predation term (Tpred), reflecting the joint predation by striped bass and spiny dogfish, was added to the models, the fit of the models to weakfish surplus production and biomass dramatically improved, the precision and magnitude of Fmsy and Bmsy rose to more plausible levels ( $F_{msy} > 0.45$ ), and, most importantly, the direction of the residuals over time shifted to a more random pattern and were therefore free of model misspecification. Finally the instantaneous consumption rates (Mp) on ages 1+ weakfish derived empirically from the Steele-Henderson model from 1999 to 2008 were closely correlated (Pearson  $r = 0.81$ ,  $P < 0.0002$ ) to the rise in ages 1+ total mortality (Z) derived independently from the most recent ADAPT VPA run. This strongly suggests that the recent increase in ages 1+ total mortality (Z) in the VPA was not due to a rise in fishing mortality (F) but rather to enhanced predation by striped bass and spiny dogfish..

Although results from regression and production models alone do not demonstrate causality, recent empirical evidence is consistent with the Predation Hypothesis involving striped bass and spiny dogfish. Striped bass are known to consume finfish prey up to 60% of their own body length (Manooch 1973). Unlike fluke and bluefish that prey mainly on small ( $< 30 \text{ cm}$ ) fish, large ( $> 76 \text{ cm}$ ) striped bass can easily prey on larger ( $> 40 \text{ cm}$ ) weakfish, whereas smaller stripers ( $< 65 \text{ cm}$ ) can effectively prey on juvenile and age 1 weakfish. Recent food habits studies of spiny dogfish show that dogfish prey on a wide variety of finfishes including weakfish (Stenlik 2007; unpublished NEAMAP data). Striped bass and spiny dogfish seem to prey more commonly on menhaden and river herring (*Alosa* spp) (Uphoff 2003; Bowman et al 2000). But coast-wide menhaden and river herring abundance has fallen dramatically after 1995 (citation), thereby enhancing the prospects that striped bass and spiny dogfish would recently switch to alternative prey such as weakfish and summer flounder. Within the forage hypothesis model (section C10.0) it was shown that the decline in menhaden was likely responsible for the recent rise in striped bass predation on weakfish after 1996. Moreover, the recent drop in weakfish productivity after 1997 was shown to have a spatial component that matched the distribution of striped bass. Weakfish landings and surplus production

fell rapidly after 1998 from the Mid and North Atlantic subregions, but surplus production from the South Atlantic subregion had remained steady (Crecco 2005b). It so happens that anadromous striped bass are very abundant along the Mid and North Atlantic coast throughout the year, but are seldom encountered in any numbers south of Cape Lookout, NC. Spiny dogfish are found coast-wide from Canada to Florida (Stehnik 2007), but their post 1998 rise inshore has occurred mostly along the Mid and North Atlantic subregions, thus allowing spiny dogfish to spatially overlap weakfish. The predator assemblage south of Cape Lookout, NC is largely a different field of predators such as channel bass, spotted seatrout, king mackerel, and cobia. This well-defined spatial match between prey (weakfish) and predators (striped bass and spiny dogfish) clearly supports the validity of the Predation Hypothesis. Further empirical support of the hypothesis includes recent food habit studies of striped bass (Walter and Austin 2003; Rudershausen et al 2005), indicating that weakfish and other sciaenids (spot) were primary food items of larger (> 60 cm) striped bass in Chesapeake Bay and Albemarle Sound. Moreover, a recent rise in striped bass abundance has been linked empirically to the steady decline of blueback herring in the Connecticut River and Albemarle Sound (Savoy and Crecco 2004; Rudershausen et al 2005), as well as with the menhaden decline from Chesapeake Bay (Uphoff 2003; Walter and Austin 2003).

Although most of the statistical and empirical evidence given here and elsewhere (Uphoff 2009, this assessment) supports the Predation Hypothesis, other factors such as unreported commercial and recreational landings and discards, disease, toxins and parasitism cannot be ruled out at this time to explain the annual production loss of between 3,000 and 5,000 mt of weakfish. At this time, there is no evidence that would link recent increases in disease, toxins and parasitism to the recent failure of weakfish. There has been a recent rise in sea surface water temperatures along the Atlantic coast (Oviatt 2004), but this analyses indicated that water temperature shifts were not significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) linked to recent increases in weakfish juvenile mortality ( $Z_0$ ), nor in the decline in weakfish surplus production and stock biomass. It is possible that an enormous upsurge in unreported weakfish landings and commercial and recreational discards took place between 1996 and 2008 to account for the estimated 3,000 to 4,000 mt annual loss of weakfish surplus production, but a recent upsurge in unreported landings seems unlikely for several reasons. First, if the sources of this rapid upsurge in unreported weakfish landings and discards are thus far unknown, it would be nearly impossible to remove this source of mortality without closing virtually all inshore fishing activity between North Carolina and Rhode Island. Second, if a recent rise in unreported landings and discards resulted in the recent weakfish stock collapse, we would expect that other finfish stocks with a similar temporal and spatial distribution as weakfish (i. e. Atlantic croaker and summer flounder) to be likewise depleted. But Atlantic croaker and summer flounder stocks have either grown or have remained relatively stable from 1998 to 2008. Third, if a recent rise in weakfish unreported landings caused the recent weakfish stock collapse, all of the statistical and empirical evidence presented elsewhere in this assessment on enhanced predation would have to be regarded as a mere coincidence. Finally, unreported landings in the order of 3,000 to 4,000 mt annually are equivalent to about 5 times the current (2007-2008) known landings and estimated discards used in this weakfish assessment. The possibility that such an astronomical rise in unreported landings and discards took place after 1998 and then remain hidden from port agents, enforcement and management agencies seems remote.

The strong inverse relationship between predatory consumption rates ( $M_p$ ) rates and weakfish biomass since 1997 is consistent with the presence of compensatory density-dependent mortality. This phenomenon plus the apparent emergence of a weakfish recruitment bottleneck between ages 0 and 1 makes stock rebuilding via the implementation of fisheries management

measures an exceedingly difficult task. As indicated by Spencer and Collie 1997b), fish stocks that are subject to moderate to severe depensatory predatory mortality, often undergo a sudden and persistent drop in surplus production over time even when fishing mortality rates have remained low for several years. Note that the biomass weighted fishing mortality (FWt) on ages 1+ weakfish have been below the Steele-Henderson Fmsy of 0.72 in all but one year since 1996. Under depensatory predation, the weakfish stock would be expected to remain low and unresponsive to favorable climatic events and to further fishery management restrictions. Note that weakfish stock biomass has fallen steadily since 1999 to a low 2008 stock biomass level of 1,333 mt which is about 92% below the new steady-state Bmsy level of 17,100 mt. The phenomenon of depensatory mortality, if driven largely by striped bass and spiny dogfish predation, could lead to a persistent and perhaps irreversible failure in weakfish productivity unless striped bass and spiny dogfish productivity in the next few years reverts back to pre 1998 levels.

The pessimistic outlook regarding the future of the Atlantic coast weakfish due to depensatory predation may be tempered somewhat by findings of compensatory density-dependent survival during or before the juvenile stage. Compensatory mortality was manifested here by the steep ascending limb and pronounced dome on the Ricker stock-recruitment curve, as well as by the recent and persistent rise in the coast-wide juvenile recruitment ( $N_0$ ) after 1995. This apparent recruitment surge took place despite the pronounced rise in juvenile mortality ( $Z_0$ ) and drop in weakfish biomass after 1998. It is notoriously difficult to sort out the ramifications on future weakfish stock growth when both depensatory and compensatory mechanisms are operating simultaneously. However, the added stock resiliency due to compensatory processes at the juvenile stage may persist over several more years. If so, it may in fact overcome or at least balance out the adverse effects of depensatory predation, allowing the weakfish stock to achieve equilibrium at the current low levels for the foreseeable future.

The most restrictive management measures, such as a coast-wide moratorium on weakfish harvest, would reduce the 2008 numbers weighted FN of 0.19 and landings to near zero. A coast-wide moratorium would also reduce the high total mortality ( $Z$ ) levels on ages 1+ weakfish by about 25% based on the average 2004-2008 ratio of fishing ( $F$ ) to total mortality ( $F/Z$ ) (refer to Table C9.3-5). In a sense, the  $F/Z$  ratio is a relative measure of leverage that fishery managers can exert in order to enhance the chances of rebuilding depleted stocks. From 1981 to 1989, the  $F/Z$  ratios for weakfish were, in most years, well above 0.75, indicating the presence of relatively high leverage and thus a high probability, that management measures if implemented then, would have lead to stock rebuilding. As natural mortality ( $M$ ) on ages 1+ weakfish increased after 1999, however, the  $F/Z$  ratios fell quickly to below 0.30 in most years, thereby greatly reducing the likelihood that management measures imposed after 2003 would eventually lead to a weakfish stock recovery. This relationship between the probability of stock rebuilding via management action and the  $F/Z$  ratio was recently addressed by (Uphoff 2005d) by forecasting weakfish stock abundance over the next 20 years from the logistic production model. If  $M$  was allowed to remain at the 2003 level, he reported little if any future weakfish stock rebuilding following a 50% reduction in fishing mortality ( $F$ ) if the current weakfish fishing mortality rates ( $F$ ) on weakfish comprised less than 40% of total mortality ( $Z$ ). The problem of weakfish stock rebuilding is made even worse by the emergence of a recruitment bottleneck at age 0. Even a coast-wide moratorium to weakfish harvest would have little if any impact on the recently emergent recruitment bottleneck, where age 0 weakfish are not susceptible to direct harvest.

Like virtually all single-species stock assessments conducted along the Atlantic coast, natural mortality ( $M$ ) of age 1+ weakfish was initially assumed to be constant ( $M = 0.25$ ) in previous Yield-

per-Recruit and VPA model runs. Results from the index-based analysis (section C8.0) indicated that ages 1+ F estimates remained low and steady from 1999 to 2008 despite a systematic rise in ages 1+ total mortality (Z) after 1998 as indicated by ADAPT. These conflicting trends between Z and F strongly suggest that natural mortality (M) has recently tripled in magnitude, and was therefore the primary cause for the recent weakfish stock failure along the Atlantic coast. The management consequences of assuming a constant M when the annual M values actually rises systematically over time can be serious (Swain and Chouinard 2008). As noted in this weakfish assessment, by holding M constant, the resulting ages 1+ fishing mortality rates (F) on weakfish would have risen steadily to around 1.40 in 2007 based on the 2009 VPA run despite the recent precipitous drop in landings and tuning indices. If the constant M assumption and ensuing VPA results were accepted without qualification, we would have concluded falsely that the recent failure in weakfish productivity was due mainly to overfishing. In future assessments here and elsewhere, the assumption of constant M for ages 1+ fish needs to be critically examined. In addition, the impacts of trophic and environmental effects on exploited finfish stocks should be integrated into fisheries models and rigorously tested as a potential alternative hypothesis to the overfishing hypothesis.

**C10.0'Evaluate AIC-based hypothesis testing of fishing and additional predation-competition effects using multi-index biomass dynamic models with and without prey-based, predator-based, or ratio dependent predator-prey extensions. Evaluate biomass dynamic model estimates of F, ages 1+ stock biomass, surplus production, time-varying natural mortality, and biological reference points along with uncertainty of those estimates. Advise on burden of proof necessary for acceptance of alternatives to constant M and whether these biomass dynamic techniques could complement or substitute for age-based modeling for management advice. (TOR #6)**

### **C10.1 Introduction**

Weakfish fisheries were subject to increasingly restrictive management during the early and mid-1990s (ASMFC 2002). In the late 1980s, states south of VA did not have length limits; commercial minimum length limits were 229 TL in VA and NJ, 250 mm in MD and DE, and 305 mm in NY, CT, and RI (Vaughan et al. 1991; see Figure 1 for map). Recreational fisheries were generally subject to the same length limits, although NJ and CT did not have any. States required a general permit for harvest and there were some gear and area restrictions at that time (Vaughan et al. 1991). After imposition of Amendment 3 in 1996 (a coastwide 305 mm length limit or its equivalent allowing at least 1-2 years of spawning, trawl and gill net mesh restrictions, recreational bag limits, reductions in directed commercial fishery effort, and fish excluder devices to minimize bycatch in southern shrimp fisheries; ASMFC 1996), weakfish were thought to be on the path to recovery, but by 2000-2003 recreational and commercial landings of weakfish along the Atlantic Coast approached all-time lows as population estimates derived from age structured or biomass dynamic models (De Silva 2002; Kahn 2002; Uphoff 2005b) reached all-time highs. This disconnection between weakfish stock assessment results, management actions, and fishery performance lead the WTC to consider external factors that lie outside of the purview of traditional single-species assessments.

The most reliable estimates of trends or values of F during 1981-2003 indicated it had been modest since at least 1995, while weakfish abundance and surplus production declined to low levels (Crecco 2006; Kahn et al. 2006; Uphoff 2006a). This lead to formulation of a hypothesis that the

most likely cause of declining weakfish fortune was increased natural mortality (Kahn et al. 2006). Decline of weakfish in response to increasing M was a default postulate reflecting the difficulty in finding evidence of increasing F, constant M, or recurring year-class failure. Fishing is often blamed for declines in fish stocks, but there is a preponderance of evidence that many other factors cause stock fluctuations (Deriso et al. 2008). During 2004-2006, a series of analyses (summarized below; Crecco 2006; Kahn et al. 2006; Uphoff 2006a) investigated hypotheses that weakfish population dynamics, growth, and survival were negatively affected by fishing, environmental conditions, forage abundance, competition and predation. As a result of these analyses, two strong covariates emerged: Atlantic menhaden (forage) abundance, and predation-competition from striped bass. Other candidate predator-competitors in particular were suggested by these analyses, but were less consistently identified as factors and often co-varied with striped bass (Crecco 2006; Uphoff 2006a).

Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) applied the predator-prey model of Steele and Henderson (1984) to examine relative effects of fishing and striped bass predation and competition on recent (1981-2003) weakfish dynamics. This predator-prey model was a biomass dynamic model with a sigmoidal type III predation function added to estimate additional predation losses (Collie and Spencer 1993). When applied generally, this predator-prey model reproduced rapid shifts in abundance exhibited by marine fish populations (Steele and Henderson 1984) and was useful in exploring the role of spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias* predation on Georges Bank haddock *Melanogrammus aeglefinus* recovery and management (Spencer and Collie 1995; 1997b). Collie and DeLong (1999) applied delay-difference biomass dynamics models with additional species interaction terms (competition and Type I, II, or III predator functional responses) to evaluate multispecies interactions in the Georges Bank fish community.

Biomass dynamic models are the simplest full stock assessment method (Haddon 2001). They are relatively simple to apply because they pool the overall effects of growth, mortality, and recruitment into a single production function. Their data needs are small - an index of relative abundance, landings (both in weight), and, in the case of species interactions, biomass or indices of predator-competitors. The stock is considered as undifferentiated biomass and age, size, and sex structure are ignored (Haddon 2001). When species interactions are not considered, variation in exploitation and biomass is important for fitting the model - length of the time-series is not (Hilborn and Walters 1992). In some situations, biomass dynamic models do not perform well (National Research Council 1998) and fisheries scientists usually prefer age-structured models (Hilborn and Walters 1992). However, biomass dynamic models may provide as good or better estimates of management parameters at a fraction of the cost (Hilborn and Walters 1992; Walters and Kitchell 2001).

The WTC has pursued biomass dynamic modeling since the late 1990s (Uphoff 2005a) as a contrasting approach to age-structured models of weakfish dynamics. Three potential problems impacting age structured assessment approaches for weakfish have been identified by the WTC: (1) estimates of F and stock were based on scale ages up through the mid-1990s and otolith ages afterwards (these aging methods may not assign the same ages), (2) age structure was not sampled well in all regions over many years (states from NJ and north had ages assigned from states south even though larger weakfish were more common and higher size limits were in place), and (3) retrospective bias of most recent year estimates from ADAPT and ASAP has been severe (NEFSC 1998b; NEFSC 2000; Kahn et al. 2006; section C7.0 of this report), leading to questions about the ability of these techniques to supply current management advice (Walters and Martell 2004). Hilborn and Walters (1992) suggested a pragmatic approach of using both age structured and surplus production modeling when data are available because they are fundamentally different approaches to



answer many of the same stock assessment questions. If both methods are applied and give different answers, then assessment scientists should try to understand why the answers are different and analyze their management implications (Hilborn and Walters 1992).

Biomass dynamic models could also be easily modified with predator-prey terms for hypothesis testing. In Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a), estimates of  $M$  and  $F$  from the Steele-Henderson model were used for investigating whether  $F$  alone or additional non-equilibrium changes in  $M$  associated with predation-competition could be influencing weakfish. Crecco (2006) largely explored biomass dynamics using a Gompertz (asymmetric) production function, while Uphoff (2006a) employed a logistic-based (symmetric) version.

In this approach to assessing 1981-2006 weakfish biomass dynamics, we have evaluated the relative merits of multiple hypotheses examining whether fishing alone or fishing and interactions with striped bass influenced biomass dynamics of weakfish. Included in this analysis is an evaluation of the two types of production functions used by Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a). In addition to fishing only models, Type I, II, and III prey-dependent predation functions (Ginzburg and Akçakaya 1992) were considered as were two additional compensatory mortality functions. Detection of moderate to severe compensatory mortality is important because stocks that are subject to it often undergo sudden and persistent drops in surplus production and shifts into domains of population behavior that are unresponsive to management (Spencer 1997; Walters and Kitchell 2001). A decline toward extinction may even be possible (Hilborn and Walters 1992).

Platt (1964) offered that strong inference and rapid progress in science can be derived from (1) devising alternative hypotheses; (2) devising crucial experiments with alternative, exclusive outcomes (as much as possible); (3) carrying out the experiments to get as clean a result as possible; and (4) making sequential hypotheses from possibilities that remain. Burnham and Anderson (2001) described the use of Kullback-Leibler information as a basis for making valid inference from analyses of empirical ecological data and to objectively answer “What model should be used to approximate reality given the data at hand?” Three general principles guide model-based inference of ecological data: simplicity and parsimony, multiple working hypotheses, and strength of evidence (Burnham and Anderson 2001). As part of a new paradigm for stock assessment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Sainsbury (1998) advocated formulating multiple hypotheses about stock status and evaluating them with empirical data. Deriso et al. (2008) presented a framework for evaluating the cause of fishery declines by incorporating covariates into assessment models to evaluate fishing effects versus other natural or human impacts. This framework has several components: identifying factors potentially affecting the stock, developing a stock assessment model that incorporates them, fitting the model, testing hypotheses, and evaluating impact of the factors (Deriso et al. 2008). We have applied this outline to structure this investigation of weakfish population dynamics during 1981-2006. Identification of factors was largely carried out in the previous assessment (Crecco 2006; Kahn et al. 2006; Uphoff 2006a) and the remaining components related to model development and hypothesis testing are the focus of this assessment of 1981-2006 weakfish dynamics.

The following analysis investigates both direct and indirect trophic interactions between weakfish and potential predators and/or competitors. Hereafter it will be referred to as the “forage hypothesis” to distinguish it from the more direct “predation hypothesis” presented in section **C9.0**.

## C10.2 Summary of Previous Analyses of External Factors Affecting Weakfish

### C10.2.1 Predator-competitors and climatic variables

Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) used diet literature review, statistical analyses, and empirical models to examine major processes (predation, competition, environmental forcing, and forage availability) affecting weakfish biomass dynamics. This empirical approach provided a bridge between the common assumption that predation and competition impose a constant rate of mortality that allows the stock to be assessed in isolation from its environment (single species assessment; Bax 1998; Sainsbury 1998) and more complex process-based multispecies models (Whipple et al. 2000).

Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) explored whether shifts in weakfish landings, growth, natural mortality, and distribution or their proxies coincided with climatic factors, forage or predator-competitor abundance or biomass using correlation and regression analyses, inferring competition for forage if test results were logical and statistically significant. Potential predator-competitors (striped bass, summer flounder *Paralichthys dentatus*, bluefish *Pomatomus saltatrix*, spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias*, and Atlantic croaker *Micropogonias undulatus*), major forage species for piscivores along the mid-Atlantic (bay anchovy *Anchoa mitchilli*, Atlantic menhaden, and spot *Leiostomus xanthurus*), and major climatic features (North Atlantic Oscillation or NAO, and water temperature) were evaluated as candidates for inclusion in assessment models. Analytical strategies of Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) consistently and strongly indicated striped bass was a major predator – competitor of weakfish.

Crecco (2006) used three stepwise multiple regression analyses ( $P < 0.05$ ) to test linkages of biotic and abiotic factors to changes in weakfish surplus production (SP), M on ages 1+, and juvenile M. Explanatory variables in these analyses included F, abundance or relative abundance of candidate finfish predator-competitors, average annual surface water temperature, and deviations in the winter NAO (both lagged 1 or 2 years to coincide with weakfish recruitment to the adult stock). Coast-wide biomass of spiny dogfish, and coast-wide striped bass, summer flounder, and bluefish stock abundance estimates from 1982 to 2004 were taken from stock assessments. In the case of the Atlantic croaker, assessment estimates were available from 1982 to 2002, so 1982-2004 total recreational catch of croaker (MRFSS A, B1, B2 estimates) was used as a coast-wide index (1982-2002 recreational catches were highly correlated with abundance estimates; Crecco 2006).

Stepwise regressions selected striped bass abundance as the only ( $P < 0.001$ ) explanatory variable inversely related to SP and juvenile M, while summer flounder biomass was inversely related to M of ages 1+ (Crecco 2006). Correlation analyses indicated that SP, M on ages 1+, and juvenile M were also inversely associated ( $P < 0.05$ ) with striped bass abundance estimated from tagging (SP, M on ages 1+, and juvenile M) and to Atlantic croaker relative abundance (SP and juvenile M). Due to substantial co-linearity among striped bass, summer flounder, and Atlantic croaker indicators, stepwise models were unable to select second or third significant variables (Crecco 2006).

Uphoff (2006a) applied three approaches to evaluate the potential of striped bass, Atlantic croaker, bluefish, summer flounder, and spiny dogfish to influence weakfish biomass dynamics. First, long-term trends (1950-2003) in Atlantic Coast commercial landings (excluding spiny dogfish) were correlated with weakfish landings to determine if significant ( $P \leq 0.10$ ) negative associations existed. Second, biomass estimates from single species assessments (generally 1981-2003) were used in a species-specific predator-weakfish model (logistic biomass dynamic model with a Type III predation function). Deterministic runs were made and model fit, its ability to produce a decline in weakfish biomass after the late 1990s, and how closely its levels of weakfish biomass were to those

estimated using the rescaled relative F technique (landings divided by average indices scaled into VPA numbers or biomass weighted F; Kahn et al. 2006) were used to evaluate the candidates. Finally, literature on candidate species' diets was reviewed to see if predation on weakfish and competition for bay anchovy, Atlantic menhaden, and spot were possible (Uphoff 2006a). Uphoff (2006a) developed a "scorecard" for each candidate predator-competitor based on these three components. Ten criteria were considered - four based on statistical or model results, and six on surveyed diet literature. The scorecard indicated that striped bass was by far the most likely predator-competitor candidate (9.5 out of 10 possible), followed by summer flounder (6.2), bluefish (6.1), spiny dogfish (5.2), and Atlantic croaker (2.6).

Uphoff (2006a) conducted additional explorations of the role of forage and striped bass on long-term commercial landings and the DE PSD Q+ index (a length-frequency index; discontinuous 1966-2003 time-series; Appendix C-2) with correlation, categorical or stepwise regression analyses (Neter and Wasserman 1974; Rose et al. 1986; Freund and Littel 2000). The DE PSD Q+ index was considered an indicator of long-term weakfish dynamics because of its significant and positive associations with recreational trophy citations, commercial and recreational yield, MRFSS catch per trip, and inshore-offshore recreational harvest distribution (Uphoff 2004; Kahn et al. 2006; Appendix C-2). Forage abundance indices and a long-term indicator of striped bass biomass (LBI, a Chesapeake Bay egg presence-absence index of spawning biomass; Uphoff 1997) were independent variables. Indices of Atlantic menhaden, spot, and bay anchovy relative abundance from NC, VA, MD, DE, and NJ, age 0 abundance estimates of Atlantic menhaden along the Atlantic Coast, and LBI were used in correlation and stepwise regression analyses with DE PSD Q+ (Uphoff 2006a).

A negative relationship of striped bass and weakfish landings that reflected high or low periods of underlying weakfish productivity was described by categorical regression of period and striped bass landings ( $P < 0.001$ ; see Figures 18 and 19 in Uphoff 2006a). This approach predicted high (1973-1989) and low (1950-1972 and 1989+) periods of weakfish landings as abrupt time-blocks. Stepwise regressions described a negative relationship of weakfish landings with LBI and a positive relationship with Atlantic menhaden abundance or  $\log_e$ -transformed juvenile menhaden indices during 1955-2002 ( $P < 0.0001$ ). In general, menhaden accounted for most variation in weakfish landings and striped bass accounted for a lesser amount in these stepwise regressions and reproduced the time-blocks of weakfish landings described by the categorical regression of striped bass landings and productivity period (Uphoff 2006a).

Significant ( $P < 0.10$ ) positive associations of weakfish size quality (1966-2003 DE PSD Q+ index) and forage abundance occurred consistently (but not among all surveys) in MD and VA for all three forage species and sporadically in NJ and NC (Uphoff 2006a). Stepwise regressions of striped bass biomass and juvenile menhaden abundance against DE PSD Q+ indicated a significant positive influence of forage and negative influence of LBI (Uphoff 2006a).

Changes in weakfish landings and size distribution were logically consistent with trends in menhaden relative abundance and striped bass biomass over a broad geographic area and time-span. These changes, coupled with little evidence of a rise in F, supported the development of hypotheses linking the aborted weakfish recovery to striped bass and menhaden.

### **C10.3 Background for Weakfish, Striped Bass, and Atlantic Menhaden Interactions**

#### *C10.3.1 Spatial and Temporal Distributions*

Weakfish occur along the Atlantic coast from FL to MA, straying as far north as Nova Scotia (Mercer 1985; Figure C10.3-1). They are most abundant from NC to NY. Adult weakfish disperse

from continental shelf wintering grounds located from lower Chesapeake Bay to Cape Lookout, NC, as waters warm in spring and initiate an inshore, northerly migration (Mercer 1985; ASMFC 2002). They enter sounds, bays, and estuaries in early spring and may stay through summer, although most in northern states return to the ocean (Mercer 1985). In fall, a general southerly movement back to overwintering grounds occurs (Mercer 1985).

Striped bass are found along the entire Atlantic coast from Canada to FL, but are most abundant between ME and NC. Migratory stocks of striped bass are mainly composed of fish spawned in Hudson River (NY) or Chesapeake Bay, but Chesapeake Bay fish predominate and are associated with most of the production along the Atlantic coast (Boreman and Austin 1985; Dorazio et al. 1994; Richards and Rago 1999). After spawning in tidal-fresh Chesapeake Bay rivers during April-May, most immature and mature striped bass females and some males migrate to spend summer in coastal waters of the mid-Atlantic (VA-NY) and New England (CT-ME; Dorazio et al. 1994). Immature females largely leave the Chesapeake Bay after ages 2-3 and reside in coastal waters until they mature. Remaining, mostly male, striped bass reside within estuarine waters of Chesapeake Bay throughout summer-fall (Dorazio et al. 1994; Secor and Piccoli 2007). In fall, southward movement of coastal fish begins (Dorazio et al. 1994). During November-March, some striped bass from Chesapeake Bay and the coastal contingent overwinter in the inshore zone between Cape Henry, VA, and Cape Lookout, NC (Setzler et al. 1980).

Atlantic menhaden are distributed from FL to ME during summer, with older, larger individuals found further northward and smaller, younger fish in the southern half of the range (Ahrenholz 1991). In September, the northerly portion of the population begins to migrate southwards. By December, these fish are in waters off the NC coast. These fish are followed by large numbers of young-of-year menhaden (Ahrenholz 1991). Although described as disappearing and dispersing from inshore waters by late January (Ahrenholz 1991), menhaden were dominant in striped bass diets in nearshore waters from the VA Capes to the Outer Banks of NC during December-March, 2000-2007 (Overton et al. 2008). During March-early April, schools move rapidly northward and have redistributed by June (Ahrenholz 1991). This general pattern of movement is closely approximated by weakfish (ASMFC 2004) and striped bass (Walter et al. 2003).

### *C10.3.2 Trophic Ecology of Weakfish and Striped Bass*

Weakfish feed throughout the water column (Wilk 1979; Mercer 1985). Young weakfish feed primarily on mysid shrimp and anchovies, while older weakfish feed on the clupeid species that are abundant in a given area. Cannibalism has been reported. Functional morphology indicates that weakfish are upper midwater feeders (Wilk 1979; Mercer 1985).

Striped bass evolved as a schooling species to take advantage of the great energy resource of clupeids along the Atlantic Coast of North America (Stevens 1979). Striped bass actively select for Atlantic menhaden, but will feed on other species when menhaden are not sufficiently abundant (Overton 2003; ASMFC 2004; Rudershausen et al. 2005).

In the mid-Atlantic region, bay anchovy represented the prey most consumed by age 0 weakfish and age 1 striped bass as they initiated piscivory, but both switched mostly to similar, larger prey (clupeids, primarily Atlantic menhaden) within a year (Mercer 1985; Taylor 1987; Hartman and Brandt 1995). Juvenile menhaden and spot would be most relevant to weakfish and younger, smaller striped bass making the transition through piscivory because of size selectivity and gape limitations (Stein et al. 1988; Juanes 1994).

Weakfish expanded the size of items in their diet least of 18 species examined by Scharf et

al. (2000) as they grew. They largely remain dependent on items in the size range of bay anchovy, and juvenile menhaden or spot; maximum fish prey size of an 800 mm weakfish was about 180 mm (Scharf et al. 2000). Walter and Austin (2003) and Overton et al. (2008) found that large striped bass fed on small pelagic prey (bay anchovy and juvenile clupeids) as well as large prey items. The upper 99% quantile of prey fish total length that can be eaten by 800 mm striped bass is approximately 280 mm and a 1,200 mm striped bass can eat a 415 mm fish (F. Juanes, University of Massachusetts, personal communication). Minimum prey size is below 50 mm for the entire size ranges of weakfish and striped bass.

Weakfish have been specifically identified as a minor food item in some, but not all, striped bass diet studies, particularly in the mid-Atlantic region (Manooch 1973; Wilk 1979; Mercer 1985; Walter and Austin 2003; Overton et al. 2008). Weakfish were encountered in striped bass diets during fall or winter (a period of heavy pelagic feeding) in the mid-Atlantic region and accounted for no more than 1-3% of striped bass diet by weight or volume (Manooch 1973; Walter and Austin 2003; Overton et al. 2008). These overwintering striped bass feed mostly on Atlantic menhaden and bay anchovy (Manooch 1973; Austin and Walter 2003; Overton et al. 2008).

Early switching of weakfish and striped bass to a fish diet indicates that both are specialized piscivores (Persson and Brönmark 2002). Early switching requires high growth rate, which implies high densities of proper forage and safe foraging opportunities. If unfavorable conditions prevail, growth is reduced, and vulnerability to competitors and predators is increased. Population densities of specialists are generally a result of their success at a feeding stage where they experience intense competition (Persson and Brönmark 2002). Species undergoing ontogenetic diet shifts face a risk of delayed transitions among feeding stages if food resources are limited and competition is intense (Persson and Brönmark 2002). Competing individuals and predators may hinder one another's feeding activities, leading to starvation or they may eat one another (including cannibalism; Yodzis 1994). Ontogenetic bottlenecks are common in piscivorous fishes because competition may retard growth and prevent size advantage necessary to feed on the larger prey in the next stage (Persson and Brönmark 2002). Individuals not reaching size advantage over prey may become stunted at size where consumption balances metabolic requirements (Bax 1998; Persson and Brönmark 2002).

## **C10.4 Current Stock Assessment**

### *C10.4.1 Harvest and Discard Estimates*

Biomass dynamic models employed in this analysis used total weight of aggregated harvest and discards by both the commercial and recreational fisheries. Commercial landings and MRFSS recreational harvest estimates were obtained from the National Marine Fisheries Service ([www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/](http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/)).

De Silva (2004) provided the first quantitative analysis of weakfish discards based on ratios of discards to harvest in 1994-2003 NMFS at sea observer data. The NMFS database contained information on weakfish discards, target species catches, estimates of landings of species kept on the haul, and length data of both discards and fish kept. Only hauls that were completely sampled for discards were evaluated. During 1994-2003, discard data were primarily available for gillnets (287 trips and 615 hauls; 89% landed in VA, NC or NJ) and otter trawls (196 trips and 519 hauls; 41% landed in MD and 49% in NJ, NY, or RI.). The annual number of gillnet trips where weakfish discards were observed ranged from 5 to 68. Annual number of otter trawl trips where weakfish discards were observed ranged from 4 to 45 (De Silva 2004).

The WTC adopted De Silva's (2004) technique for estimates of weakfish discards using

annual (1994-2003) discard ratios (weakfish to target species) and NMFS commercial landings of a suite of target species for the previous assessment (Kahn et al. 2006). The ratio of at sea observations of weight of discarded weakfish to weight of harvested target species by gear (trawl and gill net) was scaled up to total discard estimates based on total landings of the target species (De Silva 2004). Discards were subdivided into regulatory and market discards. Identification of target species was only based on complete trips and hauls where weakfish discards were observed (De Silva 2004). The WTC assumed that gear-specific relationships among the target species in the data set reflected the entire fishery.

For the current assessment, the WTC considered all estimated commercial discards to have died and chose to update de Silva's (2004) method for estimating of commercial discards (section C5.0 of this report). Haul level data for the same gear and target species combinations were used to evaluate annual, multiyear (5 or 7 year blocks), and all-year (1994 to 2007) weakfish discard ratios. Because of concerns with high interannual variability and uncomfortably large standard errors of estimates based on short time groupings, the WTC elected to use the all-year ratio estimates. Ratio-based estimates of weakfish discard weight were made for butterfish, long-fin squid, summer flounder and weakfish fisheries for trawl harvests, and Atlantic croaker, bluefish, spiny dogfish, and weakfish gillnet harvests.

Discard sampling was not conducted until 1994 and market-related discard ratios estimated for 1994-2002 were used to estimate weakfish discards in prior years (De Silva 2004). In 1993, New Jersey and Delaware enacted weakfish regulations that may have lead to non-market discarding and the total discard ratio was used for these states. For all other states, discard estimates for 1993 were based on the non-regulatory discard ratios. Discard estimates after 1993 used total discard ratios to estimate weakfish discards for all states.

Recreational discard losses were calculated as the product of estimates of MRFSS number discarded, mean weight, and discard mortality rate. The MRFSS does not estimate weight of released weakfish and we used mean weight of weakfish recreational discards (0.15 kg) estimated from MRFSS 2004-2007 headboat survey length-frequencies (D. Kahn, DE Fish and Wildlife, personal communication). This constant mean weight approximated the mode of six annual regional (VA and north or NC and south) mean discard weight estimates for headboat catches (range = 0.14-0.17 kg, three  $\approx$  0.15 kg). Weakfish hook-and-release experiments produced dichotomous mean mortality estimates either near 3% or 15% (Table C10.4-1) and 10% release mortality was adopted by the WTC.

#### *C10.4.2 Biomass Indices*

Exploitable biomass was defined as biomass of weakfish 250 mm and larger. Weakfish of this size and age (1+) and larger were heavily exploited in the past (305 mm length limit or its equivalent was not mandatory until 1994; ASMFC 2002) and represented spawning biomass (Nye et al. 2008). Size limits and gear restrictions imposed since Amendment 2 (1994) have greatly lessened vulnerability of weakfish less than 305 mm to directed harvest.

##### *C10.4.2.1 1981-2003 Assessment's Exploitable Biomass Indices*

Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) evaluated fishery and predator-weakfish biomass dynamics primarily with recreational catch (harvested and released) per effort index of relative biomass (WRI). DE and NJ trawl survey exploitable biomass indices (Kahn et al. 2006) provided additional indicators of weakfish exploitable stock biomass. These trawl surveys and WRI were positively correlated ( $r \geq 0.71$ ;  $P \leq 0.003$ ), but trawl survey indices were not used extensively in the

assessment (Crecco 2006; Kahn et al. 2006; Uphoff 2006a). A third trawl survey index (Northeast Fisheries Science Center fall survey) was rejected because exploitable-sized weakfish were poorly represented, it did not correlate consistently with other indices, cohort catch curves produced positive “mortality” rates, and the 40<sup>th</sup> SARC expressed concerns about high inter-annual variability (WTC 2006; Kahn et al. 2006; Uphoff 2006a).

#### *C10.4.2.2 1981-2006 Indices of Exploitable Biomass*

Three exploitable biomass indices (EBI) were used: one fishery-dependent and two fishery-independent. The fishery-dependent index (WRI) was estimated as weakfish recreational private/rental harvest and release weight per trip in all areas of the mid-Atlantic (VA-NY; Crecco 2009). A MRFSS directed trip index of weakfish catch (harvest and releases) per trip (Brust 2004) was very closely correlated (Pearson  $r = 0.96$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ) with the more general WRI (Crecco 2005a), so it was not considered further in analyses.

The WRI represented the only EBI available for the entire 1981-2006 time series. Harvest weight estimates were obtained directly from the MRFSS. Weight of recreational releases was estimated from numbers released (MRFSS type B2) multiplied by average weight of released weakfish from the coastwide head-boat fishery (assumed constant at 0.15 kg; see section **C10.4**). Effort equaled MRFSS annual estimates of all trips for the private/rental boat sector. The WRI used previously by Crecco (2006) and Uphoff (2006a) assigned harvest mean weights to released weakfish and these weights were much higher than indicated by headboat releases (3-15 times higher; median  $\approx$  5-times).

The private boat fishery is highly mobile and capable of catching weakfish of all sizes. Weakfish 250 mm TL and larger have constituted the majority of weakfish measured by the MRFSS. Weakfish less than 250 mm and as large as 890 mm were consistently present in historic MRFSS length-frequencies (1979-1998; M. Gibson, RI Fish and Wildlife personal communication; these years are not currently available at the MRFSS website); smaller fish are still present in 2004-2008 length-frequencies available online ([www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/](http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/)), but larger weakfish were consistently present out to about 580 mm in 2008.

Summed mid-Atlantic catches (1981-2006) indicated that nearly all weakfish (numbers) were caught during three MRFSS waves: May-June (24%), July-August (42%), and September-October (33%). Summed mid-Atlantic private boat trips were distributed similarly: May-June (27%), July-August (40%), and September-October (22%). The Mid-Atlantic subregion of the MRFSS represented the major (38-76%, median = 62%) component of annual coastwide recreational weakfish catches.

A general recommendation for data in stock assessment is that information only be used once (Cotter et al. 2004). In the case of the WRI and this assessment, the same information is contained in both the landings and the index. However, division by effort in the index reduces the direct dependency in the data (V. Crecco, CT DEP, personal communication).

Delaware and New Jersey trawl survey EBI were used as additional indicators of weakfish stock biomass. Essential data for calculating EBI for all years included annual biomass (kg) or an estimate of central tendency of abundance of all weakfish caught per tow, annual length-frequencies (cm length groups), and an equation that predicted weight (kg) at length (cm). Each agency provided catch-per-effort data and length-frequencies for the available time-series. We assumed all length-frequencies represented random samples of lengths. Annual length-frequency was converted to weight-frequency by multiplying each cm-group catch by predicted mean weight (kg) of that cm-group.

Predicted weight-at-length was derived from annual regressions of  $\log_e$ -transformed weight (kg) on  $\log_e$ -transformed length (cm). Individual lengths and weights were available from the NEFSC fall trawl survey annually for 1992-2006 (Uphoff 2005a; G. Shepherd, NMFS, personal communication). We used a weight-length regression (converted from pounds and inches to kg and cm) to estimate weight-at-length during 1989-1991 based on combined data from NC during 1982-1983 and 1988-1989, NY during 1988-1989, and coastwide data collected by VIMS (Virginia Institute of Marine Science) during 1988 (D. Vaughan, NMFS, personal communication).

A DE EBI was derived for each year as  $B_{DE} * (B_E / B_A)$ ; where  $B_{DE}$  is the kg per nautical mile estimated for all weakfish by DE;  $B_E$  equaled the summed weight of weakfish  $\geq 25$  cm created by multiplying cm length-group specific catch per tow by predicted weight; and  $B_A$  equaled the summed weight for all weakfish derived by the same procedure described for  $B_E$ .

DE data was available for 1966-1971, 1979-1984, and 1990-2006. We excluded years prior to 1990 because (1) recreational catches were only available since 1981, (2) the time series was discontinuous, (3) survey vessels had changed between 1984 and 1990, and (4) 1981-2003 DE EBI were poorly correlated with WRI, but 1990-2003 were significantly and positively correlated with WRI and NJ EBI (Uphoff 2006a).

Mean kg per nautical mile estimates were provided by DE for all weakfish captured. Twenty minute tows with a 9.1-m headrope trawl were made at nine fixed stations located along the eastern side of Delaware Bay each month during March-December (Michels and Greco 2004). May-October catches during 1990-2007 comprised 98% of weakfish biomass captured. May accounted for approximately 55% of biomass; June and July, 10-12% and August-October 5-8%; CVs of annual estimates of biomass per nautical mile ranged from 16-54% with a median of 22%. A single CV (1994) was in excess of 40%, while 19 of 24 were below 25% (S. Michels, DEDFW, personal communication).

NJ has conducted a stratified random survey along its coast during 1988-2006 (catch data only were available for 1988) and provided a complete file of catch and length-frequency data. February, April, and June data were pared from estimates because of very high frequencies of zero catches (Uphoff 2005a). Indices and weight-at-length distributions were calculated from August and October rounds, the convention used for NJ age-structured indices in early versions of ADAPT (NEFSC 2000).

Uphoff (2005a) calculated three estimators of central tendency and their standard deviations for 1989-2003 NJ data: arithmetic mean (NJAM), the proportion of positive tows (NJPT), and mean  $\log_e$ -transformed catches + 1 (NJLN); NJLN was converted to a geometric mean (NJGM) to express central tendency. These estimates of central tendency were based on catches of all sizes of weakfish.

Precision of NJPT and NJLN during 1989-2003 was comparable (CV = 7.7-29.1%) and trends in survey time-series were similar when NJPT and NJLN were used as indicators of central tendency (Uphoff 2005a). NJAM was less precise (CV = 22.9-60.9%) and indicated different trends in abundance. Uphoff (2005a) chose NJGM as the estimator of central tendency for the NJ trawl survey because its precision was comparable or better than NJPT and it indicated the same trend in relative abundance as NJPT.

An annual NJ length-frequency was converted to weight-at-length distribution (described above). A mean weight of all weakfish sampled (MWT) was estimated by dividing the summed weight frequency by the summed numeric frequency. The exploitable fraction ( $B_E / B_A$ ) of the sampled biomass was estimated as the summed weight of all weakfish  $\geq 25$  cm divided by the summed weight of all weakfish. An index of exploitable biomass (NJ EB) was then derived for each year as  $NJ EB = NJGM * MWT * (B_E / B_A)$ .



The three EBI were different in scale and we used z-transformations to place them on the same scale to view relative trends and added two to each value to positively rescale them. Z-transformations were based upon means and standard deviations during 1990-2006 - years in common among all three surveys. This approach removed the need for multiple index scalars since all were in common scale.

Once these Z+2 EB indices time-series were plotted together, two general trends emerged (Figure C10.4-1). There was (1) general agreement between WRI Z+2 and DE Z+2 indices, and (2) NJ Z+2 (GM based) exhibited considerably more inter-annual variation and disagreed substantially with the others during 1998-1999 (much lower) and 2004-2005 (much higher; Figure C10.4-1). Substitution of NJ PT for NJ GM in the NJ EBI was a slight improvement at best.

This disagreement among indices led us to re-examine whether all three EBI were suitable indicators of stock status and, if not, could they be calculated from a different estimator of central tendency to conform to accepted indicators. This search for conformity implied a single stock of weakfish, even though evidence exists for multiple stocks (Munyandorero 2006). This assumption of a single stock was consistent with how assessments of weakfish have been conducted in the past and how the species has been managed (NEFSC 1998a; NEFSC 2000; ASMFC 2002; Kahn et al. 2006).

This re-examination considered four concepts for suitability: precision, accuracy, consistency among indices, and coherency (inter-annual variation of an index). Coefficient of variation (CV) was used to evaluate precision of trawl surveys and PSEs (proportional standard error; standard error of an estimate as a percentage of the estimate; Personal communication from the National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Statistics Division) were used for MRFSS components. A CV (or PSE) of 40% was considered a threshold for rejection and CVs of 25% or less was desired. Estimates of CV were based on weight or count-based estimators or proportions of samples with weakfish of all sizes. Precision of WRI could not be determined directly, but PSE of harvest weight, catch, and effort were available from the MRFSS survey. Accuracy criteria were to reflect the true status of the population which, of course, was not readily answered. We used trends in 1981-2006 fishery losses (harvest and discard weight in commercial and recreational fisheries) as one indicator and biomass estimated from the converged portion (years exhibiting minimal or no retrospective bias - 1982-2000) of the "best" VPA run (20) from Kahn et al. (2006) as another. Consistency was indicated by how well indices correlated among themselves. Coherency was indicated by correlation with a grand mean of Z+2 transformed WRI, DE EBI and NJ EBI. We considered the grand mean a form of smoothing. Correlation coefficients and  $P (< 0.05)$  were considered in evaluations of accuracy and consistency. Evaluation of coherency involved correlations with a grand mean of the indicators which rendered  $P$  meaningless. Coherency was indicated by similar, high correlations among indices. As a first step, the four available EBI (WRI, DE, NJGM, and NJPT) were evaluated with the four criteria.

Precision of the components of the WRI were within the desirable range. Proportional standard errors (PSE) of trips ranged from 2.6-6.7%, harvest weight PSEs ranged from 8.8-21.8%, and catch PSEs fell between 5.2% and 19.8%. Precision of NJ estimators of central tendency was largely described previously. The NJAM exceeded the 40% CV threshold and was generally above the desirable criterion ( $CV > 25\%$ ). Neither NJLN nor NJPT estimators had CVs above the threshold, but both had values outside the desired range. All but one DE trawl survey estimate of mean kg per nautical mile during 1990-2006 had a  $CV < 40\%$  and 5 of the 17 remaining estimates had CVs between 25% and 40% (S Michels, DEDFW, personal communication).

In general, WRI and DE met the remaining criteria, while NJ EB indices performed poorly. None of the four EBI correlated at  $P < 0.05$  with the converged portion of the VPA, but DE EBI and

NJ GM EBI correlated at  $P < 0.1$ , and WRI correlated at  $P < 0.2$  (Table 2). WRI and DE EBI were significantly correlated with Atlantic coast fishery removals, but neither of the NJ EBIs were. The WRI and DE EBI were significantly correlated with each other and each was significantly correlated with one of the NJ EBI; the NJ indices were significantly correlated with one another. WRI and DE EBI ( $\rho = 0.82-0.95$ ) were more strongly associated with both sets of grand means than either NJ EBI (NJGM,  $\rho = 0.70$  and NJPT,  $\rho = 0.49$ ; Table C10.4-2). We concluded that WRI and DE EBI were suitable indicators of weakfish biomass, but that other estimators should be considered for NJ.

We began by looking at trends in each month (August and October) used in the NJ EBI. We concentrated on the proportion of positive tows (PT) as an indicator of central tendency because its precision should not have been as sensitive to reductions in sample size (from  $N = 71-79$  for two months to  $N = 34-41$ ). I calculated the proportion of positive tows and its 95% confidence interval by using the normal distribution to approximate the binomial probability distribution (Ott 1977). Proportion of zero catches and its inverse, NJPT in this case, tend to be robust to errors and biases in sampling when zeros are frequently encountered (Green 1979; Mangel and Smith 1990). Presence-absence indices have been more robust indicators of yellowtail snapper and age 0 white sturgeon abundance (Bannerot and Austin 1983; Counihan et al. 1999), California sardine (Mangel and Smith 1990) and upper Chesapeake Bay striped bass egg abundance (a spawning stock biomass indicator; Uphoff 1997), and longfin squid fishery performance (Lange 1991) than catch per effort. Marine surveys often contain substantial proportions of zeros and log-normal distributions of positive catches that cause high variability and low precision of sample means (Pennington 1983; 1996). The use of more efficient estimators is one way of increasing survey precision (Pennington 1983; 1996; McConnaughey and Conquest 1993).

CVs of NJ PT for either month were generally within the threshold ( $CV < 40\%$ ), with one exception (August 2003). All October NJ PT CVs were less than 25%, while two August NJ PT CVs were greater than 25%, but less than 40%. CVs were usually higher in August (14 of 18 were greater than October), but confidence intervals of August or October NJPT were significantly different from 0 at  $P = 0.05$  in all years.

We explored two options for calculating EBI from NJ August or October PT. The first option was  $EBI = PT * EWT$  and the second was  $EBI = PT * E * EWT$ , where E is the exploitable fraction (number of weakfish  $\leq 250$  mm / total number) for the August or October sampling round and EWT is mean weight of exploitable weakfish in either round. Criteria for evaluating EBI indices described previously were used to evaluate the four potential indices.

August round  $PT * EWT$  (Figure C10.4-2) met all criteria. It was significantly correlated with WRI, DE EBI, total fishery losses, and the converged portion of the VPA at  $P < 0.05$  (Table C10.4-3). Correlations of this index with the grand mean of WRI, DE, and this NJ EBI (August round  $PT * EWT$ ; all indices z-transformed +2; z-transformation based on 1990-2006) were similar ( $\rho = 0.89, 0.90, \text{ and } 0.86$ , respectively). Other indices only met a single criterion each and were not as strongly correlated with their respective grand means (Table C10.4-3). We selected August round  $PT * EWT$  as NJ EBI and it is denoted as NJA EBI.

#### *C10.4.3 Striped Bass and Atlantic Menhaden Biomass*

Versions of predator-prey models required estimates of striped bass and Atlantic menhaden biomass. The annual sum of SCAM (Statistical Catch at Age Model) biomass estimates for 2 year-old and older striped bass were used as predator-competitor biomass during 1982-2006 (NEFSC 2008). Striped bass of this size would also be important predators of menhaden and would be capable of consuming weakfish (Hartman and Brandt 1995; Walter et al. 2003; Uphoff 2003; Uphoff

2006a; Overton et al. 2008). Atlantic menhaden biomass estimates (ages 1+ during 1981-2005) from a forward projection model were used (ASMFC 2006b).

Neither the striped bass nor menhaden assessments provided time-series that matched the weakfish time-series; 1981 was missing for striped bass and 2006 was missing for Atlantic menhaden. We applied two techniques to fill in these missing estimates. The approaches used to make these estimates will be described briefly.

We developed a known-biomass production model (MacCall 2002) for ages 2+ striped bass using SCAM estimates of biomass, landings, and discard biomass (assumed to be 10% of landings) to estimate biomass. We used SCAM biomass estimates for 1982-2006 (G. Nelson, MA DMF, personal communication; NEFSC 2008), and recreational and commercial landings for 1981-2006 to generate an estimate of biomass in 1981. Parameters  $r$ ,  $K$ , and the model scalar (see modeling section) based on 1982-2006, combined with estimates of fishery losses would allow for an estimate of biomass in 1981. Biomass estimates from the known-biomass production model had a modest bias (10%) and we adjusted output downwards by this amount. Biomass of striped bass in 1981 was estimated to be 8,789 mt (Figure C10.4-3).

We used categorical regression (Neter and Wasserman 1974; Rose et al. 1986) to estimate 2006 biomass of ages 1+ menhaden (from the forward projection model; ASMFC 2006b) from landings. We constructed annual age 1+ biomass estimates by multiplying abundance at age by mean weight derived from length-at-age and weight-at-length equations in ASMFC (2006b). A categorical variable was used to split the 1955-2005 time-series into periods where bait landings were not estimated (reduction landings only during 1955-1984; coded 0; ASMFC 2006b) and the remaining period where bait estimates were added to reduction landings (coded 1). This model provided a significant fit ( $R^2 = 0.70$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ; Figure C10.4-4) and serial patterning of residuals was not indicated. All parameters were significant at  $P < 0.04$  and the relationship was described by the equation:  $B_t = (L_t * 2.484) + (217,798 * C) - 221,922$ ; where  $B_t$  = biomass in year  $t$  in MT,  $L_t$  = landings in MT, and  $C$  = bait landings category. Biomass of ages 1+ Atlantic menhaden in 2006 was predicted to be 449,784 MT (Figure C10.4-4).

#### *C10.4.4 Weakfish Biomass Dynamic Models*

Biomass dynamic models provided a stock assessment framework that allowed the incorporation of covariates for hypothesis testing. Both standard and predator-prey production models evaluated the effect of fishing, while the latter allowed for estimation of predation-competition impacts as well. The small size (250 mm) that defined exploitable biomass of weakfish allowed for use of biomass dynamic models without lags necessary in some delay-difference predator-prey models of other species (Collie and DeLong 1999; Overholtz et al. 2008).

Harvest estimates are summarized in Table C10.4-4; indices, striped bass biomass, Atlantic menhaden biomass, and the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass are summarized in Table C10.4-5.

WRI (1981-2006), DE EBI (1990-2006), and NJA EBI (1989-2006) were used as indices of relative abundance. Each set of indices were Z-transformed based on means and standard deviations from a common time period (1990-2006) and 2 was added to remove negative values (designated as ZEBI). This transformation allowed for a single index scalar (a nuisance parameter). Landings during 1981-2006 included both directed harvest and discards by the recreational and commercial fisheries. Biomass estimates for 2 year-old and older striped bass and ages 1+ Atlantic menhaden were used.

Two types of production functions were considered: the symmetric Schaefer (logistic) model and the asymmetric Gompertz model (Haddon 2001). Previously, Uphoff (2006a) used the Schaefer model as the basis for exploration fishing and predation-competition effects on weakfish, while Crecco (2006) used the Gompertz version.

Biomass dynamics based on the Schaefer model were described by the following discrete time-step equation:

$$B_t = B_{t-1} + rB_{t-1} (1 - (B_{t-1} / K)) - H_{t-1} - D_{t-1} + \varepsilon; \quad (1)$$

where  $B_t$  was weakfish biomass in year  $t$ ;  $B_{t-1}$  = biomass the previous year,  $r$  = intrinsic rate of population increase;  $K$  = maximum population biomass;  $H_{t-1}$  = harvest (commercial and recreational, including discard estimates) in the previous year;  $D_{t-1}$  was predation-competition losses from striped bass and  $\varepsilon$  = observation error (described below; Hilborn and Walters 1992; Collie and Spencer 1993; Spencer and Collie 1995; Haddon 2001).

The Gompertz predator-prey model was expressed as

$$B_t = B_{t-1} + \log_e(K) r B_{t-1} [1 - ((\log_e(B_{t-1})) / (\log_e(K)))] - H_{t-1} - D_{t-1} + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

Quinn and Deriso 1999; Haddon 2001; Crecco 2006). Parameter definitions are the same as equation 1.

In all, a dozen models were formulated, a half-dozen for each production function. Fishing only hypotheses were modeled by omitting functions that estimated  $D_{t-1}$ . Predator-prey functions described Type I, II, and III predator functional responses, as well as two functions designed to mimic depensation. The Type I, II, and III responses assumed that rates of consumption by striped bass were dependent on weakfish density (prey-dependent trophic function; Ginzburg and Akçakaya 1992).

The Type I functional response estimated  $D_{t-1}$  as

$$c P_{t-1} B_{t-1}; \quad (3)$$

where  $c$  = a positive constant;  $P_{t-1}$  = striped bass biomass in the previous year; and  $B_{t-1}$  = biomass of weakfish in the previous year (Yodzis 1994; Collie and DeLong 1999). Estimates of  $D_{t-1}$  from the Type II function were estimated as

$$(cP_{t-1}B_{t-1}) / (1 + a B_{t-1}); \quad (4)$$

where  $c$  is a positive constant and  $a$  is a coefficient that combines search time and probability of capture (Yodzis 1994; Collie and DeLong 1999). The Type III function estimated  $D_{t-1}$  as

$$[(dP_{t-1}(B_{t-1})^2) / (A^2 + (B_{t-1})^2)]; \quad (5)$$

where  $d$  is maximum per capita consumption by striped bass biomass ( $P_{t-1}$ ); and  $A$  is weakfish biomass where predator satiation begins (Collie and Spencer 1993; Spencer and Collie 1995).

Depensatory models did not include  $B_{t-1}$  to estimate  $D_{t-1}$ . The simplest depensatory model describes  $D_{t-1}$  solely as a function of striped bass (predator-competitor) biomass:

$$cP_{t-1}. \quad (6)$$

A final depensatory model expressed  $D_{t-1}$  as a function of the ratio of striped bass biomass to the biomass of its main prey, Atlantic menhaden ( $R_{t-1}$ ) and striped bass (predator-competitor) biomass:

$$P_{t-1}(c/ R_{t-1}). \quad (7)$$

This equation expresses  $D_{t-1}$  solely as a function of striped bass attack success on its main prey, Atlantic menhaden and weakfish were alternative prey. Ratio-dependence is another approach to functional response theory, and the ratio summarizes interference of predators with one another and spatial restriction in foraging (Ginzburg and Akçakaya 1992; Walters and Juanes 1993; Yodzis 1994; Walters and Martell 2004). Natural systems may be closer to ratio-dependence than prey-dependence (Ginzburg and Akçakaya 1992).

The Haddon (2001) spreadsheet version of a biomass dynamic model was easy to adapt to predator-prey formulations because it estimated weakfish biomass as a first step and then estimated an annual scalar ( $q_t$ ) as  $B_t / ZEBI_t$  (Haddon 2001). Estimating weakfish biomass first allowed striped bass biomass to be used directly rather than converting them to weakfish index equivalents. The geometric mean of annual estimates of  $q_t$  (GM  $q_t$ ) was used to predict  $ZEBI_t$ , as geometric mean GM  $q_t * B_t$ . Biomass was estimated directly for 1981 ( $B_{1981}$ ) and then the model estimated subsequent years (Haddon 2001).

An observation error model was used that assumed all residual errors were in the index observations, and the equation used to describe the time-series was deterministic and without error (Haddon 2001). A genetic algorithm super solver (Evolver; Palisade Corporation 2001) was used to estimate predator-prey model parameters that minimized the sum of observation errors (observed  $\log_e ZEBI_t - \text{predicted } \log_e ZEBI_t$ )<sup>2</sup> (Haddon 2001). The spreadsheet version of the model combined with the genetic algorithm provided a great deal of flexibility for trying different model variations.

#### *C10.4.5 Hypothesis Testing*

We used Akaike information criteria adjusted for small sample size,  $AIC_c$ , to evaluate the 12 models describing hypotheses that related changes in weakfish biomass to fishing alone or to fishing + predation-competition losses due to striped bass (Burnham and Anderson 2001):

$$AIC_c = -2(\log\text{-likelihood}) + 2K + [(2K(K+1)) / (n-K-1)]; \quad (8)$$

where  $n$  is sample size and  $K$  is the number of model parameters. We calculated lognormal likelihoods as described by equations 3.29 and 3.30 in Haddon (2001). We rescaled  $AIC_c$  values to  $\Delta_i$ , ( $AIC_{c_i} - \text{minimum } AIC_c$ ) where  $i$  is an individual model (Burnham and Anderson 2001). The  $\Delta_i$  values provide a quick “strength of evidence” comparison and ranking of models and hypotheses. Values of  $\Delta_i \leq 2$  have substantial support, while those  $> 10$  have essentially no support. We used  $\Delta_i$  to calculate Akaike weights that approximated the probability that model  $i$  constituted the best model of the hypothesis given the data. The best model or subset of models were used to generate parameters of interest, estimate variability, and explore model sensitivity. An  $R^2$  was calculated for

the best model or models to describe goodness of fit (Burnham and Anderson 2001).

Once a best model (or models) was chosen, residuals were examined to see if they were normally distributed with a mean of zero and to see if serial trends were present. We used “BestFit” software (Palisade Corporation 1997) to examine whether residuals were normally distributed. Bestfit identifies a distribution that most likely produced the data using Chi-square, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, and Anderson-Darling statistics and provides graphical output for viewing the selected distributions (Palisade Corporation 1997). A regression of residuals against year explored whether a significant linear trend (autocorrelation) was present; other types of serial patterns were evaluated visually. If residual patterns were acceptable, precision of parameters (see below) was estimated. If parameters were significantly different from zero, the model was accepted.

All 12 models had the same number of observations ( $n = 60$ ), while parameters varied from 4-6. Trial versions of biomass dynamic models indicated one data point (NJ ZEBI in 2003) would account for a large portion (nearly half in some cases) of the sums of squares (SSQ) and this point was eliminated from SSQ calculations in all models.

#### *C10.4.6 Model Output and Biological Reference Points*

Instantaneous annual fishing mortality rate in year  $t$  was estimated as:

$$F_t = H_{t-1} / [(B_t + B_{t-1}) / 2] \quad (9)$$

(Ricker 1975). An equivalent instantaneous natural mortality rate associated with striped bass predation and competition was estimated as:

$$M_{pt} = D_{t-1} / [(B_t + B_{t-1}) / 2]. \quad (10)$$

Total instantaneous annual mortality of weakfish ( $Z_{pt}$ ) due to due to fishing and striped bass predation equaled  $F_t + M_{pt}$ . This estimate did not account for other sources of natural mortality not associated with food web effects represented by striped bass. The ratio of  $F_t$  to  $Z_{pt}$  provided an indicator of “leverage” for recovery by managing the weakfish fishery and bycatch (V. Crecco, CT DEP, personal communication).

Loss of weakfish biomass per unit of striped bass biomass was estimated as

$$D_t / P_t. \quad (11)$$

The functional response of striped bass to weakfish was displayed visually by plotting  $D_t / P_t$  against  $B_t$ .

Surplus production estimated from the logistic predator-prey analysis ( $SP_t$ ) was estimated with two equations. The first estimate was from the standard equation and applied to fishing only models:

$$B_t - B_{t-1} + H_{t-1} \quad (12)$$

(Prager 1994; Jacobson et al. 2002). The second estimate of SP ( $SP_{Dt}$ ) explicitly accounted for losses due to striped bass predation and competition:

$$\mathbf{B}_t - \mathbf{B}_{t-1} - \mathbf{D}_{t-1} + \mathbf{H}_{t-1}. \quad (13)$$

This approach defined surplus production similarly to Overholtz et al. (2008). Correlation analysis was used to estimate associations of SP or SP<sub>Dt</sub> with F<sub>t</sub> and/or M<sub>pt</sub> to explore the possible linkage of these parameters to changes in surplus production.

Production (recruitment to exploitable biomass + individual weight gain) was estimated by adding estimates of D<sub>t-1</sub> (if necessary) to the basic production equation described by Walters and Hilborn (2005):

$$\mathbf{P}_{t-1} = \mathbf{B}_t - \mathbf{B}_{t-1} + \mathbf{H}_{t-1} + \mathbf{D}_{t-1}. \quad (14)$$

Estimates of F were compared to relative F estimates rescaled into F (Sinclair 1998; Crecco 2006) using:

$$\mathbf{F}_{Rt} = (\mathbf{H}_{t-1} * \mathbf{q}_{\text{mean}}) / ((\text{mean ZEBI}_t + \text{mean ZEBI}_{t-1}) / 2); \quad (15)$$

where F<sub>R</sub> is an F estimated by rescaling harvest in year t into ZEBI units using the geometric mean of q<sub>t</sub> estimated from the biomass dynamic model and then dividing this product into the average of Z+2 transformed WRI, DE EBI, and NJA ZEBI in years t and t+1. This comparison allowed me to view the impact of the observation error assumption on trends in F based on indices.

Equilibrium biological reference points (EBRPs) could be estimated for relevant Schaefer (F<sub>msy</sub> = r / 2 and B<sub>msy</sub> = K / 2) and Gompertz models (F<sub>msy</sub> = r \* F<sub>collapse</sub> = r \* 2.72, B<sub>msy</sub> = K / 2.72; Quinn and Deriso 1999; Crecco 2006). Nonequilibrium reference points were also developed for predator-prey models that accounted for additional losses from striped bass that were assumed to be responsible for all but F and residual natural mortality (denoted as M<sub>1</sub> by Overholtz et al. 2008).

Two approaches were used to estimate reference points (NBRPs) for mortality when predation-competition losses were included: total mortality at maximum sustained yield (Z<sub>msy</sub>) and annual non-equilibrium F<sub>msy</sub> (F<sub>psyt</sub>). The former simply involved renaming equilibrium estimates of F<sub>msy</sub> as Z<sub>msy</sub> in models with predator-prey terms and comparing it to Z<sub>pt</sub>. This estimate of total mortality at MSY would be constant across time and would serve as a benchmark for total mortality changes.

Annual F that provided MSY after accounting for predation was estimated as

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{psyt}} = \mathbf{F}_{\text{msy}} - \mathbf{M}_{\text{pt}}. \quad (16)$$

In this case, the predator or predator-prey conditions related to total mortality is considered “off-limits” for management and yield can only be influenced by managing the fishery.

Amendment 4 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish (ASMFC 2002) lists SSB that is 20% of an unfished stock as a maximum spawning potential (MSP) threshold and 30% as a target. Although biomass dynamic models do not provide SSB thresholds explicitly, the biology of weakfish allows for MSP proxies. We used B<sub>t</sub> / K as a proxy for MSP to compare to the target and threshold. Minimum size criterion for inclusion as exploitable biomass (≥ 250 mm) was greater than minimum size at 50% maturity (168 mm; all age 1; Nye et al. 2008). Maturity was complete by

230 mm and all age 2 fish were mature; however, age 1 weakfish produced far fewer spawns per season than ages 2 and older (weakfish are indeterminate batch spawners; Lowerre-Barbieri et al. 1998; Nye et al. 2008). Examination of 2001-2003 length at age data (J. Brust NJDEP, personal communication) indicated that age 1 weakfish mostly ranged between 130-300 mm and age 2 ranged from 200-400 mm. Inclusion of age 1 weakfish in  $B_t$  as well as annual variation in batch fecundity could introduce some bias in trying to directly interpret it as a proxy for egg deposition, but these would be problems for equilibrium-based calculations from spawner biomass per recruit or equilibrium yield models as well.

#### *C10.4.7 Variability and Model Sensitivity*

Jackknifing and bootstrapping (Efron and Tibshirani 1993) were used to describe variability of parameters estimated in the final model. The bootstrapping technique recommended by Prager (1994) that preserved the original order of the time-series was used. For each set of bootstrap trials, a synthetic data set was constructed by combining a random sample of the original residuals with the ordered predictions from the original fit; the model was then rerun with each set of synthetic observations (Efron and Gong 1983; Efron and Tibshirani 1993; Prager 1994; Haddon 2001). Percentile confidence intervals of model parameters and the time-series of  $B_t$ ,  $F_t$ ,  $M_{pt}$  and  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$  were estimated.

First, jackknifing was conducted manually using Evolver. Then bootstrapping followed using Excel's Solver. In order for Solver to run, parameter constraints were imposed based on, but broader than, jackknife minimums and maximums.

Several approaches were used to investigate sensitivity of model parameters and estimates of  $Z_t$ ,  $F_t$ , and  $B_t$ . All sensitivity analyses were deterministic. Estimates of  $B_t$  were standardized to  $K$  ( $B_t / K$ ) and estimates of  $Z_t$  and  $F_t$  were standardized to  $Z_{msy}$ . These standardizations were used in an attempt to minimize likely correlations between  $r$ ,  $K$ , and  $B_0$  that would affect comparisons based on absolute values of  $Z_t$ ,  $F_t$ , and  $B_t$ .

Sensitivity of model parameters to data from the beginning or ending of the time-series was tested by removing blocks of data and rerunning the model. Time blocks of years up through 1989 were removed from the beginning of the model. These time blocks at the beginning encompassed data where WRI was the only time-series until the first fishery-independent data were available. Up to three of the most recent years were removed from the time-series that began in 1981. Biomass estimated in 1981 for the 1981-2006 time-series was greater than  $K$  and we ran a version of this model with  $B_{1981}$  constrained to be less than  $K$  for comparison (Prager 1994).  $B_t / K$  estimates were compared in addition to model parameters in this last exercise.

### **C10.5 Results**

#### *C10.5.1 Hypothesis Testing*

AIC<sub>c</sub> scores indicated a 98% chance that the Gompertz production model with a depensatory function relating  $M_{pt}$  to the biomass of age 2+ striped bass and the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass was best (hereafter, Gompertz depensatory ratio model or GDR; equations 2 and 7) for describing the hypothesis given the data (Table C10.5-1). This model fit the data well and explained 90% of the variation in ZEBI (Figure C10.5-1). Remaining models will not be considered, but it is interesting to note that the second and third ranked models were also Gompertz functions with predator-prey functions. Fishing only models were poor choices for describing biomass dynamics of the data, ranking seventh and ninth out of twelve (Table C10.5-1).



The mean of residuals of the GDR model was close to zero (0.0045) and the normal distribution was either the first or second choice of the three procedures in BestFit (a triangular distribution was first in two). A linear serial trend in residuals was not indicated by regression ( $r^2 = 0.014$ ,  $P = 0.37$ ). There were periods of larger positive (1986-1989) and negative (1993-1995) residuals, but residuals of remaining years were mixed (Figure C10.5-2).

### *C10.5.2 Model Parameters*

Model parameters were estimated as  $r = 0.48$ ,  $K = 51,521$  mt,  $c = 0.29$ , and  $B_{1981} = 82,472$  mt. The EBRPs were  $F_{msy}$  or  $Z_{msy} = 0.48$ ,  $F_{collapse} = 1.31$ , and  $B_{msy} = 18,941$  mt. Jackknifing and bootstrapping indicated all parameters were precisely estimated (Tables C10.5-2 and C10.5-3). Parameter values of the base run were very close to their medians, indicating minimal bias. Bootstrapping required constraints and changes to base settings of Excel after preliminary trials indicated repeated failure of Solver without them. Constraints were  $r$ , 0.40 – 0.55;  $K$ , 45,000 - 55,000 MT;  $B_{1981}$ , 65,000 - 90,000 MT; and  $c$ , 0.2 - 0.4. Iterations were set at 1,000, precision to 0.1, tolerance to 0.5%, and convergence to 0.1.

The initial biomass estimate (1981) exceeded the estimate of  $K$ . We applied the penalty function for large values of  $B_0$  described by Prager (1994), but this did not change results substantially. We proceeded through a series of sensitivity analyses to determine a course of action.

Estimates of other model parameters were influenced by the estimate of  $B_0$ . Estimates of  $r$  (and dependent reference points) declined steadily as time-blocks were removed and  $B_0$  declined (Table C10.5-4). Estimates of  $K$  and  $c$  displayed a down and then up trajectory as years were removed. When models were initiated progressively later from 1981-1984,  $K$  declined from 51,000 mt to 46,000 mt and then rose at a quicker rate to 78,000 mt as 1985-1989 became the initial years in the time-series. Coefficient  $c$  declined steadily from 0.29 to 0.20 as 1981-1987 time-blocks were removed and then rose rapidly to 0.35 when the GDR model was initiated in 1988 or 1989. Constraining  $B_{1981}$  to be less than  $K$  lowered  $r$  and raised  $K$  substantially and resulted in a slight drop in  $c$ . The mean of the squared residuals was lowest with the unconstrained 1981-2006 data set (Table C10.5-4). The net impact of these parameter changes was judged by comparing time-series of  $B_t / K$ ,  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$ , and  $F_t / Z_{msy}$ .

Sensitivity analyses indicated that  $B_0 / K$  exceeded one when the time-series was initiated in 1981 or 1982 and was close to one when initiated in 1983 or 1984 (Figure C10.5-3). Remaining treatments did not exhibit  $B_0 / K$  estimates exceeding or approaching one. Estimates of  $B_t / K$  converged for the remainder of the time-series by the late-1980s. Constraining  $B_{1981}$  to less than  $K$  resulted in convergence of  $B_t / K$  with the unrestrained GDR by 1983 (Figure C10.5-3).

Estimates of  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$  were similar in trend among time-block treatments (initial years removed) until the most recent three years of the time-series, when a bifurcation between a steady increase and a plateau occurred (Figure C10.5-4). The unconstrained, constrained, 1982+ time-series, and 1989+ time-series (additional indices present) treatments produced similar increasing trends to  $Z_{2006} / Z_{msy} \approx 3.0-3.5$ , while remaining treatments indicated a leveling of  $Z_{2006} / Z_{msy} \approx 2.0-2.5$ . There were mixed rankings of values of  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$  among treatments, but similar trends for 1985-2003. There was more variability among treatments of years prior to 1985 (Figure C10.5-4).

Trends in  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  were similar among time-block removal treatments (Figure C10.5-5). Ranking of treatments was mixed across the time-series; there was not any one treatment that produced a consistent higher or lower value. Time-series based on the unconstrained  $B_{1981}$  and  $B_{1981}$  constrained to be less than  $K$  converged by 1983. Treatments using all years of data generally produced highest values of  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  in 2006 (0.66 for no constraint on  $B_{1981} / K$  and 0.63 for  $B_{1981} <$

K). Over all treatments,  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  during 2006 varied between 0.45 and 0.66, with a median of 0.53 (Figure C10.5-5).

Overall, differences in  $B_t / K$ ,  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$ , and  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  stabilized by 1983 when the entire time-series was used and  $B_{1981}$  was constrained. Biomass dynamics of weakfish were portrayed similarly among all initial time-block removal treatments. We chose to keep the results of the unconstrained GDR, but did not use 1981 and 1982 estimates. Prager (1994) recommended not using the first 2-4 years of production model estimates to draw inferences about biomass.

Removing up to three of the most recent years from the time-series had little impact on parameter estimates, except for  $B_{1981}$ . Estimates of  $r$  increased from 0.48 when all data were used, to 0.50 when 2006 or 2005-2006 were removed; estimates of  $K$  did not change;  $B_{1981}$  declined from 82,472 to 68,286 MT, and  $c$  fell from 0.292 to 0.291. Collectively, these changes did little to alter depiction of biomass dynamics after 1982 (illustrated by  $B_t / K$ ; Figure C10.5-6).

Assigning larger mean weights to recreational discards influenced parameter estimates (Table C10.5-5), but did not discernibly alter estimates of  $B_t$  unless weights above 0.3 kg or harvest mean weights were assigned (Figure C10.5-7). We accepted the use of 0.15 kg for recreational discard weights in the WRI and fishery loss estimates. Only the run with 0.4 kg mean weight had  $B_t$  estimates that were consistently higher than other runs. Using harvest mean weight produced similar estimates of  $B_t$  as the remaining treatments during 1982-1991, but estimates were consistently higher afterwards (Figure C10.5-7). The timing of the separation of estimates based on harvest weights was similar to the timing of increasing minimum length limits beginning with Amendment 1 (ASMFC 2002); size limits would have increased recreational discarding and the impact of assumed discard weights.

Biomass was about 33,600 mt in 1983 and fell to 6,300 mt by 1990;  $B_t$  rose to 18,000 mt in 1996-1997 and then began to decline again, reaching a brief plateau at 5,000-6,000 mt during 2003-2005 (Figure C10.5-8). The pace of loss accelerated in 2006 (4,000 mt) and 2007 (3,000 mt). Landings exhibited the same general trend as  $B_t$ . Initial losses to striped bass ( $D_t$ ) were very low and rose slowly to less than 1,000 mt during 1983-1993 and then began to accelerate to about 5,100 mt by 1997. Estimates of  $D_t$  fluctuated between 4,100 and 5,900 mt during 1998-2006 while  $B_t$  was dropping. Fishery-related loss estimates fell below  $D_t$  in 1999 and were less than 25% of  $D_t$  since 2004 (Figure C10.5-8). Jackknife and bootstrap estimates of  $B_t$  (Figures C10.5-9 and C10.5-10) and  $D_t$  (Figures C10.5-11 and C10.5-12) indicated little bias and estimated precision of  $B_t$  and  $D_t$  from these techniques was high.

Estimates of  $F_t$  were near  $Z_{msy}$  (0.48) during 1983-1985, then peaked quickly at 1.3 during 1988, then fell steadily to below  $Z_{msy}$  in 1992 (Figure C10.5-13).  $F_t$  remained below  $Z_{msy}$  during 1992-1997 and then rose slowly to a level slightly above  $Z_{msy}$  during 1998-2002. After 2002,  $F_t$  dropped sharply and remained at about 50-70% of  $Z_{msy}$  through 2006 (Figure C10.5-13).

Estimates of  $M_{pt}$  rose from a very low level in the mid-1980s to estimates equivalent to  $F_t$  and  $Z_{msy}$  by 1999 (Figure C10.5-13). After 1999,  $M_{pt}$  accelerated rapidly and reached 1.4 in 2006 (Figure C10.5-13).

Comparing  $F_t$  to equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  and non-equilibrium  $F_{psyt}$  may provide the best depiction of how  $D_t$  influenced biomass dynamics (Figure C10.5-14). After 1992,  $F_t$  remained below or near what would be equilibrium  $F_{msy}$  (or  $Z_{msy}$ ); however, increasing losses to striped bass were continuously eroding  $F_{psyt}$  (Figure C10.5-14). This erosion was reflected in continuous estimates of negative  $SP_{Dt}$  after 1996 (Figure C10.5-15). Negative surplus production (in absolute terms) exceeded landings since 2002 and biomass since 2006. Surplus production was generally in excess of 6,000 mt during 1983-1994 (Figure C10.5-15). Surplus production was significantly associated

( $P < 0.01$ ) with  $F_t$  and  $M_{pt}$ , but the modest positive correlation ( $\rho = +0.54$ ) with  $F_t$  was somewhat counter-intuitive (although  $F$  should increase surplus production initially in an unfished or lightly fished stock) while the association with  $M_{pt}$  was logical, negative, and strong ( $\rho = -0.90$ ).

Production varied between 5,000 – 9,000 mt during 1984-2006 and was highest during periods when biomass was greater than production (1984-1988 and 1992-2002; Figure 20). High biomass during the mid-1980s was not reflective of concurrent production and its deterioration was not particularly reflective of  $F_t$ , or  $M_{pt}$ . Production was close to biomass when total mortality rates were high during 1989-1991 (due to fishing) and 2003-2006 (due to predation-competition; Figure C10.5-15). Production appeared to decline when proxy MSP ( $B_t / K$ ) fell below 20% (Figure C10.5-16).

Estimates of proxy MSP ( $B_t / K$ ) fell continuously after 1983 from 65% of  $K$  to reach about 12% by 1990 (Figure C10.5-16).  $F_t / Z_{pt}$  indicated that this early decline would have been attributed to  $F$  (ratio was near 1). Fishing mortality reductions lead to rebuilding to approximately 35% of MSP by 1996-1997 (target level in Amendment 4 = 30%; ASMFC 2002), while  $F_t / Z_{pt}$  was falling from near 1.0 to approximately 0.5. Spawning potential continuously fell after 1997, reaching 8% MSP in 2006 and 6% MSP in 2007 as  $F_t / Z_{pt}$  declined from about 0.5 in 1997-2002 to less than 0.2 in 2006 (Figure C10.5-16).

Estimates of  $F_t$  from the GDR were usually close to estimates of relative  $F_t$ , except during 1986-1989 (Figure C10.5-17). A plot of catchability over time ( $q_t = ZEBI_t / B_t$ ) suggests this was a period of elevated catchability in the WRI (Figure C10.5-18). However, catchability was higher for the 1989 NJA EBI as well, indicating that there may have been regional aggregation of weakfish as biomass was declining as opposed to nonrandom behavior by recreational anglers alone (Figure C10.5-18).

Jackknife and bootstrap estimates of  $F_t$  were precise, with slightly more variability in estimates during 2005-2006 (Figures C10.5-19 and C10.5-20, respectively). Estimates of  $F_{2006}$  were likely to be between 0.23 and 0.32 based on jackknife 90% percentile confidence intervals, while bootstrapping indicated  $F_t$  was likely between 0.31 and 0.40. Median and original values of  $F_{2006}$  (0.31) were very close, indicating minimal bias.

As with  $F_t$ , jackknife and bootstrap estimates of  $M_{pt}$  were precise, with slightly more variability in estimates during 2005-2006 (Figures C10.5-21 and C10.5-22). Estimates of  $M_{p2006}$  were likely to be between 1.3 and 1.7 based on jackknife 90% percentile confidence intervals, while bootstrapping indicated  $M_{p2006}$  was likely between 1.0 and 1.4. Median estimates of  $M_{p2006}$  from both techniques and original values (1.41) were the same.

Estimated loss of weakfish biomass per biomass of striped bass ( $D_t / P_t$ ) was very low (0.004 – 0.005 mt / mt) during 1983-1987 when the menhaden to striped bass biomass ratio ( $R_t$ ) was at its zenith (70-80 mt / mt; Figure C10.5-23). A rapid drop in  $R_t$  to 20-30 during 1988-1993 produced a rise in estimated  $D_t / P_t$  to 0.01-0.02. By 1997,  $R_t$  became asymptotically low at less than 10, while modeled estimates of  $D_t / P_t$  became asymptotically high between 0.04 and 0.06 (Figure 28). These changes in  $R_t$  produced two striped bass functional response regimes (Figure C10.5-24). During 1983-1993, while weakfish biomass ( $B_t$ ) fell from 34,000 to 6,300 mt,  $D_t / P_t$  was low – between 0.004 and 0.01. A rapid transition followed and during 1997-2006,  $D_t / P_t$  increased to 0.04-0.06 as  $B_t$  fell from 18,000 to 4,000 mt (Figure C10.5-24).

## C10.6 Verification of Predation-Competition Loss Estimation

### C10.6.1 Long-term Evidence of the Influence of the Menhaden to Striped Bass Ratio on Weakfish

A long-term view (1959-2006) of the influence of the menhaden to striped bass ratio on weakfish was developed from an index-based menhaden to bass ratio, Atlantic Coast weakfish commercial harvest, and a Delaware Bay trawl survey length-frequency index (DE PSD Q+; Appendix C-2). Chesapeake Bay menhaden to bass index ratios ( $CR_t$ ) for 1959-2006 were developed from presence-absence of age 0 menhaden in the MD seine survey (E. Durell, MD DNR, personal communication; see <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/fisheries/juvindex/index.html> for survey description) and striped bass egg presence-absence indices in MD spawning areas (an index of mature striped bass female biomass; Uphoff 1997). Presence-absence of menhaden in the MD survey was significantly related to estimates of coastal menhaden abundance (all ages) two years later from the ASMFC assessment (linear regression, 1959-2005,  $r^2 = 0.58$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ; J. Uphoff, MD DNR, unpublished analysis). As with Skud (1982), my basic premise was that a truly competitive relationship between striped bass and weakfish would transcend deficiencies of weakfish landings or indices. A strong correlation existed between weakfish landings and the fishery-independent DE PSD Q+ index ( $\rho = 0.94$ ), indicating both reflected similar processes.

Trends in both sets of menhaden to striped bass biomass ratios ( $R_t$  and  $CR_t$ ) tracked each other closely, falling from their highest levels in the early 1980s to asymptotic lows in the mid-1990s (Figure C10.6-1). Chesapeake Bay menhaden to bass index ratios ( $CR_t$ ) indicated low attack success in the 1960s and a sudden rise in 1971. Higher ratios were maintained until the early 1990s (Figure C10.6-1). A linear regression of 1982-2005 estimates (strictly based on assessment results as opposed to 1981 and 2006 predictions) was significant ( $r^2 = 0.80$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) and  $CR_t$  could be converted to  $R_t$  with the equation:

$$R_t = (67.3 * CR_t) - 5.8.$$

During 1959-2006, weakfish commercial harvest and the DE PSD Q+ index closely followed  $CR_t$  (Figure C10.6-2) and correlations with the  $CR_t$  were strong ( $\rho \approx 0.82$  in both cases). These associations indicated that this ratio has been important in dynamics of weakfish beyond the period covered by the GDR.

### C10.6.2 Short-term Evidence of the Influence of Striped Bass on Weakfish Condition

Competition between striped bass and weakfish would be expected to influence condition of weakfish. An estimate of mean weight at a standard length provides a measure of body condition (Deriso et al. 2008).

Individual lengths and weights were available from the NEFSC fall survey annually for 1992-2006 (Uphoff 2005; G. Shepherd, NMFS, personal communication). These samples are collected by standardized trawl in a stratified random design during a restricted period of time (NEFSC 2007) and should minimize gear, location, and seasonal variation of weight. Predicted weight-at-length was derived from annual regressions of  $\log_e$ -transformed weight (kg) on  $\log_e$ -transformed length (cm) that were applied to NJ trawl survey length-frequencies to derive exploitable biomass (*described previously in Trawl Survey Indices of Exploitable Biomass*). Generally, weakfish  $< 400$  mm were well represented in the length-weight samples, although larger weakfish were present in the length-weight samples. Fits of the  $\log_e$ -transformed length and weight data were very good ( $r^2 \approx 0.99$ , except 2003  $r^2 = 0.97$ ). The length used to designate quality

weakfish in PSD analysis (Appendix C-2), 340 mm, was used as a standard length and predicted weight at this length was used as a body condition indicator (hereafter,  $Q_{wt}$ ; Table C10.6-1). Regression analysis tested whether  $Q_{wt}$  had undergone a significant linear decline since 1992, and whether it was negatively related to striped bass biomass or the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass ( $R_t$ ). Inspection of residuals of these regressions indicated that 2003  $Q_{wt}$  was a potential outlier and a separate set of analyses was run with this year removed.

Regression analysis (all years and with 2003 removed;  $r^2$  range = 0.41-0.61 and  $P$  range = 0.0009-0.01) indicated that  $Q_{wt}$  had undergone a significant decline during 1992-2006, and that the decline in  $Q_{wt}$  was significantly related with both striped bass biomass and the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass (Table C10.6-2). Predicted body mass at 340 mm was negatively related to striped bass biomass and positively related to the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass. These relationships were consistent with expected effects of intense competition between weakfish and striped bass and with parameterization of the GDR model.

### *C10.6.3 Comparison of Model and Field Estimates of Weakfish Consumption by Striped Bass*

Unlike harvest, we do not have a natural mortality “body count” to unequivocally estimate  $D_t$  or  $M_{pt}$ . However, estimates of  $D_t / P_t$  can be judged by comparing them to estimates of maximum consumption ( $C_{max}$ ) and annual consumption of food ( $C_t$ ; weight of all prey, fish and invertebrates, consumed) per weight of striped bass on an annual basis from bioenergetic models of striped bass. These estimates have been made for Chesapeake Bay during 1955-1959 (Griffin 2001), 1990-1992 (Hartman and Brandt 1995a; 1995b), and 1998-2001 (Overton 2003). Bioenergetics models of Griffin (2001) and Overton (2003) were the same as Hartman and Brandt (1995a; 1995b), but used diet and temperature data for their respective time periods. We confined comparisons of  $C_t$  to striped bass 2 years-old and older on day 365 (full year’s consumption); these studies estimated  $C_t$  for ages 2-6. These comparisons allow for an estimate of the scale of individual consumption of weakfish by striped bass and may answer the questions “Are weakfish a major or minor item?” or “Are the estimates of  $D_t / P_t$  excessively high (in excess of  $C_{max}$  or  $C_t$ )?”

Overton et al. (2008) provided a time-series of striped bass diet trends to compare with  $D_t / P_t$ . This study examined 1,154 striped bass during winter in the Atlantic Ocean off the VA and NC coasts. These striped bass were collected during 1994-1996, 2000, 2002-2003, and 2005-2007 and their diets were dominated by Atlantic menhaden and bay anchovy (Overton et al. 2008). Percent of striped bass stomachs with food ( $SS_t$ ) was relevant to GDR estimates of  $D_t / P_t$ . In the GDR, decreased feeding success by striped bass (indicated independently by  $SS_t$ ) should lead to increased search times and more encounters with weakfish since the diet is dominated by other species and includes a large contribution by menhaden, i.e.,  $D_t / P_t$  would be negatively related to  $SS_t$  and influenced by  $R_t$ . Linear regression with categorical variables and a slope shift coefficient was used to analyze these relationships (Freund and Littel 2000). The annual ratio of menhaden biomass to striped bass biomass ( $R_t$ ) was converted to a categorical variable ( $MR_t$ ), 0 for ratios 10 and above (1994-1996) and 1 for ratios below 10 (remaining years). Categories were used to minimize confounding with  $D_t / P_t$  estimates derived from the model that used these ratios to estimate  $D_t$ . A slope shift coefficient was estimated because the time trend in the functional response plot indicate two periods with different slopes that would have to be accounted for within the span of Overton et al. (2008) data (see Figure C10.5-24). The slope shift coefficient was estimated by including a variable equal to the product of  $SS_t$ , multiplied by  $MR_t$  (Freund and Littel 2000). These variables were tested for inclusion by multiple regression and those significant at  $P < 0.05$  were retained. An inverse transformation of the dependent variable,  $D_t / P_t$ , was used to place the small ratios on a

larger scale.

Estimates of  $D_t / P_t$  were quite low when compared to estimates of weight of annual food consumption (fish and invertebrates) per weight of striped bass ( $C_t$ ) in three Chesapeake Bay bioenergetics studies (Table C10.6-3; Hartman and Brandt 1995; Griffin 2001; Griffin and Margraf 2003; Overton 2003). Estimates of  $C_t$  ranged from 4.1 to 7.9, with a median of 5.5, while  $D_t / P_t$  fell between 0.004 and 0.06. Estimates of  $C_t$  were about half to a third of  $C_{max}$  (Hartman and Brandt 1995). Weakfish were a minor diet item subject to a very low level of consumption by striped bass (if all losses were strictly defined as consumption). This low level of consumption was applied over an increasingly large striped bass biomass that was engaging in higher search times (reflected by low  $R_t$ ) for their main prey after 1996. Encounters with weakfish may have been facilitated by diet, spatial, and temporal overlap with striped bass, resulting in disproportionately high  $D_t$  as weakfish biomass declined. There was no feedback between  $D_t$  and  $P_t$  since weakfish were such a minor diet item.

Estimates of  $D_t / P_t$  were strongly related to estimates of feeding success of striped bass in coastal VA and NC during winter, indicated by  $SS_t$  (as a percentage). The relationship was described by linear regression with a slope shift coefficient:

$$D_t / P_t = 1 / [(0.204 * (SS_t)) - (0.16 * (MR_t * SS_t)) + 15.35]; (R^2 = 0.89, P = 0.0013);$$

where  $MR_t$  is the category for menhaden to striped bass biomass ratio (Tables C10.6-4 and C10.6-5).

### **C10.7 Could Bycatch be Responsible for the Recent Decline?**

Weakfish Peer Review and Data Poor Workshop panels in 2006 and 2008, respectively, suggested that unreported commercial discards of weakfish after 1995 could have created the recent weakfish stock collapse in lieu of our hypothesis of a rise in natural mortality. We fit Gompertz biomass dynamic models to the three ZEBI's, harvest, estimated discards, and an additional loss term ( $L_F$ ) mimicking various commercial bycatch scenarios ( $L_F$  increasing as linear, quadratic, or exponential functions of time, a constant multiple of bycatch estimates, or as a constant additional weight). Additional losses were imposed after 1995 to reflect regulatory discards. Results were contrasted with the GDR and a Gompertz model using estimated fishery losses without additions. We used  $AIC_c$  to calculate Akaike weights that approximated the probability that model  $i$  constituted the best model of the hypothesis given the data.

Akaike weights (Table C10.7-1) indicated that there was approximately a 91% chance that the GDR provided the best model of the dynamics of the data, while there was a 6% chance when  $L_F$  was constant (an additional 3,495 MT since 1996), and a 3% chance when  $L_F$  increased as a quadratic function of time (increasing from an 2,273 MT in 1996 to 5,054 MT in 2006). These two bycatch scenarios invoke about the same biomass of  $L_F$  as  $D_t$  estimated by GDR (Figure C10.7-1). In general, bycatch estimates started at about 2-3 times the estimates of 1996 and ended up 15 to 20 times higher by 2006 (Figure C10.7-1). Each of these three scenarios provided an excellent fit to the EBI ( $R^2 \approx 0.90$ ). Remaining models had near zero odds of explaining the data compared to these three.

### **C10.8 Discussion**

Biomass dynamic modeling indicated the weakfish stock was not overfished in 2006 based on equilibrium  $F_{msy}$ , but was subject to high natural mortality that eroded the safe level of fishing. The

$B_t / K$  proxy for MSP in 2007 (6%) was far below the 20% MSP threshold in Amendment 4, while high negative values of  $F_{psyt}$  (non-equilibrium  $F_{msy}$ ) and surplus production indicated that complete (and unlikely) elimination of harvest and bycatch would not be sufficient to end the decline. Production persisted at a modest level in recent years, although it was falling gradually. Depensatory mortality, driven by high striped bass biomass and a low ratio of Atlantic menhaden to striped bass (an indicator of low feeding success on striped bass' main prey), appeared the most likely explanation for increasing natural mortality that undermined recovery given the data, hypotheses, and models developed. Fishing played a secondary role in recent biomass dynamics. Striped bass predation-competition dominated weakfish biomass dynamics after overharvesting had been controlled in the early 1990s.

Regression analyses and biomass dynamic models indicated high potential for striped bass, menhaden, and weakfish linkage. Spatial, temporal, and diet overlaps were sufficient for interactions to occur. Modeling indicated high mortality of weakfish from striped bass was derived from very low loss of weakfish per striped bass applied over a large striped bass biomass. Predation-competition from striped bass has increasingly eroded weakfish surplus production and  $F_{msy}$  reference points and there seems little chance of restoring weakfish by manipulating its fisheries alone because  $F$  has become a low fraction of total mortality ( $\approx 20\%$  by 2006). At this time, leverage for manipulating weakfish may mostly reside in the menhaden to bass ratio.

Projections of future weakfish biomass under these conditions indicated little ability to generate recovery by manipulating the fishery and suggest extirpation in a time frame shorter than a moratorium could be implemented. These predictions should be greatly qualified. We believe these predictions indicate (1) a need for broader multispecies or ecosystem-based management perspective on weakfish and (2) managing the weakfish fishery alone is unlikely to have much impact unless conditions contributing to high  $M_{pt}$  (very high striped bass biomass and low menhaden-bass ratio) lessen. The possibility of extirpation is far more uncertain than indicated by projections because of high uncertainty of model specifications. Forecasts, starting with  $B_{2007}$ , have gone beyond weakfish biomass limits represented by data (up through 2006), which the model has fit well, and continued to represent predation-competition as unchanged. This representation of a constant predation-competition function in GDR projections becomes highly uncertain as weakfish densities drop and implies lack of refuge for weakfish, as well as uniform (and suicidal) linkage of weakfish migratory and feeding behavior with striped bass. Munyandorero's (2006) summarization of weakfish population structure literature would suggest the South Atlantic region could serve as a refuge since sub-populations below NC are not subject to commercial fisheries or predation from the migratory striped bass that roam from ME to NC. The Atlantic Coast weakfish stock appears to be a mosaic of regional sub-populations with enough exchange for genetic uniformity (Munyandorero 2006).

It can be difficult to predict the effects of fishing or culling policies from fairly simple representations of predation processes (Bax 1998; Yodzis 2001; Hollowed et al. 2000a). Hollowed et al. (2000b) cited Beverton's argument that only first order symmetric interactions in which a predator and fishery exploit the same prey species are predictable. First order asymmetric interactions, in which the predator (striped bass) and fishery (weakfish) exploit different interacting prey species (striped bass mainly exploit menhaden in this case and their exploitation of weakfish is a function of their failure to do this successfully) are unpredictable (Hollowed et al. 2000a; Yodzis 2001). Further complicating projections of weakfish biomass dynamics was the reliance on single species, constant  $M$ -based biomass estimates for striped bass and Atlantic menhaden biomass as the principle drivers of  $M_{pt}$ . There is evidence for both species that their natural mortality has changed systematically (tag-based estimates for striped bass and multispecies modeling for menhaden; Jiang

et al. 2007; ASMFC Multispecies Technical Committee 2008; Gauthier et al. 2008; NEFSC 2008) and mortality could be linked between these species (Uphoff 2003). Systematic and linked changes in  $M$  would alter estimates of striped bass and menhaden biomass which drive  $D_t$  and  $M_{pt}$  in the GDR.

Atlantic menhaden is a buffer species that absorbs predatory pressure from other species when they are sufficiently abundant (ASMFC 2004). Striped bass actively select for Atlantic menhaden, but will feed on other species when menhaden are not sufficiently abundant (Overton 2003; ASMFC 2004; Ruderhausen et al. 2005). Striped bass appear capable of limiting their prey populations along the Atlantic Coast at high biomass that existed during the mid-1990s into 2006 (Hartman 2003; Uphoff 2003; Heimbuch 2008). The GDR indicated that as menhaden have become less abundant and striped bass more-so, striped bass searching has led to increasing encounters with vulnerable-sized weakfish searching for smaller prey-fish (anchovies and age 0 menhaden) that are also found in diets of the largest striped bass (Walter and Austin 2003; Overton et al. 2008).

Hypothesis testing indicated that compensatory mortality associated with high striped bass and low menhaden biomass has reduced productivity of weakfish along the Atlantic coast. Compensation may not be common, but it is not so rare a possibility that it should be considered implausible (Walters and Kitchell 2001). Movement from high to low equilibrium states can be induced by compensatory mortality (Collie and Spencer 1993). These shifts can be regarded as jumps between alternative equilibrium states of ecological systems (Steele and Henderson 1984). The term “regime shift” has been used to suggest these changes are causally connected and can be linked to other changes in an ecosystem (Steele 1996). The regime shift concept implies that different regimes have inherent stability, so that significant forcing is required to flip the system into alternative states (Steele 1996).

The effect of striped bass on weakfish in the GDR was minimal when  $R_t$  was above 20, but it intensified (more weakfish died) as  $R_t$  fell lower and their biomass dynamics were dominated by striped bass. Switching behavior by large predators may cause unexpected, sequential depletion in prey (Walters et al. 2005). In the early to mid-1990s, important forage species (Atlantic menhaden, spot, and bay anchovy) dropped to low levels (Uphoff 2006a; ASMFC Multispecies Technical Committee 2008) and depletion of weakfish followed in the late 1990s.

Hartman and Brandt (1995) found that striped bass in Chesapeake Bay during 1990-1992 increased their use of the pelagic food web (primarily menhaden) as they aged, while weakfish increased use of benthic resources (spot). Stable isotope analysis of striped bass scales collected during 1982-1997 from Chesapeake Bay indicated striped bass increased their use of the benthic food web as menhaden abundance decreased (Pruell et al. 2003). This shift would place them in more direct competition with weakfish and increase the chance striped bass would be occupying the same habitat as weakfish while feeding.

Estimates of  $D_t$  in the GDR represented combined effects of direct striped bass predation, as well as cannibalism and starvation induced by intense competition (Yodzis 1994). Estimates of  $D_t$  may have included covarying species effects as well, but striped bass predation-competition should predominate.

Weakfish are cannibalistic; weakfish juveniles were specifically mentioned in weakfish diet studies reviewed by Mercer (1985). They comprised about 20% of weakfish diet by weight in Delaware Bay during 1985 (Taylor 1987). Atlantic coast biomass estimates indicated striped bass were at low abundance and menhaden were at high abundance during 1985 ( $R_t \approx 80$ ), but menhaden were not abundant in DE and NJ surveys (Uphoff 2006a). Weakfish were not specifically mentioned in diets of weakfish sampled in Chesapeake Bay during 1990-1992 ( $R_t \approx 20$ ; Hartman and Brandt



1995), but other weakfish comprised 8% of ages 0-5 weakfish diets in Chesapeake Bay during 2002-2003 ( $R_t \approx 5$ ; Bonzek et al. 2004).

Diminished size quality (indicated by PSD Q+: Appendix C-2) and condition (indicated by  $Q_{wt}$ ) were both related to the biomass of striped bass and Atlantic menhaden (Uphoff 2006a; see section C10.6-2). Substantial decreases in mean weight at age during 1981-2003 in the VPA catch-at-age matrix also occurred (Uphoff 2006a); however, interpretation is confounded by the potential biases as aging shifted from scales to otoliths at the same time. Natural selection balances predation risk and the need to obtain food for growth and fear of being eaten may reduce foraging and growth (Walters and Juanes 1993; Walters and Martell 2004; Trussell et al. 2006) and even lead to starvation (Pine et al 2009). Mortality due to starvation is a size-dependent process and represents an alternative (albeit final) response to reduced growth and stunting during food shortages (Ney 1990; Persson and Brönmark 2002). Starvation may be more common than generally perceived (Ney 1990) and it might be expected once the bioenergetic limits of reduced growth were breached.

Comparisons of trends in biomass and production from biomass dynamic modeling and length quality (Appendix C-2) suggested large scale shifts in biomass and production relationships from the early-to-mid 1980s to current conditions. High biomass during the mid-1980s was not reflective of concurrent production, and its deterioration during 1983-1985 was not reflective of  $F_t$  ( $\approx F_{msy}$ ) or  $M_{pt}$  (near 0). The DE PSD Quality+ index (Appendix C-2, Figure 1) indicates that larger weakfish were more common during this earlier period. The grand mean of standardized YOY indices has increased since the 1980s (see Figure 32 in Kahn et al. 2006) as size quality has diminished. This suggests a trade-off between high growth–low recruitment and low growth –high recruitment that coincided with a drop in  $R_t$  after 1987 (see Figure 30).

Models used in this investigation were of modest complexity because of the basic limitations of the observational data. Simplified procedures allowed for the testing of overfishing and predation-competition hypotheses. The strategy of including striped bass predation-competition was chosen in light of realization that dynamics of predation, competition, environmental regime shifts, and habitat alteration or deterioration could take over once overharvesting had been controlled (Link 2002). Stationarity of ecological conditions or constancy of  $M$  cannot always be an acceptable default assumption (Sainsbury 1998) and simply presuming that ceasing exploitation on an overfished stock will result in recovery ignores the uncertainty imposed by ecological systems (Link 2002). Evaluating effects of fishing on ecosystems often has to be pursued by testing hypothetical conceptual models and multispecies models are essential (Hollowed et al. 2000a). An important element of these models is that they must include predators having the greatest impact on commercial and recreational species (Hollowed et al. 2000a).

The GDR was a step in an inferential process described by Platt (1964), Burnham and Anderson (2001); and Deriso et al. (2008). Hypothesis testing in subsequent years may yield other or additional environmental or ecological factors or functional descriptions. The “right” functional form of predator-prey models can be difficult to define (Yodzis 1994), but typical parameters in age structured single species models (constant  $M$ , stock-recruitment steepness, selectivity) are sometimes confounded and difficult to estimate (Magnusson and Hilborn 2007). The exact form of the predation-competition term may not be crucial. Management benchmarks from the “top” three models (GDR, bass only, and Type II; all Gompertz functions) were very close ( $F_{msy}$  range = 0.48-0.51 and  $B_{msy}$  range = 19,000-20,000 mt), as were estimates of current status ( $B_t / K$  in 2006-2007 range = 6-9%). Management advice would not vary appreciably since  $Z_{2006} / Z_{msy}$  ranged from 2.4 to 3.6 while  $F_{2006} / Z_{p2006}$  was between 0.18 and 0.20, i.e., total mortality was very high and mostly due to striped bass predation-competition.

Overfishing was the cause of the decline of weakfish in the mid-to-late 1980s, and management was successful in preventing it from reoccurring, at least by standard equilibrium benchmarks. The failure of recovery since the late 1990s cannot be attributed to overfishing unless bycatch and under-reported catches were much greater than those estimated, growing from about 3-4 times the estimates in 1996 to 15-20 times by 2006. If results of hypothetical bycatch scenarios are taken at face value, then weakfish regulations created a massive boost in discards and represent a colossal management failure. Implementation of further conservation measures short of a coast-wide moratorium on many Atlantic coast fisheries would not minimize this nominal discard problem. There is no evidence available thus far of an Atlantic coast fishery capable of generating additional unreported weakfish discards of this magnitude (Uphoff 2006b).

Equilibrium MSY limit reference points, consistent with the precautionary approach (Restrepo et al. 1998) and estimated from the GDR, indicated that  $F$  had been near or below  $F_{msy}$  for the last 15 years, but  $B_t$  fell well below 20% of  $K$  that approximated the MSP limit in Amendment 4 (ASMFC 2002). Biomass continued falling even as  $F_t$  fell to about 50-60% of  $F_{msy}$  after 2003. Fishing mortality rates in this range should have been associated with stock expansion or stability under constant  $M$  conditions and these equilibrium-based biological reference points had little utility when  $M$  was rising rapidly. Biological reference points can be sensitive with species subject to predation and cannibalism and may represent moving targets (Collie and Gislason 2001). Multispecies simulation models indicated it was impossible to derive a single fixed value for  $F_{msy}$ , but stock-recruitment and yield curves may be distorted if multispecies effects are disregarded and predictions of recovery can be much too optimistic (Hollowed et al. 2000a). Moustahfid et al. (2009) added predation loss estimates as a “fleet” in an age structured assessment of Atlantic mackerel and noted that their inclusion altered model outputs and biological reference points. Non-equilibrium  $F_{psyt}$  was informative; however, it was not developed until predation-competition effects were well established and is likely to be retrospective in practice. Once understood, non-equilibrium  $F_{psyt}$  does provide short-term understanding of underlying productivity and its relationship to fishing. In the case of the GDR, by 2000 rising  $M_{pt}$  ate away all  $F$  that represented a safe level of fishing.

The biomass dynamic approach applied here and by others (Collie and Spencer 1993; Spencer and Collie 1995; Spencer and Collie 1997a; Collie and DeLong 1999, Crecco 2006; Uphoff 2006a) is fundamentally different from biomass or age structured multispecies models employed by Hollowed et al. (2000b), Overholtz et al. (2008), and Moustahfid et al. (2009), and ASMFC (NEFSC 2006). The biomass dynamic approach applied here generates estimates of predation-competition losses through their predation-competition terms, predator-competitor biomass or trends (Crecco (2006) used relative abundance), and fits to observed indices or estimates of “victim” biomass. Estimates of individual or stock level consumption were not applied; however, estimates individual of consumption by striped bass were needed for verifying results or they could define constraints on generated estimates. Other methods require predator abundance and annual consumption rates or estimates of consumption by age (Hollowed et al. 2000b; ASMFC 2003; Overholtz et al. 2008). Size, and prey type preference parameters, evacuation rates, biomass of “other food” not explicitly modeled, and annual or semi-annual diets may also be needed (ASMFC 2003; Moustahfid et al. 2009).

It is not possible to look at all predation processes in an ecosystem (Bax 1998; Sainsbury 1998; Walters and Martell 2004) and we concentrated on a limited representation of the food web. The GDR is a minimal realistic model that represents first-order indirect (triangular) interactions (Bax 1998). Triangular food webs have been proposed as a mechanism promoting stability in marine ecosystems (Bax 1998). The virtue of a minimum-realistic approach is tractability in analyzing and

parameterizing (Yodzis 2001). Its shortcoming is that there is no *a priori* way to know how much complexity is the minimum and that can only be judged by comparing results to more complex ecosystem models. A minimum-realistic approach was used to develop an understanding of how culling seals might affect the hake (*Merluccius paradoxus* and *Merluccius capensis*) fishery in the Benguila ecosystem (Punt and Butterworth 1995; Yodzis 2001).

The GDR supports the existence of a dominance hierarchy, as defined by Skud (1982), between striped bass (dominant) and weakfish (subordinate). A dominant species is defined as the more abundant of two species that interact and whose densities are maintained at distinctly different levels (Skud 1982). Ignoring dominance hierarchy can lead to erroneous interpretation of factors contributing to changes in subordinate species abundance. Weakfish landings (1929-2006; Figure C10.8-1), GDR biomass (Figure C10.8-1), and DE PSD Q+ (see Figure 1 in Appendix C-2) maintained distinct high or low levels related to striped bass and  $R_t$ . Changes in abundance of dominant species are positively correlated with environmental factors that improve survival, while abundance of subordinate species depends on density of the dominant species (Skud 1982). Most variation in year-class strength of striped bass in Chesapeake Bay (the largest spawning area on the Atlantic Coast) can be explained by freshwater flow and temperature during March through May (Rutherford and Houde 1995; North et al. 2005) although recent high biomass and trophic demand also reflect imposition of conservative management measures (Richards and Rago 1999; Uphoff 2003). Variation in weakfish abundance is strongly related to striped bass and its success in feeding on menhaden (indexed through  $R_t$ ). An assumption of constant  $M$  ignores dominance hierarchy and attributes all changes in weakfish biomass to fishing, which would grossly overestimate the potential for recovery by managing the weakfish fishery alone.

More complex fisheries ecosystem models of other species complexes in other geographic regions (Ecopath with Ecosim or EWE) have highlighted processes similar to those displayed by the GDR. Large dominant fishes may be successful due partly to “cultivation effects”, where adults crop down forage species that are potential competitors of their own juveniles (striped bass cropping weakfish in this case; Walters and Kitchell 2001). Dominance is a result of not only being able to acquire resources but also by insuring the best possible trophic conditions for the dominant species’ young. This hierarchy leads to the risk of persistent depensatory effects (low juvenile survival) that develop with some time lag following periods of adult stock depletion (Walters and Kitchell 2001). EWE modeling of multiple systems has indicated that trophic interactions in combination with widespread fishing at  $F_{msy}$  may cause considerable change in community structure and  $MSY$  than those predicted from single-species assessments (Walters et al. 2005). The most critical predictions of change in juvenile mortality rates from EWE simulations of the Gulf of Mexico ecosystem arose when abundant predators caused high mortality of prey without those rates being represented as high proportions of predator diets (Walters et al. 2008).

Experience with Northwest Atlantic Cod *Gadus morhua* provides a case history to consider when contemplating weakfish biomass dynamics presented here. Excessive fishing mortality was the predominant factor in depletion of these stocks of cod and led to their collapse by the early 1990s (Shelton et al. 2006). Despite imposition of severe catch restrictions for over a decade, stocks largely failed to recover at predicted rates due to declines in productivity. Factors contributing to this decline in productivity (in rank order) were increased natural mortality, decreased body growth, reduced recruitment was implicated in a few cases, and continued fishing and bycatch were important (Shelton et al. 2006). An increase in  $M$  is now routinely incorporated into several cod stock assessments (Chouinard et al. 2005). Changes in estimated  $M$  in southern Gulf of St. Lawrence cod matched fluctuations of in grey seal abundance, although some inconsistencies in seal diet data

conflicted with this hypothesis (Chouinard et al. 2005). Productivity of this stock of cod has declined to the point where the population is no longer viable even in the absence of fishing (Swain and Chouinard 2008).

## **C11.0 Review evidence for constant or recent systematic changes in natural mortality, productivity, and/or unreported removals. (TOR #7)**

### **C11.1 Introduction**

A period of stock rebuilding appears to have occurred during the early 1990s, as evidenced by expansion of the population age structure, increases in commercial and recreational harvest and CPUE, and positive trends in abundance and biomass in subsequent stock assessments. However, during development of the 2006 weakfish stock assessment (ASMFC 2006a, Part A), the WTC was confronted with anomalous patterns in weakfish abundance estimates and modeling results. Preliminary runs of age structured and simple biomass models indicated that the stock had rebuilt to record levels. In contrast, observed size and age structure had diminished, CPUE and harvest were down, and fishermen were complaining about lack of fish. Management measures had not changed, and there was no evidence of increased harvest or discard rates. Discrepancies in trends of fishing mortality estimated by VPA and relative F analysis provided further evidence that the modeling results were suspect. The WTC searched for possible causes of model uncertainty and the unexpected reversal in stock growth. Additional modeling exercises, including biomass modeling with environmental and ecological covariates, suggested that the anomalous pattern was due to an incorrect assumption of constant natural mortality, and that stock declines were a result of increased interaction with principal predator/competitor species (ASMFC 2006a, Parts A and C).

Results of the 2006 stock assessment were vetted through the ASMFC external peer review process (ASMFC 2006a, Part B). The peer review panel did not accept the WTC's evaluation of the stock, suggesting that the age structured modeling could be improved by addressing concerns with the input data. These issues were addressed as well as possible by the WTC prior to and during the development of the 2009 stock assessment. Regardless, preliminary age structured and simple biomass modeling attempts still produce unrealistic results. As such, biomass modeling with ecological and environmental covariates was again pursued, with updates and improvements made over the previous (2006) methods.

An interim review of the current stock assessment as a work in progress was conducted during the 2008 DPSW in Woods Hole, MA. Modeling results presented during the DPSW indicate that fishing mortality is a minor component of total mortality, suggesting trophic or environmental forces as major influences on weakfish stock dynamics. The reviewers had similar comments as the 2006 panel regarding the advanced modeling efforts, citing concerns with input data and lack of empirical evidence to support the predation/competition hypotheses (Miller et al 2009). Although the panel appears to agree that weakfish populations have decreased, they contend that any number of sources could have been the driving force of the decline, such as environmental factors or unreported/underestimated removals. The following is a review of a suite of analyses searching for evidence of declines in productivity due to non-fishing sources.

## C11.2 Review of previous findings

### C11.2.1 Relative F

By the early 1990s, harvest (total removals) had fallen to less than half the levels seen during most of the previous decade (Figure C11.2-1). As a result (presumably), biomass began a period of rebuilding around 1993. During the mid to late 1990s, harvest was increasing slightly, but with the increase in stock size, F rates had fallen to all time low levels between 1995 and 1997. Regardless, a dramatic drop in biomass was observed between 1997 and 1998, and the decline has continued to recent years. Harvest levels remained relatively stable and were similar to those that had presumably led to stock increases earlier in the decade, but now were causing a rapid stock decline. As biomass declined, predicted trends in fishing mortality from age structured modeling (ADAPT VPA) indicated a continuous, almost exponential increase in fishing mortality between 1995 and 2002, regardless of tuning indices used. (Trends after 2002 are unreliable due to retrospective patterns.) The WTC expressed concern that trends in F from the VPA might be influenced by the assumption of constant natural mortality, M. Relative F analysis was considered as an alternative method to calculate trends in fishing mortality. Relative F evaluates the stock as a whole, and is not influenced by changes in age structure. Some of the benefits of relative F are that it is simple and intuitive, easy to calculate, and not constrained by assumptions about natural mortality. The following is a summary of the relative F analysis presented in section **C8.0** of this report.

Relative F is calculated as

$$F_{rel} = \frac{H_t}{0.5 * (I_t + I_{t+1})}$$

where  $H_t$  is total harvest in year  $t$ , and  $I$  are index values of abundance in year  $t$  and  $t+1$ . Total harvest biomass was estimated as the sum of commercial harvest from state and NMFS reporting programs, commercial discards using the methods of de Silva (2004), recreational harvest (A+B1) from MRFSS, and 10% of total recreational discards (from MRFSS) multiplied by the MRFSS estimated average weight of discarded fish of 0.15 kg. Three surveys – MRFSS 1+ CPUE, New Jersey Ocean Trawl Survey positive tows, and Delaware DFW 30-foot Delaware Bay Trawl Survey – were standardized to a common scale and averaged to develop a single index of weakfish abundance. Additional information on these data and their sources are presented in sections **C5.0** (harvest) and **C6.0** (indices).

In order to directly compare relative F estimates with estimates derived from the VPA, the relative F time series was rescaled using a span of years during the converged portion of the VPA which is robust to the number and source of tuning indices used. This method assumes relative stability of M, which is one of the main concerns of the WTC regarding ADAPT; however, the assumption is only applied for a short time period (5 years) which is much more realistic than M remaining constant over decades.

To rescale the relative F vector, the ratio between  $F_{VPA}$  (biomass weighted 1+) and  $F_{rel}$  was found for the years 1982-1985. The average ratio for these years was computed and applied to  $F_{rel}$  for all years in the time series.

Comparison of trends in rescaled  $F_{rel}$  and  $F_{VPA}$  (biomass weighted ages 1+) show similar patterns between 1982 and 1998 (Figure C11.2-2). Fishing mortality was relatively high during the

1980s, generally ranging from 0.7 to 1.3. In the early 1990s, both trends begin a gradual decline to time series lows of 0.23 ( $F_{VPA}$ ) and 0.35 ( $F_{rel}$ ) in 1995 before gradually increasing to between 0.5 and 0.6 by 1999. Beginning in 1999, the trends differ greatly.  $F_{rel}$  exhibits relative stability, generally ranging between 0.4 and 0.6 until the end of the time series. In contrast,  $F_{VPA}$  continues to increase rapidly, reaching a time series high of 1.57 in 2003.  $F_{VPA}$  declines after 2003; however a strong retrospective pattern (Figure C7.3-2) suggests  $F_{VPA}$  estimates in recent years are greatly underestimated.

Harvest and abundance data used for the VPA and relative F analyses are essentially identical. Trajectories of biomass harvested and biomass indices used for relative F are strongly correlated with the corresponding age aggregated numbers based inputs for the VPA. Identical input data and divergent results suggest violation of model assumptions or mis-specification of one of the models. An underlying assumption of the ADAPT model is that catch at age is known without error. Section C5.0 of this document identifies several sources of uncertainty with the overall catch at age, which likely lead to this assumption being violated through inaccurate harvest information and/or poorly specified age distribution. Error in the age structure would not be expected to produce such divergent trends in fishing mortality from the two methods. Inaccurate harvest information could produce the observed discrepancy, but only if there was a systematic increase in the amount of unrecorded landings. Several recent peer reviews (ASMFC 2006a, Part B; Miller et al 2009) suggest unreported landings could be contributing to the anomalous patterns. In an attempt to quantify the amount of unrecorded removals required to mimic trends in total mortality observed in the VPA, two alternative applications of the “forage model” were run using estimates of unrecorded removals that were constant or increasing over time (see section C10.0 of this report). A constant level of approximately 3,500 MT of additional removals since 1995, or an increase from 2,300 to 5,000 MT additional removals between 1995 and 2007 both resulted in strong model fits ( $R^2 \sim 0.90$ ; see Figure C10.7-1); however, neither performed as well as the “best” model fit which incorporated menhaden and striped bass abundance. In addition, the implications of these unrecorded removal scenarios are drastic. Total recorded removals in 2007 were less than 1,000 MT while estimated unrecorded removals were three to five times greater, suggesting our understanding of fleet dynamics is minimal and reporting requirements are ineffective. Also, the 2006 and DPSW review panels suggested the increases could be due to additional discarding. Such large increases in discarding rates following implementation of management measures imply a complete failure of management to constrain removals.

Another possible cause for the discrepancy in results between the VPA and relative F could be misspecification of input data. Without direct evidence to the contrary, natural mortality is often considered constant throughout time. This simplistic assumption may hold over short time periods, but is likely unrealistic over decades. Regardless, the baseline VPA model runs investigated for this and all previous stock assessments assumed constant natural mortality in weakfish of  $M = 0.25$ . ADAPT estimation procedures incorporate the input natural mortality rate, and model results are therefore influenced by the rate selected. Incorrect assumptions in the input M matrix would lead to inaccurate estimates of population parameters by the ADAPT model. In contrast, relative F calculations are independent of any assumptions regarding natural mortality rate. Discrepancies in F trends calculated using the two methods may indicate invalid assumptions regarding M.

### *C11.2.2 Biomass modeling*

Due to concerns over the uncertainty in recent years’ estimates from age structured modeling (*i.e.* retrospective patterns), as well as concerns regarding the assumptions upon which the ADAPT

runs were constructed (in particular, constant M and error free CAA), the WTC investigated biomass dynamic modeling. Methods are described in detail in sections **C9.0** and **C10.0**, and are summarized below.

Two similar but alternative models were developed to investigate both simple and extended biomass models. Three indices of weakfish abundance (two fishery independent and one fishery dependent) were standardized and combined into a single composite index to depict trends in biomass. Simple models used basic (Schaefer and/or Gompertz) formulations of surplus production models with fishing as the only source of mortality, while the extended models incorporated ecological and environmental covariates as well. One model (the “predation hypothesis”) investigated trends in potential weakfish predators as well as several environmental variables. In contrast, the “forage model” investigated links between weakfish abundance and trends in potential predators/competitors and forage species. Suitable covariates for inclusion in the extended models were selected using correlation analysis and stepwise regression. For a particular covariate to be retained for further analysis, statistical results had to be significant and logical (*e.g.* negative correlation for predator, positive correlation for forage). The predation model implemented a Type III predator-prey functional response (Steele-Henderson), while the forage model investigated a suite of response functions. “Best” models were selected using model fits, parameter estimation, trends in residuals, and/or Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).

Detailed results of the predation hypothesis are presented in section **C9.0**, while the forage hypothesis is discussed in detail in section **C10.0**. The following is a summary of findings for the two models.

### ***Predation model***

Simple biomass dynamic modeling using the Gompertz formulation produced significant parameter estimates and strong model fit ( $r^2 = 0.68$ ). However, uncertainty around parameter estimates was moderate, and a prominent systematic trend in residuals suggests process error (missing terms) in the population model (Figure C9.3-8).

Correlation analysis and stepwise regression were used to investigate potential links between key environmental and ecological covariates and trends in weakfish abundance. Results of the statistical analysis indicate that indices of abundance based on recreational CPUE for two key predator species (striped bass and spiny dogfish) are negatively correlated with weakfish biomass (Table C9.3-1). Including these indices in a biomass dynamic model with a Type III functional response increased model fit ( $r^2 = 0.94$ ) and greatly reduced uncertainty in parameter estimates (Table C9.3-6). Additionally, residuals from the run including predation appear much more random (Figure C9.3-9).

### ***Forage model***

Statistical analyses identified significant correlations between weakfish and both striped bass abundance and menhaden abundance that might influence weakfish stock dynamics. These terms were included in biomass dynamic modeling that evaluated six different mortality hypotheses (fishing only, 3 functional responses, 2 depensatory responses) in both Schaefer and Gompertz formulations, for a total of 12 competing models. AIC showed that the model including fishing mortality, striped bass abundance, and a depensatory response to the ratio of menhaden to striped bass performed best, while the two models with fishing mortality only ranked 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> out of 12.

Results of these two models (predation hypothesis and forage hypothesis) suggest that a simple biomass dynamic model based on trends in weakfish abundance and harvest is insufficient for

characterizing population dynamics. Inclusion of predation terms greatly improves model results, providing trends that more accurately reflect field observations, and strongly support a systematic increase in  $M$  in the past decade or more. Comparison of  $M_p$  from the predation model and  $M$  calculated from  $Z_{VPA} - F_{rel}$  show a very similar pattern (Figure C11.2-3). In addition, the fishing only models produce population parameters that are unrealistic for a species with a life history such as weakfish. Weakfish grow quickly and mature at a young age, suggesting that the population growth parameter,  $r$ , would be relatively high. The Gompertz model when only fishing mortality is assumed estimates  $r = 0.26$  and a carrying capacity ( $K$ ) over 150,000 MT (Table C9.3-3). This relatively slow growth rate and extreme carrying capacity seem unlikely for a species that exhibits rapid growth and early maturation. Including ecological covariates in the biomass models results in  $r$  and  $K$  estimates which are much more realistic for a species like weakfish.

It has been argued that spatial and temporal overlap of striped bass and weakfish are limited to the fall during southward migrations, and therefore opportunity for predation events is uncommon. The WTC recognizes that weakfish are not a principal prey item of striped bass. A comparison of estimated predation mortality and striped bass bioenergetic data indicates weakfish are a minor component of striped bass diet (see section C10.6.3). Regardless, with the dramatic increase in striped bass abundance over the last decade, even low consumption rates would lead to substantial increases in weakfish predation mortality.

### **C11.3 Additional analyses to investigate changes in productivity**

#### ***C11.3.1 Environmental***

North Atlantic sea surface temperatures have been found to exhibit a 65 to 70 year oscillation (Schlesinger and Ramankutty 1994; Enfield et al 2001). Kerr (2000) termed this oscillation the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) to distinguish it from the atmospheric North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO). Since its discovery, the AMO has been linked to the occurrence and severity of climatic events throughout the northern hemisphere such as rainfall/drought, severity of Atlantic hurricanes, and North American and European summer climate (Enfield et al 2001). A concise, albeit “unofficial,” review of the AMO is available from Wikipedia, the open access online encyclopedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/>).

Data for the AMO are available from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Earth System Research Laboratory at <http://www.cdc.noaa.gov/data/timeseries/AMO> as both an annual index (1948 to 2007) and a 10-year moving average index (1861 to 2002). The longest official time series available for weakfish consists of reported commercial harvest from 1950 to 2007. Although many factors affect reported harvest (*e.g.* abundance, effort, gear selectivity, data collection methods), the harvest time series was considered proxy data for weakfish abundance. Trends in the smoothed AMO index were compared to commercial weakfish harvest estimates from 1950 to 2002. Pearson correlation was conducted using SAS Proc Corr (SAS 1990). To evaluate potential temporal delays in population response, correlations were conducted with the harvest time series lagged backward 0 to 10 years.

Using reported weakfish commercial harvest as proxy data for weakfish abundance, graphical analysis suggests that weakfish abundance increases when the AMO is in a negative phase (Figure C11.3-1). In 1950, the AMO was in a positive phase, but began a gradual decline in the mid 1950s, crossing into a negative phase in the mid 1960s, and continuing to a relative minimum a decade later. The AMO index then increased steadily until the early 1980s, leveled off for a number of years, before resuming an increasing trend in 1990. The index entered a positive phase around



1994, and continued to increase through 2002 (the last year available for the 10 year average). In contrast, weakfish landings, and presumably abundance, were low from 1950 to the 1960s. Rapid increases in harvest began in 1970 while the AMO was in a negative phase. Shortly after the AMO reached a minimum, landings peaked and rapidly dropped off. As the AMO entered the recent positive phase, landings have dropped to record low levels.

Correlations between the 10 year moving average AMO index and commercial weakfish landings were negative and highly significant ( $P < 0.001$ ) for all comparisons (Table C11.3-1). The strongest association ( $r = -0.83$ ) was found when a five year time lag was incorporated. Peaks in commercial landings and record numbers of citation size fish (Uphoff 2004) are reported during the late 1970s and early 1980s when the AMO was at its lowest point. Despite commencing an upward trend in the mid 1970s, a slight stabilization of the index coincided (when a five year lag is incorporated) with management measures, perhaps boosting their effectiveness. The index resumed a positive trend, and the transition from a negative to a positive phase occurred around the time of the unexpected reversal in weakfish stock growth.

The longest official index available for weakfish is the NMFS commercial harvest record extending from 1950 to present. However, Joseph (1972) provides a landings history back to 1929. Correlation analysis with the longer time series provides weaker, but still significant negative relationships between AMO and weakfish landings. The strongest correlations ( $r \sim -0.38$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) occur with a 7 to 9 year time lag (Table C11.3-1). Between 1929 and 1935, AMO was increasing in a positive phase after which it stabilized. Landings during this period were decreasing, and reached relative low levels a short time after the AMO stabilized. Landings began to rebound shortly after the AMO began a declining trend around 1959.

Quantitative analysis is not possible prior to 1929, but a qualitative analysis suggests the correlations hold for earlier periods as well. Collette and Klein-MacPhee (2002) indicate periods of high landings in southern New England and into Cape Cod Bay during the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This harvest boom occurred as the AMO switched from a positive to negative phase, and during portions of the next 3 decades while the AMO remained negative. Landings from this region were not consistently high throughout this period, but were alternately abundant and scarce. This would not be unexpected for a species fished heavily near the extent of its range. High fishing pressure would diminish the stock, but during a period of high productivity, populations could rebuild quickly.

Crecco (2009) investigated localized temperature variation but found no correlation with weakfish abundance. Water temperature data from other New England stations (*e.g.* Oviatt 2004, Nixon et al 2004) show similar patterns to that observed by Crecco, but with localized differences in magnitude and duration of anomalies. The AMO incorporates data from the entire North Atlantic which may be more representative for a stock distributed over a wide range. In addition, Crecco evaluated correlations in temperature and abundance over a shorter time scale and without a smoothing function. Interannual variability in temperature, particularly when confined to a single site, may partially mask long term trends, making correlations harder to detect.

Decadal scale influence of climate and other variables on marine populations has been gaining recognition in the last two decades (*cf* Hare and Able 2007, Introduction pp 31-32). In some recent examples, Oviatt (2004) found that increased winter water temperatures led to a decline in boreal demersal species such as winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*) and windowpane flounder (*Scopthalmus aquosus*), followed closely by an increase in demersal decapod crustaceans. Increased winter temperatures were also strongly correlated with increases in abundance of grey snapper (*Lutjanus griseus*) in Texas (Tolan and Fisher 2007). Perhaps most

relevant to weakfish, Hare and Able (2007) identify a link between winter water temperature and juvenile abundance of Atlantic croaker (*Micropogonias undulatus*), another member of the scianid family. The authors propose a conceptual model whereby above average winter water temperatures result in high juvenile survival which leads to “outbursts” in Atlantic croaker populations. These studies provide evidence that productivity and stock dynamics can be significantly influenced by environmental factors such as water temperature. It is recognized that factors other than abundance influence harvest levels, but strong correlations and qualitative associations between weakfish harvest and the AMO over the last century provide support that oceanic conditions may have a significant influence on weakfish stock dynamics and may help explain the unexpected decline in productivity over the last decade. It is not possible from the available data to determine whether oceanic conditions are acting on weakfish directly (e.g. recruitment strength), indirectly (e.g. changes in predator and/or prey abundance), or a combination of both.

### C11.3.2 Food habits

The NEFSC Food Habits Database contains information on type and prevalence of prey items for key species, obtained by analysis of stomach contents collected during seasonal trawl surveys. Preliminary review of the database showed that fall surveys from 1991 to present have used consistent methodology and have collected sufficient sample size of weakfish. Prey types were grouped into broad diet categories (amphipod/isopod, crab/shrimp, forage fish, empty, other), and the annual percent composition in all observed stomachs was calculated for each prey category. Three year moving averages were calculated to smooth out interannual variation in prevalence, and SAS Proc Corr (SAS 1990) was used to evaluate correlations between prey prevalence and trends in total mortality (biomass weighted, ages 1-5) estimated by ADAPT VPA. These correlations were conducted for 1-inch size intervals from 5” to 12”, and for all sizes combined, for the years 1991 (first year of food habits data) to 2002 (most recent year of VPA results without retrospective pattern).

Negative correlations with  $Z_{VPA}$  were generally observed with percent composition of crab/shrimp and forage fish, while the percent composition of amphipod/isopod and the prevalence of empty stomachs were positively correlated (Table C11.3-2; Figure C11.3-2). More than half of these correlations were strong ( $P < 0.10$ ), and only the 12” category was not significantly correlated. The “empty” category produced the greatest number of significant correlations (6 out of 9 size groups) and often produced the strongest correlations with  $Z$ . One interpretation of these data is that primary prey items (forage fish and large invertebrates) became scarce, so weakfish shifted to other, less optimal prey (small invertebrates) or were unable to find suitable forage (empty stomachs).

The 2008 DPSW review panel expressed concern over the lack of empirical data to support the hypothesis that weakfish productivity has been compromised since the late 1990s. The data presented above provide direct empirical evidence that weakfish forage opportunities may have diminished during the mid to late 1990s. Decreased forage abundance and/or sub-optimal prey types could affect weakfish productivity through increased natural mortality or changes to other parameters (e.g. growth rates). Empirical data are also provided through a comparison of two studies on weakfish diet composition in Chesapeake Bay (Hartman and Brandt 1995; R. Latour, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, pers. comm.). The studies occurred approximately a decade apart on either side of the time period during which natural mortality was suspected to have increased. These studies indicate shifts in diet composition (Figure C11.3-3) that are consistent with those observed in the NEFSC food habits database. Weakfish initiate piscivory at an early age, beginning with bay anchovy at age 0 and moving to larger prey such as menhaden and spot by age 1

to 2. In Chesapeake Bay, Hartman and Brandt (1995) indicated that greater than 80% of weakfish diet from age 0 to 2 consisted of these principal prey items, with the majority of the remainder (5 to 20%) made up of invertebrates (Figure C11.3-3). In contrast, by 2002, 30% or more of weakfish diets age 0 to 5 consisted of invertebrate species, with forage fish accounting for less than 40% of the total (R. Latour, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, pers. comm.). Bay anchovy and Atlantic menhaden have become much less frequent in weakfish diets between the early 1990s and early 2000s, spot have disappeared, and invertebrates have comprised a greater part of the diet. During both periods, weakfish made a rapid transition to piscivory - bay anchovy dominated their diets as young of year. However, transition from bay anchovy to dominance of spot and Atlantic menhaden at age 2 that occurred during the early 1990s was not evident in recent years. Older weakfish (ages 2+) are subsisting on the same invertebrate and bay anchovy diet as ages 0-1, with a much smaller supplement of menhaden (Figure C11.3-3). Striped bass diets in Chesapeake Bay have undergone similar changes as those described for weakfish; small striped bass are now relying more on invertebrate prey and large striped bass on small pelagic prey such as bay anchovy and age 0 clupeids, and benthic invertebrates (Griffin and Margraf 2003; Overton 2003). This suggests that larger prey (juvenile menhaden and spot) were insufficiently available for both species to complete the transition to piscivory.

Early switching to a fish diet indicates that weakfish is a specialized piscivore (Persson and Brönmark 2002). Early switching requires high growth rate, which implies high densities of proper forage and safe foraging opportunities. Species undergoing ontogenetic diet shifts face a risk of delayed transitions among feeding stages if food resources are limited and competition is intense (Persson and Brönmark 2002). If unfavorable conditions prevail, then growth is reduced, often leading to ontogenetic bottlenecks where individuals fail to gain size advantage on larger prey items in the next stage. Unfavorable conditions can also result in increased vulnerability to competitors and predators. Competing individuals and predators may hinder one another's feeding activities, leading to starvation or they may eat one another (including cannibalism; Yodzis 1994). The two Chesapeake Bay studies and the NEFSC food habits database provide evidence that weakfish forage opportunities diminished during the late 1990s. Shifts in diet composition may have resulted in decreased productivity of the stock through decreased growth rates and/or increased competitive or predatory mortality.

### *C11.3.3 Size at Age*

Another possible indicator of changing productivity would be changes in size at age over time. Preliminary investigations were conducted using separate time series of scale- and otolith-based age data, but are not presented here. Although some data produce significant trends (both positive and negative) in size at age during the time series, the WTC was concerned that the availability of samples could be affecting the results. Due to geographic differences in size (*e.g.* between southern and northern Mid-Atlantic states), annual differences in the source and sample size by source can affect estimated average size when evaluated on a regional or stockwide basis. Additionally, no single data source had a consistent time series of sufficient sample size at age to evaluate on an individual basis. The WTC intends to continue investigating potential changes in size at age by identifying alternative data sources and analytical methods.

In addition, trends in size (weight) at age were used to evaluate trends in natural mortality (Lorenzen 1996). Preliminary investigations indicate that trends in natural mortality are well correlated with VPA-based estimates of total mortality. However, as mentioned above, the WTC is concerned that trends in weight at age may be affected by interannual variability in the location and

intensity of sampling, so formal results are not presented in this report.

#### C11.4 Discussion

Following the 2006 stock assessment, the WTC concluded that fishing mortality for weakfish had remained stable at low levels in recent years, but that the population was near all time low levels due to increased predation/competition with striped bass. These conclusions received criticism from the 2006 peer review panel and the 2008 DPSW review panel. The panels identified concerns with input data and lack of empirical data to support the conclusions. The DPSW panel expressed the opinion that any number of factors could have contributed to the trends in fishing mortality observed from the VPA, such as unreported harvest, changing fishing practices, or environmental/ecological influences other than predation. Responses to concerns regarding input data are discussed elsewhere in this report (*e.g.* sections **C5.0** and **C6.0**). This section of the report investigates a variety of data types and sources that might support or discount the hypothesis that weakfish productivity has declined.

The WTC recognizes that population dynamics of any species are influenced by a wide variety of anthropogenic, environmental, and ecological forces, both direct and indirect. As these forces work in concert, enhancing or diminishing the effects of each other, it is not possible to predict the magnitude or direction of their cumulative impact. This section is not meant to be a comprehensive review of all the possible influences on the weakfish stock, but attempts to investigate some of the more direct factors. The overwhelming majority of data types investigated lend support to the WTC's evaluation that factors other than fishing mortality were influencing stock dynamics.

- During the period 1995 to 2003, total mortality (biomass weighted  $Z_{VPA}$  ages 1 to 5) increased by 375% from 0.48 to 1.82 (Figure C11.3-2)
- During the period 1995 to 2002,  $F_{rel}$  estimates, which are independent of natural mortality, remained relatively stable and were much lower than  $F_{VPA}$  estimates based on assumptions of known constant  $M$ . (Figure C11.2-2)
- Biomass models that incorporated ecological interactions with key predators/competitors and forage species resulted in improved model fits and more realistic population parameters than models based on fishing mortality alone. (Tables C9.3-3; compare Figures C9.3-8 and C9.3-9).
- Estimates of unrecorded removals necessary to replicate  $F_{VPA}$  trends were unrealistically high and imply complete management failure. (Figure C10.7-1)
- Trends in north Atlantic sea surface temperature tracked through the AMO are strongly correlated with weakfish harvest trends over the last century. (Figure C11.3-1)
- Two independent studies identify shifts in prey types during the 1990s. (Table C11.3-1; Figures C11.3-3)
- The incidence of empty weakfish stomachs observed in the NEFSC food habits database correlates strongly with the increase in total mortality ( $Z_{VPA}$ ) as fishing mortality ( $F_{rel}$ ) remains stable (Figure C11.3-2)

The WTC admits that the conclusion in the 2006 stock assessment that weakfish declined solely as a result of striped bass predation may have been overly myopic; however, given the additional evidence presented in this section, the WTC still contends that productivity of the weakfish stock was compromised beginning in the mid to late 1990s due to one or more of the factors discussed

above. Potential changes in productivity include decreased growth rates, starvation, competition, or increased vulnerability to predation, among others. Regardless of the source, the overall effect was a decline in weakfish stock biomass which analyses suggest was not attributable to fishing pressure.

## **C12.0 Estimate biological reference points using equilibrium and non-equilibrium assumptions and evaluate stock status relative to these BRPs. (TOR #8)**

### **C12.1 Thompson-Bell reference points**

Weakfish are currently managed relative to reference points developed under Amendment 4 of the Weakfish Fishery Management Plan. Reference points were updated during the 2002 assessment (Kahn 2002) using a spreadsheet based model, but the updated reference points were not adopted because it was not a benchmark stock assessment. For the current benchmark assessment, reference points have been calculated using the spreadsheet model. The model requires input values for partial recruitment at age, natural mortality, and age specific maturity. Weight at age is calculated using relationship described by Vaughan 1999. SSB is calculated as the summed product of number and weight at age. Fishing mortality reference points were found by solving for F rates that provided spawning stock biomass of 30% (target) and 20% (threshold) relative to unfished stock (J. Uphoff, MD DNR, pers comm.).

Reference points established under Amendment 4 assumed equilibrium conditions with a constant natural mortality rate of  $M = 0.25$ . Implementing the spreadsheet method described above and updating partial recruitment values to the average of the most recent three years (2005-2007) allows direct comparison of reference points during the two periods. Amendment IV established new reference points for fishing mortality target of  $F_{\text{target}} = F_{30\%} = 0.31$ , and a fishing mortality threshold of  $F_{\text{threshold}} = F_{20\%} = 0.5$ . Updating partial recruitment to the average of 2005-2007 decreases reference points estimates to  $F_{30\%} = 0.28$  and  $F_{20\%} = 0.42$ . The Shepherd spawner–recruit function was also updated using recent data, providing a new SSB threshold estimate of  $SSB_{20\%} = 13,108$  MT. Comparison of VPA based parameter estimates indicates that fishing mortality on weakfish has been above the equilibrium target of  $F_{30\%}$  in all years since 1981, and above the  $F_{20\%}$  threshold in every year except 1995 (Figure C12.1-1). SSB has exceeded the  $SSB_{20\%}$  threshold during only two time periods: 1986-1987 and 1994-1997.  $SSB_{2007}$  is approximately 55% of the threshold, but is likely overestimated based on the observed retrospective pattern.

Reference point estimates are conditional on the input values, such as partial recruitment at age. Given the pronounced retrospective pattern that overestimates abundance at age (see section C7.0), estimates of partial recruitment in recent years are likely to be underestimated. Consequently, fishing mortality reference points are likely to be overestimated. The retrospective pattern diminishes to near zero in approximately five years, so using partial recruitment vectors from an earlier time period may provide more stable estimates of reference points. Using average partial recruitment at age from 1999 to 2001 provides estimates of a fishing mortality target of  $F_{30\%} = 0.25$ , and a fishing mortality threshold of  $F_{20\%} = 0.36$ . The associated SSB threshold is estimated at  $SSB_{20\%} = 10,179$  MT.

Another factor that could affect the reference point estimates is the assumption of constant natural mortality. The WTC has expressed concern regarding the assumption that  $M$  has remained constant throughout the time period analyzed. Recent analyses indicate that natural mortality may have increased dramatically over the last decade, to levels as high as  $M = 1.0$  or higher. Reference points were also calculated using a natural mortality rate of  $M = 0.8$ . Using average partial

recruitment at age from 1999 to 2001 provides estimates of a fishing mortality target of  $F_{30\%} = 0.78$ , and a fishing mortality threshold of  $F_{20\%} = 1.20$ . Under these assumptions, fishing mortality on weakfish declined below the threshold for most years between 1989 and 2001, and was below the  $F_{30\%}$  target between 1995 and 1999.  $F_{2007}$  is below the target mortality rate, but is likely underestimated given the observed retrospective pattern.

As noted above, reference points assume natural mortality is constant over time. Sensitivity of reference points can be investigated under different assumptions of constant natural mortality, but more advanced techniques are required to investigate the influence of systematic changes in  $M$ . Both of the biomass dynamic models investigated during this assessment produced estimates of both equilibrium and non-equilibrium reference points, and are discussed below.

## **C12.2 Reference points calculated by the “Predation Hypothesis”**

The following is a summary of the reference point and stock status analyses conducted under the predation hypothesis. Additional details are presented in the full discussion of the predation hypothesis in section **C8.0** of this report.

### *C12.2.1 Equilibrium conditions*

Updated  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds were estimated for weakfish using the dynamic Gompertz external surplus production model (Quinn and Deriso 1999; Jacobson et al 2002). Surplus production estimates from 1981-2008 were regressed against weakfish biomass (Biowt) and the product of the log weakfish biomass and biomass (LogBiowt\*Biowt) in a two variable linear regression model without a y-axis intercept (see equation (6) in section **C8.0**) using the ROBUSTREG procedure contained in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS 2002). Equilibrium  $F_{MSY}$  threshold is expressed by the intrinsic growth rate ( $r$ ) parameter, whereas  $B_{MSY}$  is expressed by the carrying capacity ( $K$ ) divided by 2.72 (Quinn and Deriso 1999). Since temporal shifts in striped bass predation are absent from the traditional dynamic models, the overfishing definitions ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) in these models are fixed in time.

The analysis was conducted for the two scenarios of fishing mortality only and fishing mortality plus predation. The “fishing only” model provided a reasonably good fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.54$ ) to the biomass time series with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$  and  $K$  parameter estimates (Table C9.3-3). The resulting overfishing thresholds were  $F_{MSY} = 0.26$  and  $B_{MSY} = 57,388$  MT. However, a distinct serial pattern was present in the residuals, and the model consistently over predicted weakfish surplus production from 1998 to 2008 by 20% to 350% (Figure C9.3-3). This systematic trend in the direction of the residuals usually indicates that the model is lacking an informative parameter(s).

Addition of a predation term resulted in greatly improved model fit ( $r^{*2} = 0.84$ ), and the parameters ( $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $C$ ) were estimated with much higher precision than the production model without predation (Table C9.3-3). Resulting equilibrium overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) from the extended Gompertz model were 0.54 and 19,289 mt, respectively (Table C9.3-3). Moreover, the strong serial correlation in the residuals noted from the basic Gompertz model was minimized when predation effects of striped bass and spiny dogfish were included (Figure C9.3-4).

Within the predation hypothesis, reference points were also calculated using the discrete Gompertz model with and without predation (see equations 12 and 11 of section **C9.0**) using iterative reweighting. The discrete model with predation is referred to in this report as the Steele-Henderson (S-H) model. As above, the equilibrium  $F_{MSY}$  threshold is expressed by the intrinsic

growth rate ( $r$ ) parameter, and  $B_{MSY}$  is expressed by the carrying capacity ( $K$ ) divided by 2.72 (Quinn and Deriso 1999).

When only fishing effects are evaluated, this model provided a good fit ( $r^2 = 0.82$ ) to the biomass data with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$  and  $K$  parameter estimates. Overfishing thresholds were calculated as  $F_{MSY} = 0.32$  and  $B_{MSY} = 25,259$  MT. As with the external model, the discrete model with fishing effects only consistently over predicted weakfish biomass from 1998 to 2008 by 10 to 250% (Figure C9.3-8), indicating that the basic Gompertz model was plagued by substantial process error.

The full Steele-Henderson (S-H) production model fit with iterative reweighting provided a very good fit ( $r^2 = 0.94$ ) to the biomass and predation data with statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ )  $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $c$  and  $A$  parameter estimates (Table C9.3-6). Overall, the S-H model was not only a better fit to weakfish biomass than the Gompertz model with only fishing effects, but the  $r$  and  $K$  parameters were estimated with much higher precision. The resulting weakfish equilibrium overfishing thresholds were estimated at  $F_{MSY} = 0.72$  and  $B_{MSY} = 17,009$  mt (Table C9.3-6). Moreover, unlike the severe residual pattern evident from 1998 to 2008 based on the basic Gompertz models, there is little if any systematic residual pattern from the S-H model fitted by iterative re-weighting (Figure C9.3-9).

Given the clear residual problem associated with the Gompertz models estimated without predation, these models were not used to evaluate weakfish stock status. Relationships between parameter estimates and reference points evaluated through the Steele-Henderson model are shown in Figures C9.3-13 (fishing mortality) and C9.3-14 (biomass). Fishing mortality fell below the  $F_{MSY} = 0.72$  1993 and has remained below the threshold in all years except 2002. SSB fell below  $B_{MSY} = 17,009$  MT threshold in 1983, falling to less than one-third the threshold in 1990. Biomass subsequently rebounded to more than 80% of the threshold in 1995 and 1996, but has since declined.

#### *C12.2.2 Non-equilibrium conditions*

The non-equilibrium S-H model allows the direct calculation of the amount of mortality attributable to predation,  $M_p$ . Because predation effects are transient over time, weakfish surplus production and predation-induced mortality can vary greatly across years, resulting in time varying  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  thresholds. The degree of temporal variation in  $F_{msy}$  and  $B_{msy}$  depends on the magnitude and trend in predator abundance, the predator consumption exponent ( $c$ ) and on the prey stock size ( $A$ ) at which the consumption threshold of predation takes place in equation (11). Thus, the annual  $F_{MSY}$  values from the S-H model are not fixed in time but rather are a function of the fixed intrinsic rate ( $r$ ) and the time varying predator consumption rate. Similarly, weakfish biomass threshold ( $B_{MSY}$ ) can vary over time depending on the amount of weakfish biomass consumed annually (see equations 16 and 17 in section C9.0).

Calculation of non-equilibrium reference points indicates that  $F_{MSY}$  has decreased substantially from above 0.75 in the early 1980s to less than 0.25 in most years since 2001 (Table C9.3-5). Estimated fishing mortality rates dropped below the threshold in 1995 and 1996; however, as excessive predation has eroded stock size and associated surplus production,  $F$  has exceeded the non-equilibrium  $F_{MSY}$  estimates in all years since 1997 (Figure C12.2-1).

$B_{MSY}$  has shown greater stability than  $F_{MSY}$ , but still declined from over 20,000 MT in 1981 to less than 15,000 MT between 1997 and 2002, before rebounding in recent years (Table C9.3-5). Stock size as a proportion of maximum spawning potential exceeded 25% MSP between 1981 and 1986, and again between 1994-1996, but has since decreased drastically to less than 5% of an

unfished stock since 2005 (Table C9.3-5).

### **C12.3 Reference points calculated by the “Forage Hypothesis”**

The following is a summary of the reference point and stock status analyses conducted under the forage hypothesis. Additional details are presented in the full discussion of the forage hypothesis in section **C10.0** of this report.

#### *C12.3.1 Equilibrium conditions*

The forage hypothesis investigated both Schaefer and Gompertz forms of the surplus production function. For both methods, equilibrium reference points are estimated from the fit population parameter values. However, the Gompertz production function with depensatory predation mortality as a function of striped bass biomass and the striped bass:menhaden ratio provided the best model fit, so reference points are evaluated for that model only. For the Gompertz model, equilibrium reference points are calculated as  $F_{MSY} = r$  and  $B_{MSY} = K / 2.72$ .

The best model fit resulted in parameter estimates of  $r = 0.48$ ,  $K = 51,521$  MT,  $c = 0.29$ , and  $B_{1981} = 82,472$  MT, providing equilibrium reference points of  $F_{MSY} = 0.48$ ,  $F_{collapse} = 1.31$ , and  $B_{MSY} = 18,941$  MT. Jackknife and bootstrap procedures indicated that parameters were estimated with good precision (Tables C10.5-2 and C10.5-3). Estimated fishing mortality rates exceeded  $F_{MSY}$  for the first decade of the time series, but dropped below the threshold in 1992 (Figure C10.5-13). By 1995,  $F$  had fallen to approximately 60% of the threshold, but subsequently began a steady increase to a level slightly above  $F_{MSY}$  during 1998-2002. After 2002,  $F_t$  dropped sharply and remained at about 50-70% of the threshold through 2006 (Figure C10.5-13).

Biomass has been below the  $SSB_{MSY}$  threshold in all years except 1996. Estimates of proxy MSP, calculated as  $B_t / K$ , fell continuously after 1983 from 65% of  $K$  to reach about 12% by 1990 (Figure C10.5-16).

#### *C12.3.2 Non-equilibrium conditions*

Two methods were implemented to calculate nonequilibrium reference points from the forage hypothesis model. The first simply involved renaming  $F_{MSY}$  to  $Z_{MSY} = 0.48$  and comparing it to annual estimates of total (fishing plus predation) mortality ( $Z_{pt}$ ). This estimate of total mortality at MSY is constant across time and serves as a benchmark for total mortality changes. Estimates of  $M_{pt}$  rose from a very low level in the mid-1980s to estimates equivalent to  $F_t$  and  $Z_{msy}$  by 1999 (Figure C10.5-13). After 1999,  $M_{pt}$  accelerated rapidly and reached 1.4 in 2006 (Figure C10.5-13). When combined with estimates of fishing mortality, it is evident that total mortality ( $Z_{pt} = F + M_{pt}$ ) has exceeded the equilibrium reference point throughout the time series, except for a brief period in the mid 1990s.

The second method used to calculate non-equilibrium reference points was to directly calculate  $F_{MSY}$  under non-equilibrium conditions as equilibrium  $F_{MSY}$  minus predation mortality (see equation 16 of section **C10.0**). Mortality associated with the predator or predator-prey conditions is considered “off-limits” for management and yield can only be influenced by managing the fishery. Low level of predation mortality occurring in the 1980s and early 1990s resulted in  $F_{PSYt}$  levels close to  $Z_{MSY}$  (Figure C10.5-14). As fishing mortality rate declined, estimates of  $F_t$  fell below the non-equilibrium threshold between 1993 and 1996. However, increasing losses due to striped bass began to erode  $F_{PSYt}$ . Consequently, the amount of production available for harvest has declined, and fishing mortality has remained above the threshold in all years since 1997.



## **C12.4 Discussion**

Reference point estimates and stock status determinations for the different models are compared in Table C12.4-1. Under equilibrium conditions, the ADAPT VPA estimate of  $F_{2007}$  (0.51) exceeds the overfishing threshold ( $F_{20\%} = 0.42$ ), indicating that overfishing is occurring. However, the two production models provide estimates of  $F_{2007}$  that are lower than their respective  $F_{MSY}$  thresholds. Under these scenarios, overfishing is not occurring on weakfish. For all three models under equilibrium condition,  $SSB_{2007}$  is below the respective biomass threshold, indicating that weakfish are overfished.

It is not possible to calculate non-equilibrium reference points from the VPA; however assuming non-equilibrium conditions, both production models indicate that weakfish are overfished and overfishing is occurring. The transition from overfishing not occurring under equilibrium to overfishing occurring in a non-equilibrium system can be attributed to the erosion of “available” production due to increased weakfish removals through predation and/or competition over the last decade. Although fishing mortality is above the threshold level, both models indicate that the  $F/Z$  ratio has been below 50% since the mid to late 1990s.

The 2006 peer review panel did not accept the WTC’s determination that stock size had declined due to increased natural mortality as a result of predation (ASMFC 2006a, Part B). In fact, little attention was given to weakfish stock status at all during that review. In the current analysis, all models investigated indicate that weakfish stocks are depressed. Regardless of the many factors influencing the stock that may have led to this condition, it is imperative that the 48<sup>th</sup> SARC evaluate the determination of stock status so that the Weakfish Management Board can be apprised of the situation. Within this document the WTC has presented a suite of hypotheses that attempt to explain the mechanisms that have resulted in the current low biomass, the implications of which will help determine future management actions. The WTC requests guidance from the SARC on the utility of the different models and how they may be improved in order to ensure sustainable management of the stock. However, before management measures can be considered, the true status of the stock must be determined. With the models investigated in this stock assessment, it is evident that the weakfish stock declined substantially and is at or near all time low levels.

## **C13.0 Review stock projections and impacts on the stock under different assumptions of fishing mortality. (TOR #9)**

### **C13.1 ADAPT projections**

Projections were conducted relative to output from the ADAPT VPA using the AgePro (version 3.1) module of the NFT Toolbox. Biomass was projected for 25 years starting from the terminal year estimates of the preferred ADAPT VPA run (see section C7.0 of this report). Values for biological parameters (*e.g.* weights at age, partial recruitment, etc) were the same as those used in the terminal year of ADAPT input. Multiple runs were conducted assuming a range of fishing and natural mortality values. Recruitment followed an empirical distribution of Age 1 numbers estimated through the full time series of the VPA.

All projection runs resulted in increased biomass over time and appeared to reach asymptotic values (Figure C13.1-1). However, different assumptions regarding  $F$  and  $M$  resulted in a wide range of projected biomass. Under the assumption of constant  $M = 0.25$  and a harvest moratorium,  $SSB$  is projected to increase to more than 275,000 MT by the year 2032. Allowing harvest to occur at a level  $F = 0.25$  (slightly below the fishing mortality target of  $F_{30\%} = 0.28$ ) the stock is expected to

peak at approximately 135,000 MT by 2019.

The WTC has expressed concern that natural mortality has increased in recent years. Under this scenario, projections based on  $M = 0.25$  would be overestimated. Recent analyses have indicated that natural mortality may be as high as  $M = 1.0$  or more. To investigate the potential for stock rebuilding under similar conditions, projections were conducted assuming a constant  $M = 0.75$  (Figure C13.1-1). Under a harvest moratorium, SSB is expected to increase to approximately 45,000 MT by 2013. Allowing fishing mortality to occur at a level of  $F = 0.25$ , rebuilding would occur to 36,000 MT by 2013.

## **C13.2 Projections based on the “Predation Hypothesis”**

### **C13.2.1 Introduction**

Results from previous weakfish assessments (Kahn et al 2002, 2006) revealed that overfishing ( $F > F_{msy}$ ) had occurred on weakfish from about 1981 to 1991. As a result, more stringent fishery regulations were imposed on the weakfish recreational and commercial fisheries in 1992 and 1993 and fishing mortality ( $F$ ) rates from 1996 to 2003 fell to well below  $F_{msy}$ . Following a drop in  $F$ , coast-wide weakfish abundance initially rose about five fold from 1992 until about 1998, but stock size dropped unexpectedly thereafter to the lowest levels in the time series by 2007. Because  $F$  levels were relatively low and stable after 1999, follow-up studies (see TOR #5-7) have begun to find evidence for a Trophic Hypothesis involving enhanced striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) and spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*) predation or a more complex trophic triangle among weakfish, striped bass and Atlantic menhaden (*Brevoortia tyrannus*). Under non-steady-state conditions that might arise from a recent increase in natural mortality ( $M$ ), the projected pace of weakfish stock rebuilding following a moratorium to harvest ( $F = 0$ ) might occur very slowly if at all as was reported recently for Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Swain and Chouinard 2008). As shown recently by Walters et al (2008), the rate of stock rebuilding of depleted finfish stocks can be highly unpredictable especially under a shifting environment. By contrast, if  $M$  for weakfish is assumed to be fixed over time at 0.25 as was assumed in the ADAPT model, and, if future recruitment remains average, a moratorium to harvest ( $F = 0$ ) should result in rapid stock rebuilding to  $B_{msy}$  over a relative short time horizon. Clearly, the degree to which additional management promotes rapid ( $< 15$  years) weakfish stock rebuilding in the future depends, among other things, on whether or not future  $M$  remains low and fixed over time.

In this section, weakfish relative spawning stock biomass (TSSB, mt) projections were made from 2010 to 2020 following the imposition of a simulated coast-wide moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) to harvest beginning in 2009. The projection model was an extension of the Harvest Control Model (HCM) (Rugolo and Crecco 1993) used to forecast decadal shifts in striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) biomass under several management scenarios. Given the uncertainty surrounding the current and future trend in  $M$  estimates, the following three scenarios that bracket a wide range of possibilities were examined with the weakfish HCM following a simulated 2009 moratorium to harvest: 1)  $M$  is fixed at 0.25 throughout the time series (1980-2020) as in ADAPT, there is no recent rise in trophic impacts on weakfish productivity, and recent (1999-2008) fishing mortality ( $F$ ) have remained high ( $F > 1.0$ ) as per ADAPT; 2) there is a moderate rise in  $M$  (from 0.25 to 0.65) from 1999 to 2020 due to predation but the magnitude of predatory mortality is less than predicted by the Steele-Henderson Model, and recent (1999-2008)  $F$  estimates have risen to moderate (0.7 to 1.0) levels; and 3)  $M$  on weakfish after 1997 has risen four-fold in magnitude (from 0.25 to 1.0) as per the Steele-Henderson Model, and fishing mortality ( $F$ ) rates have remained relatively low ( $F < 0.50$ ) from 1996 to 2008 as

per the Index-based Analysis.

### **C13.2.2 Methods**

A modification to the Harvest Control Model (HCM) was used to project relative changes in weakfish total spawning stock biomass (TSSB) from 2010 to 2020 following the imposition of a simulated moratorium to harvest ( $F = 0$ ) beginning in 2009. The theory and application of the HCM are fully described for striped bass catch quota projections (Rugolo and Crecco 1993). The entire model is programmed in SAS (SAS 2002) (Appendix C-3). The model output (ages 1+ TSSB) in the HCM was expressed as year (1980-2020) and age (ages 1-10) effects. A small percentage of weakfish do survive beyond age 10, but the average contribution of ages 11+ weakfish to annual SSB was relatively modest from 1982 to 2007. The HCM is configured to operate off several age-related (ages 1 to 10) vectors that reflect somatic growth, maturity, natural mortality and partial recruitment (PR).

In this analysis, three scenarios are offered to examine how potential shifts in future natural mortality ( $M$ ) levels might affect rebuilding of weakfish TSSB following the imposition of a simulated 2009 moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) to harvest (Table 1). The scenarios are: 1)  $M$  is fixed at 0.25 throughout the time series (1980-2020) as in ADAPT, there is no recent rise in  $M$  due enhanced trophic impacts on weakfish productivity, unreported weakfish landings and discards have recently (1999-2008) increased steadily to where they now comprise over 80% of the total fishery losses and recent (1999-2008) fishing mortality ( $F$ ) has remained high ( $F > 1.0$ ) as per ADAPT; 2) there is a moderate rise in  $M$  (from 0.25 to 0.65) from 1999 to 2020 due to enhanced predation but the magnitude of predatory mortality is less than predicted by the Steele-Henderson Model, there is a more modest rise in recent (1998-2008) unreported landings and recent (1999-2008)  $F$  estimates have risen and remain moderately high (0.7 to 1.0) from 1999 to 2008; and 3)  $M$  levels on weakfish from 1999 to 2020 have exhibited a four- fold rise (0.25 to 1.0) in magnitude as per the Steele-Henderson Model, unreported landings have remained low and steady from 1999 to 2008 and fishing mortality ( $F$ ) rates have remained relatively low ( $F < 0.50$ ) from 1996 to 2008 as per the Index-based Analysis. In all of the above scenarios, input parameters in the weakfish HCM include fully recruited fishing mortality ( $F$ ), somatic growth in average length (mm) and weight (kg) by age, percentage maturity by age, the partial recruitment vectors (PR) by age to the fisheries, either a fixed  $M$  of 0.25 (scenario #1) or a systematic rise in natural mortality (Scenarios #2 and 3) from 1997 to 2020. The fully recruited (ages 4+)  $F$  estimates, PR vectors, age at maturity and age-specific somatic growths in weight were taken directly from the preferred ADAPT run. Since retrospective bias in ADAPT severely underestimated recent ( $> 2004$ )  $F$  estimates, the fully recruited  $F$  in 2004 was repeated for the years 2005 to 2008. Discard mortality among sublegal weakfish was expressed in the HCM as  $0.10 * F$ . Annual estimates of relative TSSB were summed in the HCM as the product of relative abundance by age, the average age-specific weight (kg) and the average age-specific maturity vector. The pace of future TSSB rebuilding among the three scenarios was measured arbitrarily against a relative  $B_{msy}$  value that was scaled directly from the estimated equilibrium  $B_{msy}$  threshold for weakfish from surplus production modeling.

In the HCM, a time series vector (1970-2020) of recruitment relative abundance is the primary variable that dictates temporal changes in future weakfish TSSB abundance by age. Thus relative TSSB in numbers from the HCM across the time series is expressed in recruitment units. There is a time series (1982-2007) of coast-wide average age 0 indices (Rec 0) that are expressed as mean catch/effort from nine State surveys from 1982 to 2007 (see section **C9.0**). However, the relatively high and stable age 0 indices occurring from 1997 to 2006 have thus far not translated into

high subsequent abundance of ages 1 and older fish, This mismatch in year-class abundance between subsequent age groups suggests the emergence of a recruitment bottleneck in recent years that has constricted the flow of recruitment via a rise in natural mortality (see sections C7.0 to C9.0). Thus, instead of using average age 0 recruitment to express coast-wide recruitment in the HCM, a time series (1970-2008) of trial values of age 1 weakfish relative indices were imputed to the HCM so that the resulting trend in model-based TSSB from 1981 to 2008 closely approximated (Pearson correlation  $r > 0.90$ ) the observed trend in ages 1+ relative biomass from the Index-based Analysis (refer to section C8.0). All available trawl data have indicated that coast-wide weakfish abundance was at peak levels from the mid 1970's until the early 1980's. To simulate these high TSSB levels from 1980 to 1985, a series (1970-1980) of dominant year-classes and relatively low fishing mortalities ( $F < 0.4$ ) were imputed in the HCM. Note that projected TSSB each year is composed of 10 age groups. For this reason, it was necessary to begin recruitment to the HCM in 1970 so that the first full year of simulated TSSB composed of 10 age groups began in 1980. The long-term (1982-2008) average recruitment (long-term mean = 16.5) level was used to express age 1 recruitment from 2009 to 2020 (Table 1). We are primarily interested in comparing how a simulated moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) might affect future stock rebuilding among three scenarios with a fixed  $M$  versus a rising future  $M$ . Thus, the use of constant recruitment from 2009 to 2020 would not alter the relative trajectory in projected TSSB rebuilding from 2010 to 2020. Random or log normal variation (stochastic) of future (2009-2020) recruitment using the observed recruitment time series (1982-2007) could have been used in TSSB projections from the HCM, but stochastic variation in future recruitment would have complicated the interpretation of TSSB trends during the rebuilding phase (2010-2020) of each scenario.

### C13.2.3 Results and Discussion

In Scenario #1 under a relatively low and fixed natural mortality ( $M = 0.25$ ) throughout the time series (1980-2020), the HCM predicted that a moratorium to all weakfish harvest ( $F = 0$ ) enacted in 2009 and thereafter would lead to rapid TSSB recovery that would approach the Bmsy threshold by 2020 (Figure C13.2-1). Since  $M$  was assumed to have remained fixed at 0.25, reducing a high  $F$  ( $> 2.0$ ) to zero from 2009 to 2020 exerts an enormous leverage on enhanced survival (high  $F/Z$  ratio) with which to rapidly rebuild TSSB from 2010 to 2020. However, it is important to note that in Scenario #1, we have assumed that the primary cause of the post 1999 weakfish stock collapse is overfishing mainly resulting in a systematic rise in unreported landings and discards from some yet unknown recreational and commercial fisheries. Since reported weakfish landings and estimated discards have fallen from 5500 mt in 1996 to about 800 mt by 2008, these unreported landings would need to have increased from about 1,000 mt to 5,000 mt. from 1998 to 2008 to have caused the post 1999 weakfish stock decline. Thus, in order to enact a complete moratorium on all weakfish landings in 2009, nearly all inshore fisheries activities from North Carolina to Rhode Island would have to cease from 2009 to 2020.

In scenario #2 under the assumption of a moderate rise in  $M$  from 0.25 to 0.65 after 1997, the HCM predicted that a moratorium ( $F = 0$ ) enacted in 2009 would result in some measureable TSSB rebuilding by 2020, but the magnitude of stock growth would fall far short of the Bmsy threshold (Figure C13.2-2). Since  $M$  rose more moderately in this Scenario from 0.25 to 0.65, a moratorium to harvest exerts somewhat less leverage on survival (lower  $F/Z$  ratio) than Scenario #1 in order to rebuild TSSB over a 10 year horizon. Note that in Scenario #2, we have assumed that both a moderate rise in  $M$  (from 0.25 to 0.65) after 1996 coupled with a more modest systematic increase in unreported landings resulted in the post 1999 stock collapse. Thus, like Scenario #1, to enact an

effective moratorium to harvest of both reported and unreported weakfish landings, we would have to close nearly all inshore fisheries from North Carolina to Rhode Island from 2009 to 2020.

In scenario #3 under a pronounced rise in  $M$  from 0.25 to 1.0 ostensibly due to enhanced predation, the HCM predicted that a moratorium to harvest in 2009 and thereafter would result in little if any TSSB rebuilding by 2020 (Figure C13.2-3). Given the pronounced rise in  $M$  coupled with low and steady  $F$  from 1996 to 2008 in Scenario #3, a moratorium to harvest after 2008 provides very little leverage to enhanced survival (lowest  $F/Z$  ratio) on which measurable stock rebuilding depends. In Scenario #3, we note that fishing mortality ( $F$ ) was largely driven by reported weakfish landings which have fallen by 80% from 1996 to 2008. By contrast, unreported weakfish landings and discards are assumed to have remained relatively low and steady from 1996 to 2008 during which  $M$  rose four-fold (0.25 to 1.0). In this Scenario, we have assumed that high  $M$  would persist throughout the rebuilding time frame (2010-2020). It is important to note that if  $M$  of 1.0 associated largely with enhanced predation during the recovery period (2010-2020) should drop back to the pre-1997 level of 0.25, measurable weakfish stock rebuilding would likely occur after 2010 without further management restrictions, although the imposition of a moratorium during this period would accelerate the pace of stock rebuilding.

### C13.3 Projections based on the “Forage Hypothesis”

Jackknife and bootstrap estimates of GDR parameters and biomass in 2007 were projected with equations 2 and 7 to evaluate the effect of fishing restriction scenarios through 2015. Projections explored whether conditions set forward in Amendment 4 (ASMFC 2002) for stock rebuilding could be achieved by managing the weakfish fishery alone. Under overfished conditions (two consecutive years above the  $F$  threshold),  $F$  was to drop below 0.2 and SSB was to be rebuilt to 30% of an unfished stock (ASMFC 2002). While these conditions were based on VPA-based estimates and reference points, approximations could be developed from the GDR. The probability of biomass growing to 15,000 mt (approximating 30% of  $K$ ) by 2015 under reduced fishing could be determined. Three fishery management scenarios were portrayed: an approximation of the minimum  $F$  reduction in Amendment 4 ( $F_{\text{recover}}$ ),  $F = 0.2$  (a literal interpretation of Amendment 4), and a moratorium.

Projections of biomass used each jackknife or bootstrap trial estimate of  $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $c$ ,  $R_t$ , and  $B_{2007}$ . Estimates of  $H_t$  equaled  $U_t * B_t$  during 2008-2015, where  $U_t$  was an assumed exploitation rate derived from  $F_{2006}$  for 2007-2008, a transition  $F$  for 2009, and a 2010-2015 target  $F$  (specified above) and biomass. Striped bass biomass and  $R_t$  were constant at the 2006 estimate (88,000 mt and 5, respectively). In trials where cuts in  $F$  were imposed, it was assumed that cuts in  $F$  would not occur until fall 2009, so biomass trajectory during 2008 was based on a continuation of 2007 conditions. Cuts were instituted in 2009 ( $F$  drops by a maximum of half to mimic regulations imposed by fall) and maintained until 2015.  $F_{\text{recover}}$  was estimated as

$$(0.2 / 0.31) * F_{\text{msy}}; \tag{17}$$

where 0.2 equaled the maximum  $F$  allowed for rebuilding under Amendment 4 and 0.31 equaled target.  $F_{\text{msy}}$  was represented by the median of the bootstrap and jackknife trials (0.48), therefore  $F_{\text{recover}}$  was approximated as 0.31. Losses under moratorium conditions ( $U_m$ ) during 2010-2015 were approximated as

$$(1 - (H_w / H_t)) * U_{2006}; \tag{18}$$

where  $H_w$  = losses of weakfish from all harvest and weakfish commercial fishery discards in 2006;  $H_t$  total losses of weakfish in all fisheries, and  $U_{2006}$  was estimated exploitation rate in 2006.  $U_m$  was approximated as 0.056. The probability of  $B_{2015}$  reaching 15,000 mt was estimated separately for jackknife or bootstrap-based projections.

Stock recovery was not possible under  $F_{\text{recover}}$  and  $F = 0.2$ , and there was about 1.4% chance of recovery under moratorium conditions for bootstrap runs and 0% chance for jackknife moratorium scenarios. It should be noted that estimates of  $F$  since 2003 have been below or at  $F_{\text{recover}}$ . Prospects for weakfish are grim under these projections; jackknifing and bootstrapping indicated 98% and 91% chances (respectively) that weakfish biomass would fall to zero by 2010 if trophic conditions prevailing in 2006 continued. Instances where extirpation did not occur were associated with estimates of  $B_{2007}$  in excess of 4,600 mt. If high predation-competition losses estimated for 2006 prevail, a moratorium cannot be initiated in time according to the great majority of trials. By 2015, extirpation becomes a virtual certainty even under a moratorium

#### **C14.0 Make research recommendations for improving data collection and assessment. (TOR #10)**

The following list of prioritized research needs updates the list provided in the 2008 Weakfish Fishery Management Plan Review. New research recommendations identified by the WTC are presented in ALLCAPS. Comments regarding existing recommendations are shown in *italics*.

##### ***High Priority***

INVESTIGATE ALTERNATIVE AGE BASED MODELS WHICH ALLOW ERROR IN CATCH AT AGE ESTIMATES (*E.G.* STATISTICAL CATCH AT AGE) AND/OR ARE LESS PRONE TO RETROSPECTIVE PATTERNS (*E.G.* EXTENDED SURVIVORS ANALYSIS).

EVALUATE CONSUMPTION OF WEAKFISH BY PREDATORS USING A MORE ADVANCED MULTISPECIES MODEL, SUCH AS THE ASMFC MSVPA MODEL OR ECOPATH WITH ECOSIM, TO VALIDATE ESTIMATES CALCULATED BY PRODUCTION MODELS WITH PREDATION-COMPETITION EXTENSIONS.

DEVELOP A BIOENERGETICS MODEL FOR WEAKFISH THAT ENCOMPASSES A BROADER RANGE OF AGES THAN HARTMAN AND BRANDT (1995). USE IT TO EVALUATE DIET AND GROWTH DATA.

INITIATE MONITORING OF WEAKFISH, STRIPED BASS, AND SPINY DOGFISH DIETS OVER A BROAD REGIONAL AND SPATIAL SCALE.

Collect catch and effort data including size and age composition of the catch, determine stock mortality throughout the range, and define gear characteristics. In particular, increase length-frequency sampling, particularly in fisheries from Maryland and further north.

Derive alternative estimates of discard mortality rates and the magnitude of discards for all commercial gear types from both directed and non-directed fisheries. In particular, quantify trawl bycatch, refine estimates of mortality for below minimum size fish, and focus on factors such as

distance from shore and geographical differences. Improved estimates of discard mortality would best be obtained through increased observer coverage.

Conduct an age validation study. *This work has been completed in Lowerre-Barbieri et al (1995).*

Identify stocks and determine coastal movements and the extent of stock mixing, including characterization of stocks in over-wintering grounds. Most direct method would be to develop a coastwide tagging program. *Otolith samples have been obtained by Old Dominion University, but funding has not been available for processing.*

Conduct spatial and temporal analysis of the fishery independent survey data. The analysis should assess the impact of the variability of the surveys in regards to gear, time of year and geographic coverage on their (survey) use as stock indicators. *Research is ongoing by Dr. Yan Jiao of Virginia Tech. University. See Winter et al 2009 in the supplementary material for this peer review.*

Analyze the spawner-recruit relationship and examine the relationships between parental stock size and environmental factors on year-class strength. *Work is currently underway by Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee.*

Develop latitudinal/seasonal/gear specific age length keys for the Atlantic coast. Increase sample sizes to consider gear specific keys.

#### *Medium Priority*

Examine geographic and temporal differences in growth rate (length and weight at age).

Define reproductive biology of weakfish, including size at sexual maturity, maturity schedules, fecundity, and spawning periodicity. Continue research on female spawning patterns: what is the seasonal and geographical extent of "batch" spawning; do females exhibit spawning site fidelity? *This work has been completed by Nye et al 2008 and Lowerre-Barbieri et al 1996.*

Compile data on larval and juvenile distribution from existing databases in order to obtain preliminary indications of spawning and nursery habitat location and extent.

Conduct hydrophonic studies to delineate weakfish spawning habitat locations and environmental preferences (temperature, depth, substrate, etc.) and enable quantification of spawning habitat.

Continue studies on mesh-size selectivity; up-to-date (1995) information is available only for North Carolina's gill net fishery. Mesh-size selectivity studies for trawl fisheries are particularly sparse. *Gillnet selectivity has been investigated by Swihart et al (2000). Can also be obtained from the NC PSIGNS survey.*

Assemble socio-demographic-economic data as it becomes available from ACCSP.

Continue studies on recreational hook-and-release mortality rates, including factors such as depth, warmer water temperatures, and fish size in the analysis. Studies are needed in deep and warm water conditions. Further consideration of release mortality in both the recreational and

commercial fisheries is needed, and methods investigated to improve survival among released fish.

#### *Low Priority*

Define restrictions necessary for implementation of projects in spawning and over-wintering areas and develop policies on limiting development projects seasonally or spatially.

Document the impact of power plants and other water intakes on larval, post larval and juvenile weakfish mortality in spawning and nursery areas, and calculate the resultant impact to adult stock size. *Data are available for power plants in the Delaware Bay area and North Carolina. Data should be compiled and evaluated.*

Determine the onshore versus offshore components of the weakfish fishery.

## **15.0 References**

- Ahrenholz DW. 1991. Population biology and life history of the North American menhadens, *Brevoortia* spp. Mar Fish Rev. 53: p 3-19.
- Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). 1994. Amendment 2 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish. Washington (DC): ASMFC. 2 p.
- ASMFC. 1996. Amendment 3 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish. Washington (DC): ASMFC Weakfish Plan Development Team. Fishery Management Report No. 27. 63 p.
- ASMFC. 2002. Amendment 4 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish. Washington (DC): ASMFC Weakfish Plan Development Team. Fishery Management Report. No. 39. 84 p.
- ASMFC. 2003. Linking multispecies assessments to single species management. Washington (DC): ASMFC. Special Report No 79. 66 p.
- ASMFC. 2004. Atlantic menhaden workshop report and proceedings. Washington (DC): ASMFC. Special Report No 83. 113 p.
- ASMFC. 2005. Addendum I to Amendment 4 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish. Washington (DC): ASMFC Weakfish Plan Development Team. 5 p.
- ASMFC. 2006a. 2006 Weakfish Stock Assessment: Weakfish Stock Assessment Report, Terms of Reference and Advisory Report, and Technical Committee Supplemental Material. Washington (DC): ASMFC. 315 p.
- ASMFC. 2006b. Stock Assessment Report for Atlantic Menhaden. Washington (DC): Atlantic Menhaden Technical Committee. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. 149 p.
- ASMFC Multispecies Technical Committee. 2008. Update of the Multispecies Virtual Population Analysis. Washington (DC). Report to the ASMFC ISFMP Policy Board, December 19, 2008. 54 p.
- Bannerot SP, Austin CB. 1983. Using frequency distributions of catch per unit effort to measure fish-stock abundance. Trans Am Fish Soc. 112: 608-617.
- Bax NJ. 1991. A comparison of the fish biomass flow to fish, fisheries, and mammals in six marine ecosystems. ICES Mar Sci Symp. 193: 217-224.
- Bax NJ. 1998. The significance and prediction of predation in marine fisheries. ICES J Mar Sci. 55: 997-1030.



- Beck MW. 1997. Size-specific limitation in stone crabs, a test of the demographic bottleneck hypothesis. *Ecology* 76: 968-980.
- Berrien PL, Fahay MP, Kendall Jr AW, Smith WG. 1978. Ichthyoplankton from the RV *Dolphin* Survey of Continental Shelf Waters between Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts and Cape Lookout, North Carolina, 1965-1966. NMFS NEFSC Sandy Hook Laboratory. Technical Series Report No. 15. 152 p.
- Bigelow H, Schroeder W. 1953. Fishes of the Gulf of Maine. *Fish Bull.* US 53: 1-577.
- Bonzek CF, Latour RJ, Gartland J. 2004. Chesapeake Bay Multispecies Monitoring and Assessment Program. In: Orner DM, editor. Chesapeake Bay Fisheries Research Program Symposium Report – 2003. Annapolis (MD): NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office.
- Bonzek CF, Latour RJ, Gartland J. 2007. Data collection and analysis in support of single and multispecies stock assessments in Chesapeake Bay: The Chesapeake Bay Multispecies Monitoring and Assessment Program. Gloucester Point (VA): Virginia Institute of Marine Science. USFWS Sportfish Restoration Project F-130-R-2 Annual Progress Report. 177 p.
- Bonzek CF, Gartland J, Lange JD, Latour RJ. 2008. NEAMAP Trawl Program Progress Report: Fall 2007 Survey Data Summary. Gloucester Point (VA): Virginia Institute of Marine Science. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. 156 p.
- Boreman J, Austin HM. 1985. Production and harvest of anadromous striped bass stocks along the Atlantic Coast. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 114: 3-7.
- Bowman RE, Stilwell CE, Michaels WL, Grosslein MD. 2000. Food of Northwest Atlantic fishes and two common species of squid. Woods Hole (MA): NMFS NEFSC. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS-F/NE-155. 138 p.
- Brust JC. 2004. Development of a Recreational CPUE Index for Weakfish Using Proxy Data to Estimate Target Effort. Port Republic (NJ): DEP Division of Fish and Wildlife. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, October 2004. 6 p.
- Brust JC. 2009. Comparison of commercial weakfish catch at size and age in New Jersey using direct and substituted biological sample data. Port Republic (NJ): DEP Division of Fish and Wildlife. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, February 2009. 6 p.
- Burnham KP, Anderson DR. 2001. Kullback-Leibler information as a basis for strong inference in ecological studies. *Wildl Res* 28: 111-119.
- Burns TS, Schultz R, Brown BE. 1983. The Commercial Catch Sampling Program in the Northeastern United States. In: Doubleday WG, Rivard D, editors. Sampling commercial catches of marine fish and invertebrates. *Can Spec Publ Fish Aquat Sci.* p 82-95.
- Chouinard GA, Swain DP, Hammill MO, Poirier GA. 2005. Covariation between grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) abundance and natural mortality of cod (*Gadus morhua*) in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 62: 1991-2000.
- Collette BB, Klein-MacPhee G, editors. 2002. Bigelow and Schroeder's Fishes of the Gulf of Maine. 3rd ed. Washington (DC): Smithsonian Institution Press. 748 p.
- Collie JS, DeLong AK. 1999. Multispecies interactions in the Georges Bank fish community. In: Alaska Sea Grant, editor. Ecosystem Approaches for Fisheries Management. 16th Lowell Wakefield Fisheries Symposium. Fairbanks (AK): Alaska Sea Grant College Program. AK SG -99-01. p 187-211.
- Collie JS, Gislason H. 2001. Biological reference points for fish stocks in a multispecies context. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 58: 2167-2176.

- Collie JS, Spencer PD. 1993. Management strategies for fish populations subject to long-term environmental variability and depensatory predation. In: Kruse G, Eggers DM, Marasco RJ, Pautzke C, Quinn TJ II, editors. Management Strategies for Exploited Fish Populations. Fairbanks (AK): Alaska Sea Grant Program. AK-SG-93-02. p 629-650.
- Collie JS, Wood AD, Jeffries HP. 2008. Long-term shifts in the species composition of a coastal fish community. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 65: 1352-1365.
- Cook R. 2005. Summary Report by the Chair on the 40<sup>th</sup> North East Regional Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC). Aberdeen (UK). Prepared for University of Miami Independent System for Peer Review. 17 p
- Cordes JF, Graves JE. 2003. Investigation of congeneric hybridization in and stock structure of weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*) inferred from analyses of nuclear and mitochondrial DNA loci. *Fish Bull US.* 101: 443-450.
- Counihan TD, Miller AI, Parsley MJ. 1999. Indexing the relative abundance of age-0 white sturgeon in an impoundment of the lower Columbia River from highly skewed trawling data. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 19: 520-529.
- Cotter AJR, Burt L, Paxton CGM, Fernandez C, Buckland ST, Pan J-X. 2004. Are stock assessment methods too complicated? *Fish Fish.* 5: 235-254.
- Crawford MK, Grimes CB, Buroker NE. 1988. Stock identification of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in the middle Atlantic region. *Fish Bull US.* 87:205-211.
- Crecco VA. 2000. Projected striped bass equilibrium harvest under alternative minimum size and slot limits. Old Lyme (CT): Marine Fisheries Division. Report to the ASMFC Striped Bass Technical Committee, December 11, 2000. 32 p.
- Crecco VA. 2005a. Fishing Mortality (F), Stock Biomass and Overfishing Thresholds for Atlantic Coast Weakfish from 1981 to 2003. Old Lyme (CT): Marine Fisheries Division. Report to the ASMFC, January 19, 2005. 22 p.
- Crecco VA. 2005b. Biomass Weighted Fishing Mortality (F), Stock Biomass and Overfishing Thresholds Between the South Atlantic Weakfish and Mid-North Atlantic Weakfish from 1981 to 2004. Old Lyme (CT): Marine Fisheries Division. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, July 28, 2005. 24 p.
- Crecco VA. 2006. Alternative Explanation to the Overfishing Hypothesis: Examination of Trophic and Environmental Effects on the Recent Stock Decline of Atlantic Coast Weakfish. Old Lyme (CT): Marine Fisheries Division. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, February 1, 2006. 43 p.
- Crecco VA. 2009. Update on the Joint Effects of Fishing, Trophic and Environmental Factors on Atlantic Coast Weakfish, 1981-2008. Old Lyme (CT): Marine Fisheries Division. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, March 25, 2009. 56 p.
- Dahlberg MD. 1972. An ecological study of Georgia coastal fishes. *Fish Bull US.* 70:323-353.
- Daniel L, Vaughan D. 1997. Comparison of weakfish ages derived from scales and otoliths. Morehead City (NC): DENR Division Marine Fisheries. Memorandum to ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee. 12 p.
- Deriso RB, Maunder MN, Pearson WH. 2008. Incorporating covariates into fisheries stock assessment models with application to Pacific herring. *Ecol Appl.* 18: 1270-1286.
- de Silva JA. 2002. An evaluation of Separable Virtual Population Analysis as a tool for assessing the stock status of weakfish on the Atlantic Coast of the United States. Tallahassee (FL): Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, July 2002. 39 p.

- de Silva JA. 2004. Estimating At-Sea Discards of Weakfish Using NEFSC Observer Database. Tallahassee (FL): Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, September 2004. 74 p.
- Dorazio RM, Hattala KA, McCollough CB, Skjeveland JE. 1994. Tag recovery estimates of migration of striped bass from spawning areas of the Chesapeake Bay. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 123: 950-963.
- Duffy J. 2002. Catch-and-release mortality studies of spotted seatrout and red drum in coastal Alabama. *Am Fish Soc Symp.* 30:110-113.
- Efron B, Gong G. 1983. A leisurely look at the bootstrap, the jackknife, and cross-validation. *The American Statistician* 37: 36-48.
- Efron B, Tibshirani R. 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. New York (NY): Chapman and Hall. 456 p.
- Enfield DB, Mestas-Nunez AM, Trimble PJ. 2001. The Atlantic multidecadal oscillation and its relation to rainfall and river flows in the continental US. *Geophys Res Letters* 28(10): 2077-2080.
- Freund RJ, Little RC. 2000. *SAS System for Regression*, 3rd ed. Cary (NC): SAS Publishing. 236 p.
- Gauthier DT, Latour RJ, Heisey DM, Bonzek CF, Gartland J, Burge EJ, Vogelbein WK. 2008. Mycobacteriosis-associated mortality in wild striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) from Chesapeake Bay, USA. *Ecol Appl.* 18: 1718-1727.
- Gearhart J. 2002. Hooking mortality of spotted seatrout, weakfish, red drum, and southern flounder in North Carolina. Morehead City (NC): DENR Division of Marine Fisheries. Completion Report for Cooperative Agreement No. NA 87FG0367/2. Documentation and Reduction in Bycatch in North Carolina, Job 3.
- Ginzburg LR, Akçakaya HR. 1992. Consequences of ratio-dependent predation for steady-state properties of ecosystems. *Ecology* 73: 1536-1543.
- Graves JE, McDowell JR, Jones ML. 1992. A genetic analysis of weakfish *Cynoscion regalis* stock structure along the mid-Atlantic coast. *Fish Bull US.* 90:469-475.
- Greacy PA, Targett TE. 1996. Spatial Patterns in Condition and Feeding of Juvenile Weakfish in Delaware Bay. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 125: 803–808.
- Green RH. 1979. *Sampling design and statistical methods for environmental biologists*. New York (NY): John Wiley and Sons. 257 p.
- Griffin JC. 2001. Dietary habits of an historical striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) population in Chesapeake Bay [thesis]. Princess Ann (MD): University of Maryland Eastern Shore. 135 p.
- Griffin JC, Margraf FJ. 2003. The diet of Chesapeake Bay striped bass in the late 1950s. *Fish Manage Ecol.* 10: 323-328.
- Haddon M. 2001. *Modelling and quantitative methods in fisheries*. Washington (DC): Chapman and Hall/CRC. 424 p.
- Hare JA, Able KW. 2007. Mechanistic links between climate and fisheries along the east coast of the United States: explaining outbursts of Atlantic croaker (*Micropogonias undulatus*). *Fish Oceanogr.* 16(1): 31-45.
- Hartman KJ. 1993. Striped bass, bluefish and weakfish in the Chesapeake Bay: trophic linkages, and bioenergetics model application [dissertation]. College Park (MD): University of Maryland. 66 p.
- Hartman KJ. 2003. Population-level consumption by Atlantic coastal striped bass and the influence of population recovery upon prey communities. *Fish Manage Ecol.* 10: 281-288.

- Hartman KJ, Brandt SB. 1995. Predatory demand and impact of striped bass, bluefish and weakfish in the Chesapeake Bay: application of bioenergetics model. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 52: 1667-1687.
- Hawkins JH III. 1988. Age, growth and mortality of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in North Carolina with a discussion on population dynamics [thesis]. Greenville (NC): East Carolina University. 86 p.
- Heimbuch DG. 2008. Potential effects of striped bass predation on juvenile fish in the Hudson River. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 137: 1591-1605.
- Hilborn R, Walters CJ. 1992. Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: choice, dynamics and uncertainty. New York (NY): Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc. 592 p.
- Holland PW, Welsch RE. 1978. Robust regression using iterative reweighted least squares. In: Balakrishnan N, editor. *Commun Stats.* (A9). p 813-827.
- Hollowed AB, Bax N, Beamish R, Collie J, Fogarty M, Livingston P, Pope J, Rice JC. 2000a. Are multispecies models an improvement on single-species models for measuring fishing impacts on marine ecosystems? *ICES J Mar Sci.* 57:707-719.
- Hollowed AB, Ianelli JN, Livingston PA. 2000b. Including predation mortality in stock assessments: a case study for Gulf of Alaska walleye Pollock. *ICES J Mar Sci.* 57: 279-293.
- Jacobson LD, Cadrin SX, Weinberg JR. 2002. Tools for estimating surplus production and Fmsy in any stock assessment model. *N Amer J Fish Manage.* 22: 326-338.
- Jiang H, Pollock KH, Brownie C, Hoenig JM, Latour RJ, Wells BK, Hightower JE. 2007. Tag return models allowing for harvest and catch and release: evidence of environmental and management impacts on striped bass fishing and natural mortality rates. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 27: 387-396.
- Joseph EB. 1972. The status of Sciaenid stocks of the Middle Atlantic Coast. *Chesapeake Sci.* 13: 87-100.
- Juanes F. 1994. What determines prey size selectivity in piscivorous fishes. In: Stouder DJ, Fresh KL, Feller RJ, editors. *Theory and Application in Fish Feeding Ecology.* Belle W. Baruch Library in Marine Science Number 18. Columbia (SC): University of South Carolina Press. p 79-100.
- Kahn DM. 2002. Stock Assessment of Weakfish through 2000, including Estimates of Stock Size on January 1, 2001. Dover (DE): Division of Fish and Wildlife. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, April 2002. 25 p.
- Kahn DM. 2005. ASMFC Striped Bass Tagging Subcommittee Summary of USFWS Cooperative Tagging Program Results. Dover (DE): Division of Fish and Wildlife. Report to the ASMFC Striped Bass Technical Committee, September 23, 2005. 44 p.
- Kahn DM, Uphoff J, Murphy B, Crecco V, Brust J, O'Reilly R, Paramore L, Vaughan D, de Silva J. 2006. Weakfish Stock Assessment Report for Peer Review (Part 1). In: ASMFC, editor. 2006 Weakfish Stock Assessment. Washington (DC): ASMFC. p 1-144.
- Kerr RA. 2000. A North Atlantic climate pacemaker for the centuries. *Sci.* 288 (5473): 1984-1985.
- Lange AM. 1991. Alternative indices for predicting availability of longfin squid to seasonal Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 11: 443-450.
- Latour RJ, Gartland J, Bonzek CF, Brasseur EA. In review. Aspects of the growth and trophic ecology of weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*) in Chesapeake Bay.

- Latour RJ, Gartland J, Bonzek CF, Johnson RA. 2007. The trophic dynamics of summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*) in Chesapeake Bay. *Fish Bull.* 106: 47-57.
- Link JS. 2002. Ecological considerations in fisheries management: when does it matter? *Fish.* 27: 10-17.
- Lorenzen K. 1996. The relationship between body weight and natural mortality in juvenile and adult fish: a comparison of natural systems and aquaculture. *J Fish Biol.* 49: 627-647.
- Lowerre-Barbieri SK, Chittenden ME, Barbieri LR. 1995. Age and growth of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in the Chesapeake Bay region with a discussion of historical changes in maximum size. *Fish Bull.* 93: 643-656.
- Lowerre-Barbieri SK, Chittenden ME, Barbieri LR. 1996. The multiple spawning pattern of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in the Chesapeake Bay and Middle Atlantic Bight. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 55: 2244-2254.
- Lowerre-Barbieri SK, Lowerre JM, Barbieri LR. 1998. Multiple spawning and the dynamics of fish populations: inferences from an individual-based simulation model. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 55: 2244-2254.
- MacCall AD. 2002. Use of known-biomass production models to determine productivity of west coast groundfish stocks. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 22: 272-279.
- Magnusson A, Hilborn R. 2007. What makes fisheries data informative? *Fish Fish.* 8: 337-358.
- Malchoff MH, Heins SW. 1997. Short-term hooking mortality of weakfish caught on single-barb hooks. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 17:477-481.
- Mangel M, Smith PE. 1990. Presence-absence sampling for fisheries management. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 47: 1875-1887.
- Manooch CS. 1973. Food habits of yearling and adult striped bass, *Morone saxatilis* (Walbaum), from Ablemarle Sound, North Carolina. *Chesapeake Sci.* 14:73-86.
- McConnaughey RA, Conquest LL. 1993. Trawl survey estimation using a comparative approach based on lognormal theory. *Fish Bull.* 91: 107-118.
- Mercer LP. 1983. A biological and fisheries profile of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*. Morehead City (NC): DENR Division of Marine Fisheries. Special Science Report No. 39. 107 p.
- Mercer LP. 1985. Fishery Management Plan for Weakfish. Washington (DC): Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Fish Manage Rep. No 7. 140 p.
- Mercer LP. 1989. Species profiles: life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Mid-Atlantic) - weakfish. US Fish Wildl Ser Biol Rep 82(11.109). US Army Corps of Engineers TR EL-82-4. 17p.
- Merriner JV. 1975. Food habits of the weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in North Carolina waters. *Chesapeake Sci.* 16: 74-76.
- Merriner JV. 1976. Aspects of the reproductive biology of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis* (Scianidae), in North Carolina. *Fish Bull US.* 74:18-26.
- Michels SF, Greco MJ. 2004. Bottom trawl sampling of adult groundfish in Delaware Bay. Dover (DE): Fish and Wildlife Division. Federal Aid in Sportfish Restoration Project Annual Report F-42-14.
- Miller T, Muller R, O'Boyle B, Rosenberg A. 2009. Report by the Peer Review Panel for the Northeast Data Poor Stocks Working Group. Woods Hole (MA): Northeast Fisheries Science Center. Report for the Data Poor Assessment Working Group. 38 p.
- Miranda LE. 2007. Approximate Samples Sizes Required to Estimate Length Distributions. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 136(2): 409-415.

- Munyandorero J. 2006. The weakfish population structure along the Atlantic coast of the United States of America: a literature review. St Petersburg (FL): Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, July 2006. 4 p.
- Munyandorero J. 2008. A review of indirect, life-history-based methods and estimators of natural mortality for weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, off the US Atlantic coast. St Petersburg (FL): Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, July 2008. 13 p.
- Murphy MD, Heagey RF, Neugebauer VH, Gordon MD, Hintz JL. 1995. Mortality of spotted seatrout released from gill-net or hook-and-line gear in Florida. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 15:745-753.
- Moustahfid H, Link JS, Overholtz WJ, Tyrrell MC. 2009. The advantage of explicitly incorporating predation mortality into age-structured stock assessment models: an application for Atlantic mackerel. *ICES J Mar Sci Advance Access [Internet]*. 2009 Jan 16. Available from: <http://icesjms.oxfordjournals.org/>
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 1999. Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey Data User's Manual. Office of Science and Technology [Internet]. Available from: [http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/pubs/data\\_users/index.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/pubs/data_users/index.html)
- National Research Council. 1998. Improving fish stock assessments. Washington (DC): National Academy Press. 188 p.
- National Research Council. 2006. Review of Recreational Fisheries Survey Methods. Washington (DC): National Academies Press. 202 p.
- Nelson G. 2007. A forward-projecting Statistical Catch-at-Age model for striped bass. Gloucester (MA): Division of Marine Fisheries. Report to the ASMFC Striped Bass Stock Assessment Subcommittee, August 2007. 45 p.
- Nesbit RA. 1954. Weakfish migration in relation to conservation. US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Dept of the Interior. Special Scientific Report – Fisheries No 115.
- Neter J, Wasserman W. 1974. Applied Linear Statistical Models. Homewood (IL): Irwin. 842 p.
- Ney JJ. 1990. Trophic economics in fisheries: assessment of demand-supply relationships between predators and prey. *Aquat Sci.* 2: 55-81.
- Nixon SW, Granger S, Buckley BA, Lamont M, Rowell B. 2004. A one hundred and seventeen year coastal water temperature record from Wood Hole, Massachusetts. *Estuaries.* 27(3) 397-404.
- North E, Hood R, Chao S, Sanford L. 2005. The influence of episodic events on transport of striped bass eggs to the estuarine turbidity maximum nursery area. *Estuaries and Coasts.* 28(1): 108-123.
- Northeast Fishery Science Center (NEFSC). 1996. Report of the 21st Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (21st SAW): Public Review Workshop. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 96-05d. 200 p.
- NEFSC. 1998a. Report of the 26<sup>th</sup> Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (26th SAW): Public Review Workshop. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 98-04. 44 p.
- NEFSC. 1998b. Report of the 26th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (26th SAW): Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC) Consensus Summary of Assessments. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 98-03; p 10-50.
- NEFSC. 2000. Report of the 30th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (30th SAW): Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC) Consensus Summary of Assessments. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 00-03. p 7-61.

- NEFSC. 2003. VPA/ADAPT Version 2.0 Reference Manual. Woods Hole (MA). 29 p.
- NEFSC. 2006. 42nd Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (42nd SAW) Stock Assessment Report, Part B: Expanded Multispecies Virtual Population Analysis (MSVPA-X) Stock Assessment Model. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Reference Document 06-09b. 308 p.
- NEFSC. 2007. Cruise results, NOAA Ship Albatross IV, Cruise No. AL 06-08 (Parts I – IV), Autumn Bottom Trawl Survey. Woods Hole (MA): NMFS. [Internet]. 2007 Jan 4. Available from:  
[http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/femad/ecosurvey/mainpage/cruise\\_results/fbts/2006\\_fbts.pdf](http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/femad/ecosurvey/mainpage/cruise_results/fbts/2006_fbts.pdf)
- NEFSC. 2008. Report of the 46th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment Workshop (46th SAW): Part A. Assessment Report [Striped Bass]. Woods Hole (MA): National Marine Fisheries Service. NEFSC Ref Doc. 08-03a. 252 p.
- Nye JA, Targett TE, Helser TE. 2008. Reproductive characteristics of weakfish in Delaware Bay: implications for management. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 27: 1-11.
- Ott L. 1977. An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis. North Scituate (MA): Duxbury Press. 730 p.
- Overholtz WJ, Jacobson LD, Link JS. 2008. An ecosystem approach for assessment advice and biological reference points for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic herring complex. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 27: 247-257.
- Overton AS. 2003. Striped bass predator-prey interactions in Chesapeake and along the Atlantic Coast [dissertation]. Princess Ann (MD): University of Maryland Eastern Shore. 226 p.
- Overton AS, Manooch CS, Smith J, Brennan K. 2008. Interactions between adult migratory striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) and their prey during winter off the Virginia and North Carolina Atlantic coast from 1994 to 2007. *Fish Bull.* 106: 174-182.
- Oviatt CA. 2004. The changing ecology of temperate coastal waters during a warming trend. *Estuaries* 27(6): 895-904.
- Palisade Corporation. 1997. BestFit User's Guide. Ithaca (NY): Palisade Corporation.
- Palisade Corporation. 2001. Guide to Evolver: the Genetic Algorithm Super Solver. Ithaca (NY): Palisade Corporation.
- Pennington M. 1983. Efficient estimators of abundance for fish and plankton surveys. *Biometrics* 39: 281-286.
- Persson A, Brönmark C. 2002. Foraging capacity and resource synchronization in an ontogenetic diet switcher, pikeperch (*Stizostedion lucioperca*). *Ecology* 83: 3014-3022.
- Pine WE, Martell SJD, Walters CJ, Kitchell JF. 2009. Counterintuitive responses of fish populations to management actions: some common causes and implications for predictions based on ecosystem modeling. *Fish.* 34: 165-180.
- Platt JR. 1964. Strong inference. *Science* 146: 347-353.
- Prager MH. 1994. A suite of extensions to a nonequilibrium surplus-production model. *Fish Bull.* 92: 374-389.
- Pruell RJ, Taplin BK, Cicchelli K. 2003. Stable isotope ratios in archived striped bass scales suggest changes in trophic structure. *Fish Manage Ecol.* 10: 329-326.
- Punt AE, Butterworth DS. 1995. The effects of future consumption by the Cape fur seal catches and catch rates of the Cape hakes. 4. Modelling the biological interaction between Cape fur seals *Arctocephalus pusillus pusillus* and the Cape Hakes *Merluccius capensis* and *M. paradoxus*. *S Afr J Mar Sci.* 16: 355-385.

- Quinn II TJ, Deriso RB. 1999. Quantitative Fish Dynamics. New York (NY): Oxford University Press. 560 p.
- Restrepo VR, Thompson GG, Mace PM, Gabriel WL, Low LL, MacCall AD, Methot RD, Powers JE, Taylor BL, Wade PR, Witzig JF. 1998. Technical guidance on the use of precautionary approaches to implementing national standard of the Magnuson-Stevens fishery conservation and management act. National Marine Fisheries Service. NOAA Tech Memo. Available from: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/NSGtkgd.pdf>
- Richards RA, Rago PJ. 1999. A case history of effective fishery management: Chesapeake Bay striped bass. *N Am J Fish Manage* 19: 356-375.
- Ricker WE. 1975. Computation and Interpretation of Biological Statistics of Fish Populations. *Bull Fish Res Board Can.* 191: 1-382.
- Rose KA, Summers JK, Cummins RA, Heimbuch DG. 1986. Analysis of long-term ecological data using categorical time series regression. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 43: 2418-2426.
- Rousseuw PJ, Van Driessen K. 2000. An algorithm for positive breakdown regression based on concentration steps in data analysis. In: Gaul W, Opitz O, Schader M, Sokal RR, editors. *Data analysis: Scientific Modeling and Practical Application*. New York (NY): Springer. p 335-346.
- Rudershausen PJ, Tuomikoski JE, Buckel JA, Hightower JE. 2005. Prey selectivity and diet of striped bass in western Ablemarle Sound, North Carolina. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 134: 1059-1074.
- Rugolo L, Crecco V. 1993. The development of a Harvest Control Model to project landings quotas for striped bass in Chesapeake Bay. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Striped Bass Technical Committee, March 1993. 75 p.
- Rutherford ES, Houde ED. 1995. The influence of temperature on cohort-specific growth, survival, and recruitment of striped bass, *Morone saxatilis*, larvae in Chesapeake Bay. *Fish Bull.* 93(2): 315-332.
- SAS. 1990. *Statistical Analysis System (SAS) Procedures Guide, Version 6, 3rd edition*. Cary (NC): SAS Publishing. 705 p.
- SAS. 2002. *SAS Users Guide to Syntax, Procedures and Concepts: Section on Nonlinear Least Squares Regression Methods*. Cary (NC): SAS Publishing. 425 p.
- Sainsbury K. 1998. Living Marine Resource Assessment for the 21st Century: What Will Be Needed and How Will It Be Provided? In: Funk F, Quinn II TJ, Heifetz J, Ianelli JN, Powers JE, Schweigert JF, Sullivan PJ, Zhang CI, editors. *Fishery Stock Assessment Models*. Fairbanks (AK): Alaska Sea Grant College Program. AK-SG-98-01.
- Scharf FS, Juanes F, Rountree RA. 2000. Predator size – prey size relationships of marine fish predators: interspecific variation and effects of ontogeny and body size on trophic-niche breadth. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser.* 208: 229-248.
- Schlesinger ME, Ramankutty N. 1994. An oscillation in the global climate system of period 65-70 years. *Nature* 367: 723- 726.
- Scoles DR. 1990. Stock identification of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, by discriminant function analysis of morphometric characters [thesis]. Gloucester Point (VA): Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary. 55 p.
- Seagraves RJ. 1991. Weakfish Fishery Management Plan Amendment 1. Washington (DC): ASMFC. *Fish Manage Rep. No. 20.* 68 p.



- Secor DH, Piccoli PM. 2007. Oceanic migration rates of upper Chesapeake Bay striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), determined by otolith microchemical analysis. *Fish Bull.* 105: 62-73.
- Setzler EM, Boynton WR, Wood KV, Zion HH, Lubbers L, Mountford NK, Frere P, Tucker L, Mihursky JA. 1980. Synopsis of biological data on striped bass, *Morone saxatilis* (Walbaum). Washington (DC): US Dept of Commerce. NOAA Tech Rep. NMFS Circular 433. 69 p.
- Shelton PA, Sinclair AF, Chouinard GA, Mohn R, Duplisea DE. 2006. Fishing under low productivity conditions is further delaying recovery of Northwest Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 63: 235-238.
- Shepherd GR, Grimes CB. 1983. Geographic and historic variations in growth of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in the Middle Atlantic Bight. *Fish Bull.* US 81:803-813.
- Shepherd GR, Grimes CB. 1984. Reproduction of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis*, in the New York Bight and evidence of geographically specific life history characteristics. US National Marine Fisheries Service *Fish Bull.* 82: 501-511.
- Sinclair AF. 1998. Estimating trends in fishing mortality at age and length directly from research survey and commercial catch data. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 55: 1248-1263.
- Skud BE. 1982. Dominance in fishes: the relation between environment and abundance. *Science* 216: 144-149.
- Spencer PD. 1997. Optimal harvesting of fish populations with non-linear rates of predation and autocorrelated environmental variability. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 54: 59-74.
- Spencer PD, Collie JS. 1995. A simple predator-prey model of exploited marine fish populations incorporating alternative prey. *ICES J Mar Sci.* 53: 615-628.
- Spencer PD, Collie JS. 1997a. Patterns of population variability in marine fish stocks. *Fish Oceanog.* 6: 188-204.
- Spencer PD, Collie JS. 1997b. Effect of nonlinear predation rates on rebuilding the Georges Bank haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*). *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 54: 2920-2929.
- Steele JH. 1996. Regime shifts in fisheries management. *Fish Res.* 25: 19-23.
- Steele JH, Henderson EW. 1984. Modeling long-term fluctuations in fish stocks. *Science* 224: 985-987.
- Stehlik LL. 2007. Essential fish habitat source document: Spiny dogfish, *Squalus acanthias*, life history and habitat characteristics, 2nd ed. Highlands (NJ): NMFS James J. Howard Marine Sciences Lab. NOAA Tech Memo NMFS-NE-203. 44 p.
- Stein RA, Threlkeld ST, Sandgren CD, Sprules WG, Persson L, Werner EE, Neill WE, Dodson SWE. 1988. Size structured interactions in lake communities. In: Carpenter SR, editor. *Complex Interactions in Lake Communities*. New York (NY): Springer-Verlag. 283 p.
- Stevens R. 1979. Fourth session discussion. In: Clepper H, editor. *Predator-Prey Systems in Fisheries Management*. Alexandria (VA): Sport Fishing Institute. 295 p.
- Swain DP, Chouinard GA. 2008. Predicted extirpation of the dominant demersal fish in a large marine ecosystem: Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 65: 2315-2319.
- Swihart GL, Galvez JI, Daniel LB, Swihart ML. 2000. Evaluation of hook and release mortality from a recreational hook and line fishery on weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*). Gloucester (MA): US Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Fishery Assistance. 4 p.
- Taylor ET. 1987. Food habits of dominant piscivorous fishes in Delaware Bay, with special reference to predation on juvenile weakfish [thesis]. Newark (DE): University of Delaware.

- Thomas DL. 1971. The early life history and ecology of six species of drum (Scianidae) in the lower Delaware River, a brackish tidal estuary. III. In: Schuler VJ, editor. An Ecological Study of the Delaware River in the Vicinity of Artificial Island. Ithaca (NY): Ichthyological Associates. 247 p.
- Thorrold SR, Jones CM, Swart PK, Targett TE. 1998. Accurate classification of juvenile weakfish *Cynoscion regalis* to estuarine nursery areas based on chemical signatures in otoliths. Mar Ecol Prog Ser. 173: 253-265.
- Thorrold SR, Latkoczy C, Swart PK, Jones CM. 2001. Natal homing in a marine fish metapopulation. Science 291: 297-299.
- Tolan JM, Fisher M. 2007. Biological response to changes in climate patterns: population increases of gray snapper (*Lutjanus griseus*) in Texas bays and estuaries. Fish Bull 107(1): 36-44.
- Trussel GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Matassa CM. 2006. The fear of being eaten reduces energy transfer in a simple food chain. Ecology 87: 2979-2984.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 1997. Use of egg presence-absence to derive probability-based management criteria for upper Chesapeake Bay striped bass. N Am J Fish Manage. 17: 663-676.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2003. Predator-prey analysis of striped bass and Atlantic menhaden in upper Chesapeake Bay. Fish Manage Ecol. 10: 313-322.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2004. Indicators of Weakfish Size Quality: Proportional and Relative Stock Density Indices for Weakfish. Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, December 2004. 7 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2005a. Biomass dynamic modeling of Atlantic Coast weakfish derived from Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Delaware, and New Jersey Trawl Survey Indices. Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee, January 2005. 25 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2005b. Has the weakfish recovery hit the limits of the mid-Atlantic food web? Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment and Technical Committees, January 2005. 19 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2005c. Does a regime shift underlie the failure of weakfish recovery? Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment and Technical Committees, March 2005. 27 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2005d. Projections of Atlantic coast weakfish biomass. Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment and Technical Committees, June 2005. 12 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2006a. Weakfish Stock Assessment Report for Peer Review (Part 2): An ecological assessment of weakfish: examination of fishing and trophic effects on the recent stock decline. In: ASMFC, editor. 2006 Weakfish Stock Assessment. Washington (DC): ASMFC. p A144-227.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2006b. How much additional discarding and under-reporting is needed to cause the decline in weakfish? Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment and Technical Committees, June 20, 2006. 2 p.
- Uphoff JH Jr. 2008. Revisiting exploitable biomass indices for weakfish. Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Presentation to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee, July 2008. 16 p.

- Uphoff JH Jr. 2009. Using Hypothesis Testing to Understand Trophic Interactions and Biomass Dynamics of Atlantic Coast Weakfish *Cynoscion regalis*. Stevensville (MD): DNR Fisheries Service. Report to the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee, April 2009. 90 p.
- Vaughan D. 2000. Catch-at-age matrix for the Atlantic weakfish stock, 1990-1999. Beaufort (NC): National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Vaughan DS, Seagraves RJ, West K. 1991. An assessment of the Atlantic coast weakfish stock, 1982-1988. Washington (DC): ASMFC. Special Report No. 21. 29 p.
- Villoso EP. 1990. Reproductive biology and environmental control of spawning cycle of weakfish, *Cynoscion regalis* (Bloch and Schneider), in Delaware Bay [dissertation]. Newark (DE): University of Delaware.
- Vokoun JC, Rabeni CF, Stanovick JS. 2001. Sample-size requirements for evaluating population size structure. *N Am Jour Fish Manage.* 21:660-665.
- Wahle RA. 2003. Revealing stock-recruitment relationships in lobsters and crabs: is experimental ecology the key? *Fish Res* 65: 3-32.
- Walter JF, Austin HM. 2003. Diet composition of large striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*). *Fish Bull.* 101: 414-423.
- Walter JF, Overton AS, Ferry KH, Mather ME. 2003. Atlantic coast feeding habits of striped bass: a synthesis supporting a coast-wide understanding of trophic biology. *Fish Manage Ecol.* 10: 349-360.
- Walters CJ, Christensen V, Martell SJ, Kitchell JF. 2005. Possible ecosystem impacts of applying MSY policies from single-species assessment. *ICES J Mar Sci.* 62: 558-568.
- Walters CJ, Hilborn R. 2005. Exploratory assessment of historical recruitment patterns using relative abundance and catch data. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 62: 1985-1990.
- Walters CJ, Hilborn R, Christensen V. 2008. Surplus production dynamics in declining and recovering fish populations. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 65: 2536-2551.
- Walters CJ, Juanes F. 1993. Recruitment limitation as a consequence of natural selection for use of restricted feeding habitats and predation risk taking by juvenile fishes. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 50: 2058-2070.
- Walters CJ, Kitchell JF. 2001. Cultivation/depensation effects on juvenile survival and recruitment: implications for the theory of fishing. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* 58: 39-50.
- Walters CJ, Martell SJD. 2004. *Fisheries Ecology and Management*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press. 448 p.
- Walters CJ, Martell SJD, Christensen V, Mahmoudi B. 2008. An Ecosim model for exploring Gulf of Mexico management options: implications of including multistanza life-history models for policy predictions. *Bull Mar Sci.* 83: 251-271.
- Weakfish Technical Committee. 2006. Implementation of 40th SARC recommendations. In: ASMFC, editors. Washington (DC): ASMFC. 2006 Weakfish Stock Assessment: Section C – Supplemental Materials Requested by the Weakfish Management Board Available. p C1-4.
- Whipple SJ, Link JS, Garrison LP, Fogarty MJ. 2000. Models of predation and fishing mortality in aquatic ecosystems. *Fish Fish* 1: 22-40.
- Wilk SJ. 1979. Biological and fisheries data on weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*). Highlands (NJ): NMFS James J Howard Marine Sciences Laboratory. Tech Ser Rep.No 21. 49 p.

- Yodzis P. 1994. Predator-prey theory and management of multispecies fisheries. *Ecol Appl.* 4: 51-58.
- Yodzis P. 2001. Must top predators be culled for the sake of fisheries? *Trends in Ecol Evolu.* 16: 78-84.
- Yoshimoto SS, Clarke RP. 1993. Comparing dynamic versions of the Schaefer and Fox Production models and their application to lobster fisheries. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 50: 181-189.

## Tables

**Table C4.6-1.** Commercial landings (MT) and percent of annual total by state and year. A) Landings (MT); B) Percent of total.

A)	Year	MA	RI	CT	NY	NJ	DE	MD	VA	NC	FL	Total
	1981	18.1	109.8	12.4	615.9	1,701.1	477.0	153.5	1,121.2	7,662.9	86.3	11,958.2
	1982	10.4	80.2	11.6	570.2	940.5	587.2	113.0	974.9	5,466.9	79.9	8,834.8
	1983	3.1	74.3	19.4	385.6	985.5	409.1	176.9	1,176.1	4,642.0	53.4	7,925.4
	1984	2.2	76.0	14.2	219.8	1,248.1	354.9	147.4	956.6	5,892.6	57.1	8,968.9
	1985	1.4	74.0	12.8	175.2	1,374.4	449.4	143.4	944.5	4,454.9	60.0	7,690.0
	1986	2.6	57.9	6.2	163.2	1,455.4	328.2	152.7	904.5	6,490.7	49.3	9,610.7
	1987	0.8	35.7	13.4	149.3	949.9	262.1	166.4	890.3	5,220.2	55.8	7,743.9
	1988	1.7	8.8	1.1	56.5	1,058.2	240.7	377.7	668.2	6,845.6	52.2	9,310.7
	1989	0.9	4.4	1.0	46.9	661.6	240.5	337.4	465.0	4,588.5	77.7	6,423.9
	1990	0.8	11.2	0.6	9.0	439.2	278.1	300.4	547.7	2,631.8	62.2	4,281.0
	1991	0.9	11.3	9.7	50.6	532.6	225.6	148.9	480.7	2,408.0	74.8	3,943.1
	1992	1.4	13.7	1.6	76.2	426.7	164.4	174.8	249.5	2,205.6	67.1	3,381.0
	1993	0.5	4.5	0.7	40.1	378.5	88.3	82.5	493.5	1,954.7	65.5	3,108.8
	1994		8.2	5.0	45.1	315.4	118.8	63.9	587.1	1,583.0	81.5	2,808.0
	1995	0.2	23.9	2.9	78.2	393.4	127.6	31.5	673.6	1,865.8	22.8	3,219.9
	1996	0.0	19.7	3.1	165.7	372.9		60.2	719.9	1,804.3	2.0	3,147.8
	1997	0.0	14.1	5.0	152.7	470.1	253.5	87.4	706.7	1,615.3	5.3	3,310.1
	1998	0.2	35.0	6.6	225.2	818.6	250.7	110.9	845.5	1,521.4	6.8	3,820.9
	1999	1.2	57.3	10.1	222.2	585.7	199.7	101.4	759.3	1,187.3	7.9	3,132.1
	2000	0.2	85.9	3.6	160.0	486.0	149.1	94.5	618.2	847.8	4.3	2,449.6
	2001	0.1	49.7	3.1	262.5	379.9	85.1	84.3	508.9	889.2	4.9	2,267.7
	2002	0.4	55.7	4.6	233.1	391.5	78.4	50.5	518.9	829.3	2.6	2,165.0
	2003	0.2	28.7	1.4	65.5	154.3	41.5	21.5	208.4	385.0	1.2	907.7
	2004	0.0	17.4	2.8	80.9	92.8	23.3	19.8	161.9	310.9	1.2	711.0
	2005		18.9	2.8	49.8	29.2	32.1	16.2	176.9	191.2	3.3	520.4
	2006	3.9	20.2	3.2	69.3	93.7	15.6	23.2	85.2	164.6	2.7	481.6
	2007	0.2	9.3	0.9	39.3	74.6	11.1	12.6	156.7	79.6	3.5	387.8

**Table C4.6-1 (continued).** Commercial landings (MT) and percent of annual total by state and year. A) Landings (MT); B) Percent of total.

B)	Year	MA	RI	CT	NY	NJ	DE	MD	VA	NC	FL
	1981	0.15	0.92	0.1	5.15	14.23	3.99	1.28	9.38	64.08	0.72
	1982	0.12	0.91	0.13	6.45	10.65	6.65	1.28	11.03	61.88	0.9
	1983	0.04	0.94	0.24	4.87	12.43	5.16	2.23	14.84	58.57	0.67
	1984	0.02	0.85	0.16	2.45	13.92	3.96	1.64	10.67	65.7	0.64
	1985	0.02	0.96	0.17	2.28	17.87	5.84	1.86	12.28	57.93	0.78
	1986	0.03	0.6	0.06	1.7	15.14	3.41	1.59	9.41	67.54	0.51
	1987	0.01	0.46	0.17	1.93	12.27	3.38	2.15	11.5	67.41	0.72
	1988	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.61	11.37	2.59	4.06	7.18	73.52	0.56
	1989	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.73	10.3	3.74	5.25	7.24	71.43	1.21
	1990	0.02	0.26	0.01	0.21	10.26	6.5	7.02	12.79	61.48	1.45
	1991	0.02	0.29	0.25	1.28	13.51	5.72	3.78	12.19	61.07	1.9
	1992	0.04	0.41	0.05	2.25	12.62	4.86	5.17	7.38	65.24	1.98
	1993	0.02	0.14	0.02	1.29	12.18	2.84	2.65	15.87	62.88	2.11
	1994	0	0.29	0.18	1.61	11.23	4.23	2.28	20.91	56.37	2.9
	1995	0.01	0.74	0.09	2.43	12.22	3.96	0.98	20.92	57.95	0.71
	1996	0	0.63	0.1	5.26	11.85	0	1.91	22.87	57.32	0.06
	1997	0	0.43	0.15	4.61	14.2	7.66	2.64	21.35	48.8	0.16
	1998	0.01	0.92	0.17	5.89	21.42	6.56	2.9	22.13	39.82	0.18
	1999	0.04	1.83	0.32	7.09	18.7	6.38	3.24	24.24	37.91	0.25
	2000	0.01	3.51	0.15	6.53	19.84	6.09	3.86	25.24	34.61	0.18
	2001	0	2.19	0.14	11.58	16.75	3.75	3.72	22.44	39.21	0.22
	2002	0.02	2.57	0.21	10.77	18.08	3.62	2.33	23.97	38.3	0.12
	2003	0.02	3.16	0.15	7.22	17	4.57	2.37	22.96	42.41	0.13
	2004	0	2.45	0.39	11.38	13.05	3.28	2.78	22.77	43.73	0.17
	2005	0	3.63	0.54	9.57	5.61	6.17	3.11	33.99	36.74	0.63
	2006	0.81	4.19	0.66	14.39	19.46	3.24	4.82	17.69	34.18	0.56
	2007	0.05	2.4	0.23	10.13	19.24	2.86	3.25	40.41	20.53	0.9

**Table C4.6-2.** Estimated commercial discards of weakfish by year.

Year	MT	Number at age (thousands)							Total N (thousands)
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6+	
1982	604.54	1,231.2	2,020.8	1,173.3	54.4	4.2	1.4	0.3	4,485.5
1983	417.29	338.2	1,573.2	769.2	120.3	4.6	1.1	0.2	2,806.7
1984	681.34	1,431.7	2,911.0	845.0	83.8	5.6	1.3	0.3	5,278.7
1985	386.55	664.1	1,363.0	572.2	112.6	5.6	1.3	0.3	2,719.2
1986	431.77	339.1	1,578.3	778.0	127.1	7.7	1.8	0.3	2,832.4
1987	364.28	226.6	1,280.0	809.8	93.3	6.9	1.7	0.4	2,418.5
1988	326.02	66.5	1,209.9	698.0	89.8	34.3	8.2	1.5	2,108.3
1989	311.71	434.5	1,459.2	508.9	27.0	4.7	1.1	0.2	2,435.7
1990	190.16	107.7	615.1	353.6	81.4	4.6	1.0	0.2	1,163.6
1991	200.09	112.8	692.2	365.5	64.1	19.0	4.4	0.9	1,259.0
1992	216.62	280.0	873.6	364.0	35.2	3.3	0.8	0.2	1,557.1
1993	416.35	126.9	1,205.4	586.8	53.9	5.5	1.2	0.2	1,980.0
1994	989.57	219.6	378.5	934.1	355.7	127.7	3.0	0.9	2,019.4
1995	715.83	810.6	576.6	421.3	125.0	42.3	1.3	0.5	1,977.7
1996	985.21	1,026.3	643.9	403.4	608.1	138.3	28.9	1.4	2,850.4
1997	864.41	81.8	488.9	550.9	229.7	318.1	35.3	8.6	1,713.3
1998	762.07	262.1	300.5	296.3	309.3	79.7	70.2	26.9	1,345.1
1999	746.42	2,347.4	416.1	104.1	123.7	183.6	15.9	15.1	3,205.9
2000	548.36	0.6	249.3	618.2	465.0	133.0	40.4	6.0	1,512.6
2001	1,138.70	1,153.2	2,124.5	734.4	305.0	297.4	104.1	34.7	4,753.5
2002	470.07	1,310.0	2,093.7	456.0	155.0	25.6	5.8	2.4	4,048.6
2003	238.22	2.9	19.6	157.6	127.5	34.4	8.2	3.7	353.9
2004	209.44	17.2	98.5	276.6	110.9	5.5	4.6	2.5	515.9
2005	173.91	0.6	33.6	307.3	202.0	24.2	0.4	0.2	568.2
2006	199.00	54.5	230.1	187.8	245.5	30.9	0.4	0.0	749.1
2007	193.27	43.1	288.7	548.4	254.3	16.3	3.3	0.0	1,154.1

**Table C4.6-3.** Recreational harvest and percent of annual total by state and year. A) Harvest (thousands of fish); B) Percent of total.  
 \*Florida values have been corrected for sand seatrout and weakfish-sand seatrout hybrids.

A)	Year	MA	RI	CT	NY	NJ	DE	MD	VA	NC	SC	GA	FL*	Total
	1981	5.95	18.37	18.71	275.12	1,028.79	122.74	177.76	7,484.78	204.23	2.58	2.43	0.00	9,341.46
	1982	0.00	18.61	11.77	88.23	104.07	217.82	440.15	715.89	200.05	17.34	0.00	11.65	1,825.58
	1983	2.73	74.61	6.36	36.93	2,857.09	1,009.90	595.29	354.85	387.87	6.81	17.21	69.64	5,419.29
	1984	2.24	0.00	1.56	20.13	1,026.04	593.11	104.06	782.85	489.47	7.84	0.00	103.34	3,130.63
	1985	0.00	17.09	2.87	89.54	812.84	365.69	305.80	505.22	217.67	61.79	4.81	8.92	2,392.24
	1986	0.00	4.60	7.32	34.58	2,500.62	914.49	1,947.39	2,418.05	611.36	78.32	18.13	27.16	8,562.01
	1987	0.00	0.00	0.78	7.45	1,666.62	638.34	824.88	1,015.41	624.16	18.84	10.80	13.58	4,820.87
	1988	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.22	642.03	974.71	1,163.77	2,297.05	438.15	1.83	0.00	20.92	5,551.68
	1989	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.44	303.29	254.17	226.51	357.86	190.19	6.81	8.25	30.08	1,383.59
	1990	0.00	0.41	0.00	3.06	216.39	179.84	370.53	286.46	91.30	8.03	2.27	18.54	1,176.81
	1991	0.00	0.00	18.70	28.07	545.67	366.46	221.24	351.95	140.83	19.62	4.95	24.97	1,722.45
	1992	0.00	9.62	0.43	5.28	311.66	100.56	137.26	265.65	35.49	23.50	1.75	14.71	905.91
	1993	0.00	0.00	2.46	12.61	203.92	235.31	238.77	108.39	106.74	7.36	14.75	31.57	961.88
	1994	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.87	591.57	300.21	332.85	169.74	177.97	46.86	0.72	46.23	1,668.01
	1995	0.00	1.57	0.00	22.31	671.85	406.73	88.70	226.68	62.48	29.90	22.44	11.95	1,544.60
	1996	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.32	1,104.25	633.92	183.41	193.86	90.70	5.70	5.41	7.55	2,241.13
	1997	0.00	1.42	0.52	112.99	1,028.33	647.53	162.90	557.81	184.95	2.04	44.20	18.29	2,760.97
	1998	0.62	0.00	2.18	21.39	920.56	455.60	290.05	463.53	191.18	15.84	0.72	6.44	2,368.11
	1999	0.00	2.30	1.61	18.35	583.88	224.31	340.10	229.21	127.16	3.94	1.68	26.18	1,558.71
	2000	0.00	0.71	7.34	42.41	760.28	311.55	475.35	286.75	71.25	5.59	4.18	30.28	1,995.68
	2001	0.00	2.30	0.72	28.13	736.07	72.45	302.72	175.87	158.61	0.00	3.32	11.14	1,491.32
	2002	0.00	1.42	1.80	24.96	492.88	121.88	100.47	178.11	90.17	90.25	0.85	16.67	1,119.45
	2003	0.11	0.30	0.44	9.23	151.10	20.12	41.05	86.11	153.75	4.16	1.57	6.28	474.24
	2004	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.60	183.65	6.97	29.65	103.18	237.40	153.59	9.82	10.50	742.34
	2005	0.00	1.01	0.00	0.36	1,053.01	19.03	22.16	30.35	163.27	129.58	5.76	18.28	1,442.80
	2006	0.00	3.30	0.00	9.12	417.53	11.16	0.47	58.81	153.70	7.12	3.50	19.62	684.33
	2007	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.12	209.31	4.18	10.32	44.49	114.33	71.23	4.71	26.05	491.74



**Table C4.6-3 (continued).** Recreational harvest and percent of annual total by state and year. A) Harvest (thousands of fish); B) Percent of total. \*Florida values have been corrected for sand seatrout and weakfish-sand seatrout hybrids.

B)	Year	MA	RI	CT	NY	NJ	DE	MD	VA	NC	SC	GA	FL*
	1981	0.06	0.20	0.20	2.95	11.01	1.31	1.90	80.12	2.19	0.03	0.03	0.00
	1982	0.00	1.02	0.64	4.83	5.70	11.93	24.11	39.21	10.96	0.95	0.00	0.64
	1983	0.05	1.38	0.12	0.68	52.72	18.64	10.98	6.55	7.16	0.13	0.32	1.29
	1984	0.07	0.00	0.05	0.64	32.77	18.95	3.32	25.01	15.63	0.25	0.00	3.30
	1985	0.00	0.71	0.12	3.74	33.98	15.29	12.78	21.12	9.10	2.58	0.20	0.37
	1986	0.00	0.05	0.09	0.40	29.21	10.68	22.74	28.24	7.14	0.91	0.21	0.32
	1987	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.15	34.57	13.24	17.11	21.06	12.95	0.39	0.22	0.28
	1988	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	11.56	17.56	20.96	41.38	7.89	0.03	0.00	0.38
	1989	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.47	21.92	18.37	16.37	25.86	13.75	0.49	0.60	2.17
	1990	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.26	18.39	15.28	31.49	24.34	7.76	0.68	0.19	1.58
	1991	0.00	0.00	1.09	1.63	31.68	21.28	12.84	20.43	8.18	1.14	0.29	1.45
	1992	0.00	1.06	0.05	0.58	34.40	11.10	15.15	29.32	3.92	2.59	0.19	1.62
	1993	0.00	0.00	0.26	1.31	21.20	24.46	24.82	11.27	11.10	0.77	1.53	3.28
	1994	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	35.47	18.00	19.95	10.18	10.67	2.81	0.04	2.77
	1995	0.00	0.10	0.00	1.44	43.50	26.33	5.74	14.68	4.04	1.94	1.45	0.77
	1996	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.73	49.27	28.29	8.18	8.65	4.05	0.25	0.24	0.34
	1997	0.00	0.05	0.02	4.09	37.25	23.45	5.90	20.20	6.70	0.07	1.60	0.66
	1998	0.03	0.00	0.09	0.90	38.87	19.24	12.25	19.57	8.07	0.67	0.03	0.27
	1999	0.00	0.15	0.10	1.18	37.46	14.39	21.82	14.71	8.16	0.25	0.11	1.68
	2000	0.00	0.04	0.37	2.12	38.10	15.61	23.82	14.37	3.57	0.28	0.21	1.52
	2001	0.00	0.15	0.05	1.89	49.36	4.86	20.30	11.79	10.64	0.00	0.22	0.75
	2002	0.00	0.13	0.16	2.23	44.03	10.89	8.97	15.91	8.05	8.06	0.08	1.49
	2003	0.02	0.06	0.09	1.95	31.86	4.24	8.66	18.16	32.42	0.88	0.33	1.33
	2004	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02	24.74	0.94	3.99	13.90	31.98	20.69	1.32	1.41
	2005	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.02	72.98	1.32	1.54	2.10	11.32	8.98	0.40	1.27
	2006	0.00	0.48	0.00	1.33	61.01	1.63	0.07	8.59	22.46	1.04	0.51	2.87
	2007	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.45	42.56	0.85	2.10	9.05	23.25	14.49	0.96	5.30

**Table C5.1-1.** Sample size and parameter estimates for weakfish length-weight equations.

<b>Region</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Season</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>
North	2004	Early	1,553	1.593E-08	3.0510
North	2004	Late	2,290	3.612E-08	2.9091
North	2005	Early	810	1.599E-08	3.0394
North	2005	Late	3,466	8.150E-08	2.7815
North	2006	Early	1,031	1.472E-08	3.0707
North	2006	Late	3,112	7.565E-08	2.8010
North	2007	Early	1,631	5.396E-08	2.8649
North	2007	Late	3,889	4.376E-08	2.8852
South	2004	Early	568	4.386E-08	2.8971
South	2004	Late	596	2.991E-08	2.9554
South	2005	Early	480	2.309E-08	2.9913
South	2005	Late	574	2.889E-08	2.9510
South	2006	Early	488	1.538E-08	3.0586
South	2006	Late	475	3.604E-08	2.9178
South	2007	Early	298	1.648E-08	3.0575
South	2007	Late	266	4.537E-08	2.8882

**Table C5.1-2. Commercial biological sample substitution matrix.**

	2004 Early	2004 Late	2005 Early	2005 Late	2006 Early	2006 Late	2007 Early	2007 Late
MA Trawl	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	NY Trawl PLUS MD and NJ Trawl 16+	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
MA Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
RI Float trap	2003 RI Float trap E and L combined	2003 RI Float trap E and L combined	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
RI Trawl	VA Pound 16+	MD Trawl 16+ AND VA Pound 16+	VA 2006 Early Pound 16+	MD 2005 Late Trawl 16+	NJ Pound 16+	NY Trawl PLUS MD and NJ Trawl 16+	NJ Trawl 16+	NJ Trawl PLUS pound 16+
RI Gill	Combined in "Other"	VA Gill 16+ AND 2005 VA Gill 16+	Combined in "Other"	VA Gill 16+	Combined in "Other"	NJ Gill 16+	Combined in "Other"	NY Gill 16+
RI Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
CT Trawl	Combined in "Other"	MD Trawl 16+ AND VA Pound 16+	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	NJ Pound 16+	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
CT Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
NY Gill	VA Gill 16+	VA Gill 16+ AND 2005 VA Gill 16+	VA Gill 16+	NY Gill PLUS VA Gill 16+	Direct	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct
NY Trawl	VA Pound 16+	MD Trawl 16+ AND VA Pound 16+	VA 2006 Early Pound 16+	Direct	NJ Pound 16+	NY Trawl PLUS MD and NJ Trawl 16+	Combined in "Other"	NJ 2007 Late Trawl PLUS Pound 16+
NY Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
NJ Gill	VA Gill 13+	VA Gill 13+	VA Gill 13+	MD Gill 13+	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NJ Pound	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	VA Pound 13+	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NJ Trawl	VA Pound 13+	MD Trawl 12+	Combined in "Other"	MD Trawl 12+	NJ Pound 13+	Direct	Direct	Direct
NJ Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
DE Gill	Direct	VA Gill 12+	Direct	VA Gill 12+	Direct	VA Gill 12+	DE 2006 Early Gill	Combined in "Other"
DE Hand	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
DE Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"

**Table C5.1-2 (continued).** Commercial biological sample substitution matrix.

MD Gill	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct
MD Pound	Combined in "Other"	MD Pound PLUS VA Pound 12+	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
MD Trawl	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct	Combined in "Other"	Direct
MD Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
VA Gill	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
VA Haulsne	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
VA Pound	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
VA Other	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"	Combined in "Other"
NC Bch sne	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC Est GN	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC LH Sne	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC Sink gill	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC Pound	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC Trawl	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct	Direct
NC Other	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data
SC Other	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest
GA Other	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest	No harvest
FL Other	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data	Combined NC data

**Table C5.1-3.** Biological sampling intensity by state and season for recent years.

Year	Season	Source2	AGES			LENGTHS		
			Comm	Recr	Fish Ind	Comm	Recr	Fish Ind
2004	Early	MA						
		RI						
		CT						
		NY					1	
		NJ	11				6	
		DE	46			782		
		MD	12					
		VA	354			1408	126	
		NC	353			5129	31	
		SC					11	
		GA						
		FL					15	
		NEFSC						
		CHESMAP			263			271
		NEAMAP						
SEAMAP				246		246		
2004	Early Total		776		509	7319	190	517
2004	Late	MA						
		RI	4					
		CT						
		NY					4	
		NJ	46				61	
		DE			533		13	533
		MD	136			105	44	
		VA	55			1848	45	
		NC	295			3312	142	
		SC					38	
		GA					15	
		FL					14	
		NEFSC			476			563
		CHESMAP			811			837
		NEAMAP						
SEAMAP				316		316		
2004	Late Total		532		2136	5265	376	2249
2005	Early	MA						
		RI					1	
		CT						
		NY						
		NJ	13				2	
		DE	43			573	12	
		MD	18					
		VA	217			1000	294	
		NC	295			5529	37	
		SC						
		GA					25	
		FL					13	
		NEFSC						
		CHESMAP			99			99
		NEAMAP						
SEAMAP				185		185		
2005	Early Total		586		284	7102	383	284

**Table C5.1-3 (continued).** Biological sampling intensity by state and season for recent years.

Year	Season	Source2	AGES			LENGTHS		
			Comm	Recr	Fish Ind	Comm	Recr	Fish Ind
2005	Late	MA						
		RI	60			59		
		CT						
		NY				400	6	
		NJ	135				131	
		DE			601		29	601
		MD	260			301	30	
		VA	244			3046	51	
		NC	293			3266	117	
		SC					31	
		GA					4	
		FL					25	
		NEFSC				594		648
		CHESMAP				1005		1020
NEAMAP								
SEAMAP				286		285		
2005	Late Total		932		2486	7013	424	2554
2006	Early	MA						
		RI	5					
		CT						
		NY					1	
		NJ	43			350	17	
		DE	79			117	5	
		MD						
		VA	361			1738	51	
		NC	800			6337	95	
		SC					3	
		GA						
		FL					37	
		NEFSC						
		CHESMAP				167		171
NEAMAP								
SEAMAP				120		121		
2006	Early Total		1283		287	8542	209	292
2006	Late	MA						
		RI	38			38	3	
		CT						
		NY				41	4	
		NJ	257			380	69	
		DE			481		11	481
		MD	180			176		
		VA	253			3540	8	
		NC	696			2246	149	
		SC					75	
		GA					1	
		FL					13	
		NEFSC				1171		1198
		CHESMAP				550		557
NEAMAP				494		494		
SEAMAP				197		197		
2006	Late Total		1386		2893	6383	330	2927

**Table C5.1-3 (continued).** Biological sampling intensity by state and season for recent years.

Year	Season	Source2	AGES			LENGTHS		
			Comm	Recr	Fish Ind	Comm	Recr	Fish Ind
2007	Early	MA						
		RI						
		CT						
		NY						
		NJ	350			370	8	
		DE	159				2	
		MD						
		VA	280			997	4	
		NC	298			3455	14	
		SC					25	
		GA					4	
		FL					11	
		NEFSC						
		CHESMAP			120			120
NEAMAP								
SEAMAP								
2007	Early Total		1087		120	4822	68	120
2007	Late	MA						
		RI						
		CT						
		NY				61		
		NJ	193			183	30	
		DE			446		6	446
		MD	276			204	7	
		VA	142			1831	5	
		NC	270			2653	65	
		SC					150	
		GA					5	
		FL					27	
		NEFSC			682			748
		CHESMAP			434			434
NEAMAP			564			572		
SEAMAP								
2007	Late Total		881		2126	4932	295	2200

**Table C5.1-4.** Number of observed commercial hauls with weakfish discards by year and gear type.

Year	Gillnet	Otter trawl	Other	Total
1994	92	19		111
1995	158	140		298
1996	99	137	1	236
1997	63	33	1	96
1998	68	5		73
1999	26	29		55
2000	41	12		53
2001	26	53		79
2002	15	42		57
2003	6	53		59
2004	7	110		117
2005	4	34		38
2006	1	35	1	36
2007	5	77	1	82
Total	611	779	4	1390



**Table C5.2-1.** Coastwide recreational weakfish harvest and discards and percent standard error (PSE). Estimates from Florida are not corrected for weakfish/sand seatrout hybrids.

Year	Harvest (A+B1)		Harvest (A+B1)		Discard (B2)	
	Numbers	NumPSE	Pounds	LbsPSE	Numbers	DiscPSE
1981	9,344,461	35.4	16,105,028	15.7	284,848	49.2
1982	1,854,090	14.8	8,285,326	15.3	190,580	48.8
1983	5,642,950	12.8	11,730,619	12.3	273,319	35.3
1984	3,520,811	13.7	7,013,781	21.1	248,229	27.3
1985	2,419,670	9.4	5,489,026	10.6	356,154	34.9
1986	8,664,122	8.3	10,141,786	9.2	2,309,464	16.4
1987	4,871,532	11	6,749,890	14.3	848,274	18.9
1988	5,626,268	11.9	6,331,649	11.2	820,115	34.6
1989	1,495,391	8	2,177,237	7.7	179,177	16.6
1990	1,232,253	6.8	1,347,260	8.1	439,555	12.3
1991	1,812,691	6.8	2,130,563	7.4	788,789	17.7
1992	960,151	7.5	1,398,980	8.5	707,658	12.6
1993	1,079,275	7.3	1,102,340	9.3	1,139,284	10.2
1994	1,826,495	7.7	1,795,517	9.5	3,102,455	7.1
1995	1,588,079	8	1,855,548	8.7	4,108,344	6.9
1996	2,269,330	8.4	2,925,392	10.5	5,036,968	7.1
1997	2,815,654	7.6	3,692,716	7.5	4,016,709	5.8
1998	2,386,345	6.7	4,044,974	7.6	3,311,050	7
1999	1,651,554	7	3,143,427	8	2,826,435	6.6
2000	2,089,202	7.6	4,154,794	9.2	4,870,876	5.8
2001	1,526,583	7.1	2,722,630	7.9	3,708,952	5.8
2002	1,171,889	9.2	2,192,607	8.1	2,117,876	6.7
2003	497,571	8.9	864,962	11.5	1,600,485	8.5
2004	777,856	11.8	926,962	12.4	1,888,567	9.1
2005	1,503,540	10.9	1,587,378	11.5	2,344,871	10
2006	745,135	11.2	919,662	14.1	2,416,228	9.9
2007	584,569	14.4	692,392	15.8	1,427,669	13.7

**Table C5.3-1.** Weakfish catch at age matrix (thousands of fish) for all four fishery sectors combined.

Year	Age					
	1	2	3	4	5	6+
1982	9,914.20	12,967.00	5,473.00	2,778.20	721.60	639.50
1983	8,004.00	12,869.10	5,822.70	2,780.00	568.20	424.10
1984	10,444.20	14,736.90	6,521.10	3,045.30	484.50	254.50
1985	14,153.20	11,262.30	3,246.10	1,171.00	212.90	55.10
1986	18,610.70	15,778.40	4,942.40	1,823.70	264.10	52.10
1987	16,256.30	14,343.10	4,347.10	1,485.20	145.40	11.00
1988	8,161.90	16,140.80	10,545.30	6,092.00	1,050.50	70.70
1989	3,705.00	5,304.90	4,333.50	2,922.30	626.20	84.60
1990	9,510.10	4,890.10	2,093.60	1,204.80	591.40	89.10
1991	9,795.90	5,825.60	2,750.00	1,373.60	463.40	57.30
1992	5,179.50	6,046.00	2,211.00	1,255.00	527.80	65.00
1993	4,974.80	6,357.00	2,179.80	1,138.60	401.10	48.20
1994	3,761.88	4,347.41	3,561.04	1,563.46	204.05	39.79
1995	4,336.27	3,727.71	3,566.71	1,637.76	198.10	54.28
1996	2,498.83	2,689.49	5,033.34	3,174.23	1,379.29	100.14
1997	1,716.38	2,394.16	2,913.23	5,522.01	1,523.11	410.19
1998	1,270.62	2,138.27	3,983.12	2,019.16	2,928.80	909.47
1999	1,412.62	1,300.41	2,256.60	3,326.01	725.65	1,145.02
2000	1,376.99	1,727.14	1,985.75	1,663.66	1,528.22	403.05
2001	2,420.66	2,953.08	1,474.09	1,219.89	658.73	485.92
2002	2,591.74	1,070.50	2,695.67	823.88	388.16	231.49
2003	335.59	949.93	959.71	718.40	209.46	254.18
2004	852.25	1,511.95	667.85	115.80	49.72	38.35
2005	334.26	1,771.52	1,255.15	191.46	10.19	27.12
2006	747.26	637.33	959.20	252.90	15.49	11.94
2007	616.61	1,148.02	507.63	135.20	25.23	5.78

**Table C6.2-1.** Young of year indices of abundance.

Year	MA CPUE	MA CV	RI CPUE	RI RelCV	CT 0 CPUE	CT 0 RelCV	CT Fall 1+ CPUE	CT Fall 1+ RelCV	CT Spring 1+ CPUE	NY CPUE	NY 95% CI
1981	1.87	90.65	5.04	12.71							
1982	0.77	45.59	4.11	13.23							
1983	1.14	67.91	0.79	21.39							
1984	0.15	85.24	0.38	39.39	1.00	0.17	0.53	0.18	0.02		
1985	15.19	100.00	2.37	16.38	6.19	0.10	0.24	0.23	0.00		
1986	2.67	85.00	0.70	21.73	13.16	0.09	0.24	0.24	0.10		
1987	0.00	0.00	0.33	37.25	0.63	0.22	0.11	0.36	0.02	0.6	0.40 - 0.82
1988	0.00	0.00	0.90	29.22	3.49	0.12	0.06	0.41	0.05	0.1	0.05 - 0.17
1989	1.40	94.95	0.42	34.23	8.69	0.11	0.02	0.70	0.04	1.4	0.91 - 1.96
1990	0.00	0.00	2.45	21.14	5.56	0.10	0.08	0.34	0.07	0.6	0.34 - 0.80
1991	0.07	63.83	1.66	26.62	11.95	0.08	0.31	0.28	0.28	20.6	15.30 - 27.73
1992	0.02	100.00	2.35	20.56	3.05	0.12	0.18	0.30	0.12	3.3	2.17 - 4.73
1993	0.00	0.00	1.30	27.13	4.08	0.09	0.12	0.28	0.10	1.0	0.68 - 1.46
1994	0.16	86.60	1.57	26.78	11.19	0.08	0.06	0.41	0.04	8.3	5.53 - 12.35
1995	0.63	66.44	0.09	60.52	5.22	0.12	0.70	0.18	0.18	1.6	1.16 - 2.14
1996	0.26	92.32	6.34	20.24	15.23	0.08	0.56	0.21	0.19	24.5	15.72 - 37.86
1997	0.57	75.87	6.69	16.08	12.38	0.08	0.89	0.16	0.42	18.8	12.97 - 26.91
1998	0.28	80.00	1.39	24.91	5.02	0.12	0.28	0.29	0.37	1.0	0.69 - 1.44
1999	0.32	53.45	1.00	23.98	30.93	0.07	0.39	0.22	0.45	8.4	5.87 - 11.94
2000	1.10	69.55	2.10	19.30	63.31	0.07	0.30	0.26	0.18	15.9	10.33 - 24.13
2001	1.11	74.24	2.39	21.41	40.09	0.07	0.52	0.21	0.27	16.2	10.70 - 24.24
2002	0.06	100.00	2.07	19.74	41.35	0.06	0.16	0.31	0.16	12.2	7.75 - 18.82
2003	1.82	52.41	16.54	13.15	49.41	0.07	0.07	0.57	0.04	7.0	4.45 - 10.76
2004	0.08	100.00	0.40	35.92	58.98	0.06	0.21	0.24	0.15	5.5	3.67 - 8.11
2005	0.74	71.90	8.64	16.29	25.86	0.07	0.12	0.39	0.27	32.0	15.60 - 64.51
2006	2.93	83.59	0.16	43.05	1.05	0.25	0.29	0.37	0.14	8.7	5.66 - 13.13
2007	0.16		4.83	16.80	63.93	0.06	0.06	0.54	0.11	12.07	8.03 - 17.94

**Table C6.2-1 (continued).** Young of year indices of abundance.

Year	DE CPUE	DE 95% CI	MD Ches Bay CPUE	MD Coast CPUE	VIMS CPUE	NC 0 CPUE	NC 0 95% CI	NC 1+ CPUE	NC 1+ 95% CI
1981	5.98	4.39 - 8.05			6.02				
1982	11.49	9.15 - 14.36			10.95				
1983	4.47	3.43 - 5.76			10.85				
1984	6.67	4.90 - 8.96			6.05				
1985	9.35	7.11 - 12.22			37.04				
1986	12.94	10.02 - 16.64			4.62				
1987	5.98	4.45 - 7.95			17.85	1.01	0.40 - 1.88	14.07	8.70 - 22.40
1988	4.73	3.35 - 6.53			21.72	23.8	12.89 - 43.29	12.09	7.10 - 20.15
1989	11.11	8.40 - 14.6	0.44	0.87	21.27	4.04	2.18 - 6.99	3.51	2.08 - 5.60
1990	8.73	6.52 - 11.59	0.95	1.72	30.01	9.23	4.50 - 18.01	5.98	3.78 - 9.21
1991	20.07	15.73 - 25.54	0.78	1.89	15.32	3.77	1.62 - 7.70	4.67	2.87 - 7.29
1992	14.72	11.06 - 19.49	3.24	1.81	15.91	14.34	8.68 - 23.29	6.3	3.61 - 10.57
1993	14.79	11.01 - 19.75	1.59	0.91	15.42	1.67	0.83 - 2.91	20.63	14.09 - 30.00
1994	11.47	8.43 - 15.49	2.33	1.84	7.04	20.6	12.10 - 34.61	16.56	10.54 - 25.73
1995	13.49	10.01 - 18.06	5.95	4.44	11.00	14.3	8.85 - 22.75	14.32	8.67 - 23.26
1996	11.93	8.67 - 16.30	6.40	3.18	7.42	38.01	25.67 - 56.04	9.69	6.02 - 15.27
1997	15.40	11.14 - 21.16	4.28	3.06	14.82	16.57	10.54 - 25.73	19.05	11.66 - 30.76
1998	11.35	8.61 - 14.87	5.87	2.80	9.95	31.41	19.46 - 50.34	3.05	1.41 - 5.81
1999	13.51	10.23 - 17.76	3.26	2.76	16.25	59.65	43.93 - 80.86	15.91	10.57 - 23.73
2000	14.16	10.55 - 18.9	6.54	2.34	11.09	35.22	24.27 - 50.92	51.52	34.21 - 77.35
2001	7.57	5.60 - 10.12	8.10	2.56	11.52	5.17	2.98 - 8.59	9.9	5.48 - 17.34
2002	5.96	4.25 - 8.23	3.92	0.61	8.59	4	2.16 - 6.93	3.78	2.02 - 6.58
2003	10.44	7.58 - 14.26	4.89	5.64	5.42	10.98	7.20 - 16.52	3.22	1.83 - 5.29
2004	8.39	6.00 - 11.59	1.62	3.39	10.47	9.4	5.44 - 15.81	4.35	2.06 - 8.36
2005	16.84	12.02 - 23.45	3.55	4.98	7.10	9.05	5.22 - 15.24	4.31	2.04 - 8.30
2006	5.35	3.93 - 7.19	2.41	1.50	6.20	7.4	3.80 - 13.70	29.71	17.63 - 49.64
2007	13.70	10.07 - 18.52	1.64	2.32	14.37	12.93	7.28 - 22.44	4.3	2.41 - 7.22

**Table C7.2-1.** Comparison of model fit statistics for various sensitivity runs and the preferred model run. Tuning indices used are as follows: Base = All available aged and young of year indices; FI+YOY = All aged fishery independent indices plus all YOY indices; FI only = All aged fishery independent indices only; FD+YOY = All fishery dependent aged indices plus all YOY indices; FD only = Fishery dependent indices only; Scores = indices selected by assigning scores to a set of survey criteria; Preferred = the WTC preferred model run

	<b>Base</b>	<b>FI+YOY</b>	<b>FI only</b>	<b>FD+YOY</b>	<b>FD only</b>	<b>Scores</b>	<b>Preferred</b>
Residual Sum of Squares	1042.95	939.705	572.098	460.518	78.3876	676.472	446.968
Number of Residuals	633	512	293	340	121	367	359
Number of Parameters	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Degrees of Freedom	627	506	287	334	115	361	353
Mean Squared Residual	1.66339	1.85712	1.99337	1.3788	0.681631	1.87388	1.2662
Standard Deviation	1.28973	1.36276	1.41187	1.17422	0.82561	1.3689	1.12526

**Table C7.3-1.** Index values for tuning indices used in the preferred ADAPT VPA model run. DE = Delaware 30-foot trawl, NJ = New Jersey ocean trawl, NC = North Carolina gillnet, MRFSS = recreational harvest, Rec = recreational catch.

Year	Index											
	DE 1	DE 2	DE 3	DE 4	DE 5	DE 6+	NJ 1	NJ 2	NJ 3	NJ 4	NJ 5	NJ 6+
1982	4.71	7.33	3.02	1.45	0.24	0.33	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	5.39	8	3.34	1.57	0.2	0.18	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	2.99	5.32	2.42	1.15	0.13	0.07	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0356	0.026	0.0057	0.0024	0.0003	0
1991	27.1588	3.6382	0.6383	0	0	0	0.0745	0.0523	0.0099	0.0023	0.0001	0
1992	21.1512	2.6081	0.0318	0.0318	0	0	0.0892	0.3206	0.0585	0.0007	0	0
1993	50.2801	25.422	3.9002	0.5169	0	0	0.0405	0.1103	0.0445	0.0181	0.0014	0
1994	113.4222	68.536	23.6497	0.9653	0	0	0.2556	0.1489	0.0316	0	0	0
1995	75.2633	53.4866	15.7403	5.4251	0.0764	0	0.0398	0.1607	0.0702	0.0082	0	0
1996	44.0437	48.3017	111.1071	23.8182	6.387	0.1331	0.0543	0.0434	0.1177	0.0273	0.0107	0.0009
1997	33.4142	25.0014	13.5633	34.5991	2.9623	0.474	0.1323	0.0342	0.0466	0.1339	0.0116	0
1998	23.3566	24.6266	20.3749	11.5955	20.7062	1.3252	0.0087	0.044	0.0679	0.035	0.0821	0.0113
1999	42.0661	20.1604	17.031	6.7402	2.5878	4.0331	0.0222	0.0396	0.0302	0.0053	0.0015	0.0012
2000	97.8468	50.3831	23.6377	5.7446	0.6592	0.9418	0.0397	0.1255	0.1011	0.2153	0.0112	0.0002
2001	13.1139	42.6313	18.7718	5.5263	0.5702	0.0877	0.0047	0.0788	0.1381	0.0582	0.0137	0.0029
2002	89.3537	23.3228	27.9672	3.8367	0.4039	0	0.1398	0.0546	0.0239	0.0029	0	0
2003	50.1607	13.9835	1.2183	0.4237	0	0	0.0416	0.0407	0.0021	0.0003	0	0
2004	26.3628	22.4048	0.1089	0	0	0	0.0591	0.1735	0.0726	0.0129	0.0002	0
2005	12.0686	14.5354	2.3872	0	0	0	0.0977	0.0934	0.0099	0.0008	0	0
2006	58.3793	37.1285	10.0217	0.7848	0	0	0.0746	0.0747	0.0161	0	0	0
2007	23.4698	17.4276	2.0963	0.1644	0	0	0.0926	0.0122	0.0009	0.0001	0	0
2008	40.9767	4.4014	0.5579	0	0	0	0.0591	0.1735	0.0726	0.0129	0.0002	0

**Table C7.3-1 (continued).** Index values for tuning indices used in the preferred ADAPT VPA model run. DE = Delaware 30-foot trawl, NJ = New Jersey ocean trawl, NC = North Carolina gillnet, MRFSS = recreational harvest, Rec = recreational catch.

Year	Index										
	NC 1	NC 2	NC 3	NC 4	NC 5	NC 6+	MRFSS 3	MRFSS 4	MRFSS 5	MRFSS 6+	Rec 2-6+
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1865	0.2176	0.2131	0.1066	0.2021
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0084	0.0588	0.0671	0.063	0.5109
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1771	0.1631	0.1165	0.0326	0.3001
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1033	0.0919	0.0632	0.0172	0.2777
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0933	0.0758	0.0525	0.0175	0.7681
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3885	0.1329	0.0664	0.0102	0.5178
1988	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2272	0.1262	0.0707	0.0101	0.5738
1989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1498	0.1915	0.129	0.0291	0.1673
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0527	0.0527	0.0341	0.0093	0.1557
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0574	0.0309	0.0177	0.0044	0.1778
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.053	0.0485	0.0265	0.0088	0.1928
1993	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.037	0.0328	0.0287	0.0082	0.1651
1994	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.03	0.0258	0.0172	0.0043	0.3849
1995	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0355	0.0659	0.0304	0	0.5079
1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0271	0.0588	0.0407	0.0045	0.6054
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0137	0.0504	0.1054	0.0321	0.5177
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0151	0.0605	0.0958	0.0302	0.5297
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0162	0.0647	0.1024	0.0323	0.4101
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0105	0.0264	0.0632	0.0474	0.4585
2001	0.148	1.4886	0.3694	0.1459	0.1127	0	0.0109	0.0274	0.0328	0.0711	0.2818
2002	0.1729	0.2674	1.0873	0.2423	0.0569	0.0089	0.0368	0.0263	0.0158	0.0158	0.2379
2003	0.1454	0.3669	0.345	0.6802	0.0583	0	0.0051	0.0462	0.0205	0.0154	0.1162
2004	0.2269	0.5946	0.584	0.1885	0.0722	0	0.0094	0.0047	0.0047	0.0047	0.1154
2005	0.1719	0.4862	0.6925	0.1747	0.0343	0.0009	0.0135	0.0058	0.0021	0.002	0.2243
2006	0.1974	0.3766	0.5534	0.213	0.0543	0.0008	0.0489	0.0384	0.0058	0.0001	0.1704
2007	0.1597	0.2564	0.179	0.114	0.052	0.0008	0.0084	0.0196	0.0088	0.0009	0.0884
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0113	0.0054	0.0026	0.0003	0.13

**Table C7.3-2.** Fishing mortality estimates from preferred run of ADAPT VPA.

	Ages 4-5					Ages 1-5			
	Unweighted	N Wtd	B Wtd	C Wtd		Unweighted	N Wtd	B Wtd	C Wtd
1982	1.4015	1.4015	1.4015	1.4015	1982	0.9182	0.5433	0.7299	0.6642
1983	1.6135	1.6135	1.6135	1.6135	1983	1.0231	0.5748	0.9195	0.7473
1984	2.2116	2.2116	2.2116	2.2116	1984	1.446	0.7622	1.2146	1.0228
1985	1.3506	1.3506	1.3506	1.3506	1985	0.8896	0.4477	0.6967	0.5392
1986	1.7287	1.7287	1.7287	1.7287	1986	1.0526	0.5097	0.758	0.5867
1987	0.6618	0.6618	0.6618	0.6618	1987	0.5303	0.4564	0.4913	0.4651
1988	1.7955	1.7955	1.7955	1.7955	1988	1.2169	0.9216	1.2525	1.0414
1989	1.1127	1.1127	1.1127	1.1127	1989	0.7895	0.5474	0.8092	0.7008
1990	0.7645	0.7645	0.7645	0.7645	1990	0.6204	0.5395	0.6247	0.5453
1991	0.8351	0.8351	0.8351	0.8351	1991	0.7222	0.5875	0.7466	0.6137
1992	1.0256	1.0256	1.0256	1.0256	1992	0.7219	0.3824	0.749	0.5401
1993	1.3097	1.3097	1.3097	1.3097	1993	0.7349	0.3042	0.5366	0.4193
1994	0.9848	0.9848	0.9848	0.9848	1994	0.5337	0.1994	0.3409	0.3293
1995	0.3237	0.3237	0.3237	0.3237	1995	0.2635	0.21	0.2348	0.2365
1996	0.5304	0.5304	0.5304	0.5304	1996	0.3328	0.2403	0.3384	0.3145
1997	0.5634	0.5634	0.5634	0.5634	1997	0.3699	0.3003	0.3954	0.4159
1998	0.7208	0.7208	0.7208	0.7208	1998	0.4395	0.3655	0.501	0.4669
1999	0.6693	0.6693	0.6693	0.6693	1999	0.4402	0.3837	0.5308	0.4768
2000	0.8219	0.8219	0.8219	0.8219	2000	0.5525	0.4075	0.6482	0.5633
2001	1.0366	1.0366	1.0366	1.0366	2001	0.7686	0.6293	0.8023	0.6666
2002	1.3437	1.3437	1.3437	1.3437	2002	1.0447	0.9078	1.1444	0.988
2003	2.3915	2.3915	2.3915	2.3915	2003	1.4689	0.6538	1.5688	1.4585
2004	2.1654	2.1654	2.1654	2.1654	2004	1.2523	0.4319	0.6936	0.666
2005	2.0733	2.0733	2.0733	2.0733	2005	1.2511	0.579	0.8919	0.9359
2006	1.3175	1.3175	1.3175	1.3175	2006	0.8194	0.2876	0.5168	0.6327
2007	0.5101	0.4784	0.4828	0.4779	2007	0.3309	0.1288	0.2034	0.2287



**Table C7.3-2.** Bootstrap mean and 80% confidence intervals for estimates of fishing mortality and spawning stock biomass in 2005 using different terminal years.

Fishing mortality in 2005			
<b>Terminal</b>		<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>
<b>year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>80% CI</b>	<b>80% CI</b>
2005	0.39	0.2475	0.5333
2006	0.94	0.6487	1.2235
2007	2.04	1.9222	2.1584

Spawning stock biomass (MT) in 2005			
<b>Terminal</b>		<b>Lower</b>	<b>Upper</b>
<b>year</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>80% CI</b>	<b>80% CI</b>
2005	4,889	3,738	6,040
2006	3,045	2,574	3,516
2007	2,265	2,182	2,347

**Table C8.2-1.** Mid-Atlantic private boat catch of weakfish in number (MIDN\*1000), catch in weight (MIDW, mt) private boat effort (MIDEF, Trips\*1000), abundance index in number (RELNT) and weight (RELWT).

YEAR	midN	midw	midef	RelNt	RELWT
1981	4592	5549.44	6032	0.76	0.92
1982	1218	2712.6	6028	0.20	0.45
1983	4328	4066.56	8472	0.51	0.48
1984	2365	2285.49	7881	0.30	0.29
1985	1942	1748.5	6994	0.28	0.25
1986	7683	3501.05	10003	0.77	0.35
1987	4429	2566.2	8554	0.52	0.30
1988	5085	2481.36	8862	0.57	0.28
1989	1130	810.72	6756	0.17	0.12
1990	1227	551.67	7881	0.16	0.07
1991	1549	784.17	8713	0.18	0.09
1992	1331	621.36	6904	0.19	0.09
1993	1445	437.5	8750	0.17	0.05
1994	3498	908.7	9087	0.38	0.10
1995	4358	1115.53	8581	0.51	0.13
1996	5354	1680.36	8844	0.61	0.19
1997	5035	1750.5	9725	0.52	0.18
1998	4571	1984.9	8630	0.53	0.23
1999	3254	1428.3	7935	0.41	0.18
2000	5192	2038.32	11324	0.46	0.18
2001	3376	1318.02	11982	0.28	0.11
2002	2272	1050.61	9551	0.24	0.11
2003	1311	451.44	11286	0.12	0.04
2004	1279	332.52	11084	0.12	0.03
2005	2631	821.1	11730	0.22	0.07
2006	2066	484.92	12123	0.17	0.04
2007	1109	251.02	12551	0.09	0.02
2008	1510	374.18	11693	0.13	0.03

**Table C8.2-2.** Delaware trawl survey index of weakfish in mean number (DEN) and weight (DEW) per tow and New Jersey trawl survey index of weakfish in mean number (NJN) and weight (NJW) per tow.

YEAR	DEN	DEW	NJN	NJW
1989			0.10	0.12
1990	4.27	1.15	0.08	0.08
1991	2.68	2.63	0.12	0.08
1992	29.80	3.80	0.31	0.12
1993	93.00	11.31	0.17	0.07
1994	74.70	14.84	0.41	0.12
1995	189.80	23.93	0.32	0.14
1996	77.00	42.56	0.28	0.14
1997	78.69	20.04	0.39	0.19
1998	50.55	21.44	0.22	0.10
1999	81.36	12.66	0.22	0.08
2000	67.59	20.68	0.53	0.13
2001	32.31	13.58	0.18	0.10
2002	15.62	14.43	0.24	0.07
2003	22.52	4.65	0.04	0.02
2004	16.93	4.30	0.13	0.06
2005	47.93	2.91	0.23	0.06
2006	19.69	5.20	0.11	0.03
2007	23.07	2.80	0.14	0.04

**Table C8.2-3.** Scaled Delaware trawl survey index in number (ADEN) and weight (ADEW) per tow, scaled New Jersey trawl survey index in number (ANJN), and weight (ANJN), recreational cpue in number (RelNt) and weight (RelWt) and the blended indicies in number (WKN) and weight (WKW), 1981 to 2008.

YEAR	ADEN	ANJN	RelNt	WKN	ANJW	RELWT	ADEW	WKW
1981			0.761	0.761		0.920		0.920
1982			0.202	0.202		0.450		0.450
1983			0.511	0.511		0.480		0.480
1984			0.300	0.300		0.290		0.290
1985			0.278	0.278		0.250		0.250
1986			0.768	0.768		0.350		0.350
1987			0.518	0.518		0.300		0.300
1988			0.574	0.574		0.280		0.280
1989		0.159	0.167	0.163	0.258	0.120		0.189
1990	0.029	0.127	0.156	0.104	0.172	0.070	0.018	0.087
1991	0.018	0.191	0.178	0.129	0.172	0.090	0.042	0.101
1992	0.203	0.493	0.193	0.296	0.258	0.090	0.061	0.136
1993	0.632	0.270	0.165	0.356	0.151	0.050	0.181	0.127
1994	0.508	0.652	0.385	0.515	0.258	0.100	0.237	0.198
1995	1.291	0.509	0.508	0.769	0.301	0.130	0.383	0.271
1996	0.524	0.445	0.605	0.525	0.301	0.190	0.681	0.391
1997	0.535	0.620	0.518	0.558	0.409	0.180	0.321	0.303
1998	0.344	0.350	0.530	0.408	0.215	0.230	0.343	0.263
1999	0.553	0.350	0.410	0.438	0.172	0.180	0.203	0.185
2000	0.460	0.843	0.459	0.587	0.280	0.180	0.331	0.263
2001	0.220	0.286	0.282	0.263	0.215	0.110	0.217	0.181
2002	0.106	0.382	0.238	0.242	0.151	0.110	0.231	0.164
2003	0.153	0.064	0.116	0.111	0.043	0.040	0.074	0.052
2004	0.115	0.207	0.115	0.146	0.129	0.030	0.069	0.076
2005	0.326	0.366	0.224	0.305	0.129	0.070	0.047	0.082
2006	0.134	0.175	0.170	0.160	0.065	0.040	0.083	0.063
2007	0.157	0.223	0.088	0.156	0.086	0.020	0.045	0.050
2008			0.129	0.129		0.032		0.032

**Table C8.2-4.** Coast-wide weakfish harvest and discards in number (CATCHN) and weight (CATCHW, MT), relative fishing mortality in number (RELFN) and weight (RelWt)), ages 1+I fishing mortality in numbers (FN) and weight (FW) and fishing mortality rates due to discards in number (FDISN) and weight (FDISW), 1981 to 2008.

YEAR	CATCHN	HARVN	DISN	CATCHW	HARVW	DISCARDS	RELFN	RELFW	FN	FW	FDISW	FDISN
1981	49379	44693.2	4685.8	20199	19269.1	929.9	102517.3	29487.6	0.687	0.708	0.033	0.065
1982	32493	27988.7	4504.3	13408	12593.3	814.7	91155.2	28834.4	0.611	0.692	0.042	0.085
1983	30043	27210.7	2832.3	13849	13247.3	601.7	74093.5	35971.4	0.496	0.863	0.038	0.047
1984	35487	30184.0	5303.0	13010	12151.1	858.9	122844.4	48185.2	0.823	1.156	0.076	0.123
1985	30045	27290.8	2754.2	10720	10180.1	539.9	57461.9	35733.3	0.385	0.858	0.043	0.035
1986	41471	38409.5	3061.5	14863	14211.5	651.5	64504.2	45732.3	0.432	1.098	0.048	0.032
1987	36587	34080.3	2506.7	11311	10805.5	505.5	67035.7	39003.5	0.449	0.936	0.042	0.031
1988	42062	39871.7	2190.3	12690	12182.4	507.6	114155.0	54115.1	0.765	1.299	0.052	0.040
1989	16977	14523.4	2453.6	7865	7411.9	453.1	127118.6	57034.1	0.852	1.369	0.079	0.123
1990	18379	17171.7	1207.3	5165	4892.5	272.5	157820.3	54900.1	1.057	1.318	0.070	0.069
1991	20266	18930.9	1335.1	5206	4909.4	296.6	95359.6	43816.6	0.639	1.052	0.060	0.042
1992	15284	13659.3	1624.7	4320	4015.3	304.7	46879.4	32799.3	0.314	0.787	0.056	0.033
1993	15100	13010.5	2089.5	4011	3608.4	402.6	34677.5	24635.1	0.232	0.591	0.059	0.032
1994	12442	8954.2	3487.8	4659	3622.3	1036.7	19379.5	19835.1	0.130	0.476	0.106	0.036
1995	12936	9560.1	3375.9	4840	4062.1	777.9	19996.5	14623.5	0.134	0.351	0.056	0.035
1996	13819	8818.2	5000.8	5536	4474.6	1061.4	25534.7	15960.8	0.171	0.383	0.073	0.062
1997	13631	10622.8	3008.2	5911	4985.8	925.2	28239.7	20897.0	0.189	0.502	0.079	0.042
1998	12762	10486.2	2275.8	6468	5655.8	812.2	30190.0	28905.1	0.202	0.694	0.087	0.036
1999	9771	4815.7	4955.3	5347	4557.7	789.3	19072.0	23853.9	0.128	0.572	0.085	0.065
2000	8922	6938.3	1983.7	4956	4334.2	621.8	21005.5	22313.3	0.141	0.536	0.067	0.031
2001	9853	4734.6	5118.4	4698	3503	1195.0	39064.1	27270.1	0.262	0.654	0.166	0.136
2002	8922	4667.8	4254.2	3662	3159.8	502.2	50568.9	33866.6	0.339	0.813	0.111	0.162
2003	2905	2395.7	509.3	1563	1300.6	262.4	22633.0	24345.8	0.152	0.584	0.098	0.027
2004	3350	2655.9	694.1	1350	1112.1	237.9	14854.4	17111.7	0.100	0.411	0.072	0.021
2005	3637	2843.0	794.0	1450	1240.8	209.2	15641.5	20080.3	0.105	0.482	0.070	0.023
2006	2698	1723.5	974.5	1134	898.7	235.3	17093.1	20100.4	0.115	0.482	0.100	0.041
2007	2513	1222.8	1290.2	967	752.2	214.8	17630.0	23508.9	0.118	0.564	0.125	0.061
2008	1348	957.6	390.4	811	556.4	254.6	10444.1	25343.8	0.070	0.608	0.191	0.020

**Table C8.2-5.** Method of scaling relative fishing mortality rates in numbers (RelNt) and weight (RelWt) from 1981 to 2008 (Table 4) to units of instantaneous fishing mortality (F). Annual instantaneous F estimates (ages 1+, number weighted and biomass weighted) were taken from the ADAPT VPA run, tuned to the Delaware trawl, SEAMAP trawl indices and cpue from the Mid-Atlantic recreational fishery from 1982 to 1985. The scalars to convert relative F to units of instantaneous F (FNt, FWt) from 1981 to 2008 (Tables 4) were derived from the average (1982-1985) F estimates from the VPA to the corresponding relative F estimates.

---

**Number Weighted F (ages 1+)**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>VPA FN</b>	<b>RelFnt</b>
<b>1982</b>	0.54	91,155
<b>1983</b>	0.58	74,094
<b>1984</b>	0.76	122,844
<b>1985</b>	0.45	57,462
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>86,389</b>

**Scalar = 0.58 / 86,389 = 0.000067**

---

**Biomass Weighted F (ages 1+)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>VPA FW</b>	<b>RelFwt</b>
<b>1982</b>	0.73	28,834
<b>1983</b>	0.92	35,971
<b>1984</b>	1.22	48,185
<b>1985</b>	0.70	35,733
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>37,131</b>

**Scalar = 0.89 / 37,131 = 0.000024**

**Table C8.2-6.** Coast-wide age 1+ weakfish stock size in number (BION\*1000), weight (BIOW, MT), harvest in weight (MT) and surplus production (SURP, MT), 1981 to 2008.

YEAR	CATCHW	BIOW	BION	SURP
1981	20199	28541.7	71890.3	11032.3
1982	13408	19375.0	53202.7	10074.7
1983	13849	16041.7	60518.5	9057.3
1984	13010	11250.0	43116.1	14260.0
1985	10720	12500.0	78040.0	11761.7
1986	14863	13541.7	95958.1	13404.7
1987	11311	12083.3	81460.3	8998.5
1988	12690	9770.8	54994.6	8665.0
1989	7865	5745.8	19933.2	6039.2
1990	5165	3920.0	17381.4	6195.6
1991	5206	4950.6	31719.7	5743.4
1992	4320	5487.9	48660.9	5616.1
1993	4011	6784.0	64991.3	7013.9
1994	4659	9786.9	95823.7	8662.6
1995	4840	13790.6	96554.4	5501.5
1996	5536	14452.1	80773.9	2869.9
1997	5911	11786.0	72043.1	3448.6
1998	6468	9323.6	63092.9	6484.3
1999	5347	9339.9	76466.1	5261.7
2000	4956	9254.6	63394.8	2879.6
2001	4698	7178.2	37645.8	2025.2
2002	3662	4505.4	26333.2	1831.6
2003	1563	2675.0	19157.0	2175.2
2004	1350	3287.2	33660.1	1071.5
2005	1450	3008.8	34704.8	791.9
2006	1134	2350.7	23558.4	497.2
2007	967	1713.9	21274.8	586.4
2008	811	1333.3	19264.0	810.7

**Table C9.2-1.** Abundance indices of striped bass (STRIPrec2) from the MRFSS catch/trip, striped bass abundance from SCAM, summer flounder abundance (FLUKE), bluefish abundance (BLUE), dogfish abundance (DGFISH), mean deviation in sea surface temperature (devtemp, C) and the deviations in the winter North Atlantic Oscillation Index (NAO), 1981-2008.

YEAR	STRIP2	STRIPREC2	fluke	BLUE	DGFISH	devTEMP	NAO
1981	463	160.59	0.64	0.67	0.20	0.50	2.05
1982	463	283.40	0.54	0.69	0.20	0.08	0.80
1983	333	292.84	1.12	0.70	0.36	-0.01	3.42
1984	245	226.72	1.23	0.53	0.84	0.09	1.60
1985	232	321.18	0.63	0.54	0.10	0.59	-0.63
1986	337	406.20	0.77	0.71	1.50	-0.21	0.50
1987	412	321.18	0.83	0.78	0.90	0.09	-0.75
1988	495	755.73	0.62	0.43	1.30	-0.41	0.72
1989	628	774.62	0.10	0.46	2.30	0.09	5.08
1990	1375	1180.83	0.38	0.53	0.90	0.29	3.96
1991	1918	1719.28	0.61	0.38	1.90	0.39	1.03
1992	2329	2427.78	0.55	0.38	1.50	-0.51	3.28
1993	2621	2635.60	0.93	0.27	1.40	0.29	2.67
1994	3052	5308.99	0.66	0.26	1.50	0.49	3.03
1995	3496	6584.28	0.64	0.26	0.70	0.69	3.96
1996	3865	7500.60	0.75	0.25	0.43	-0.91	-3.78
1997	4498	9730.00	0.67	0.29	0.86	-0.81	-0.17
1998	4372	9918.93	0.86	0.24	0.69	0.39	0.72
1999	4421	8955.38	0.90	0.24	0.82	1.29	1.70
2000	4982	9153.76	0.70	0.31	0.60	0.89	2.80
2001	6934	7084.95	0.84	0.36	2.70	0.89	-1.89
2002	7133	8360.24	0.53	0.33	2.80	1.19	0.76
2003	7669	8483.05	0.64	0.36	3.40	0.69	0.20
2004	8028	9304.90	0.63	0.46	4.40	0.39	-0.07
2005	6927	9824.46	0.77	0.41	4.10	0.69	0.12
2006	5915	12110.54	0.56	0.38	4.45	0.89	-1.09
2007	5915	8039.06	0.59	0.41	4.36	0.69	2.80
2008	5915	5923.02	0.71	0.43	3.73	1.09	2.11



**Table C9.2-2.** Weakfish juvenile indices from Rhode Island (RI0), Connecticut (CT0), New York (NY0), New Jersey (NJ0), Delaware (DE0), Maryland (MD0), Virginia (VA0) and North Carolina (NC0) 1981 to 2007

YEAR	RI0	CT0	NY0	NJ0	DE0	MD0	VA0	NC0
1981	39.00				5.98		6.02	
1982	19.60				11.49		10.95	
1983	3.10				4.47		10.85	
1984	5.00	1.00			6.67		6.05	
1985	19.20	6.19			9.35		37.04	
1986	2.00	13.16			12.94		4.62	
1987	1.30	0.63	0.60		5.98		17.85	12.14
1988	10.90	3.49	0.10	25.71	4.73		21.72	105.50
1989	1.20	8.69	1.40	43.37	11.11	0.44	21.27	14.20
1990	27.30	5.56	0.60	14.71	8.73	0.95	30.00	50.20
1991	25.40	11.95	20.60	27.09	20.07	0.78	15.32	36.90
1992	14.50	3.05	3.30	5.95	14.72	3.24	15.91	42.70
1993	7.50	4.08	1.00	23.88	14.79	1.59	15.42	8.70
1994	15.20	11.19	8.30	37.14	11.47	2.33	7.04	68.10
1995	0.30	5.22	1.60	77.48	13.49	5.95	11.00	38.20
1996	116.10	15.23	24.50	46.27	11.93	6.40	7.42	72.40
1997	88.80	12.38	18.80	21.75	15.40	4.28	14.82	32.80
1998	13.20	5.02	1.00	3.04	11.35	5.87	9.95	70.40
1999	3.70	30.93	8.40	25.32	13.51	3.26	16.25	100.00
2000	9.40	63.31	15.90	0.09	14.16	6.54	11.09	63.00
2001	19.30	40.10	16.20	21.68	7.57	8.10	11.52	30.30
2002	8.40	41.35	12.20	39.31	5.96	3.92	8.59	22.00
2003	198.00	49.41	7.00	72.72	10.44	4.89	5.42	23.90
2004	1.88	58.98	5.50	68.38	8.39	1.62	10.47	28.80
2005	129.50	25.86	32.00	70.64	16.84	3.55	7.10	28.80
2006	0.36	1.05	8.70	9.03	5.35	2.41	6.20	39.10
2007		63.93			13.70	1.64		56.80

**Table C9.2-3.** Scaled weakfish juvenile indices from Rhode Island (ARI0), Connecticut (ACT0), New York (ANY0), New Jersey (NJ0), Delaware (ADE0), Maryland (AMD0), Virginia (AVA0), and North Carolina (ANC0), blended age 0 index (REC0), age 1 abundance (NVPA) and juvenile relative mortality (z0), 1981-2007.

YEAR	ARI0	ACT0	ANY0	NJ0	ADE0	AMD0	AVA0	ANC0	REC0	nvpa	z0
1981	43.29				18.54		15.35		25.73	45	1.74
1982	21.76				35.62		27.92		28.43	41	1.94
1983	3.44				13.86		27.67		14.99	44.1	1.22
1984	5.55	1.66			20.68		15.43		13.88	63.4	0.78
1985	21.31	10.28			28.99		94.45		48.25	70.9	1.92
1986	2.22	21.85			40.11		11.78		18.04	54.4	1.20
1987	1.44	1.05	2.13		18.54		45.52	8.98	12.94	26.3	1.59
1988	12.10	5.79	0.36	25.71	14.66		55.39	78.07	27.44	20.8	2.58
1989	1.33	14.43	4.97	43.37	34.44	4.11	54.24	10.51	20.92	26.7	2.06
1990	30.30	9.23	2.13	14.71	27.06	8.87	76.50	37.15	25.74	29.5	2.17
1991	28.19	19.84	73.13	27.09	62.22	7.29	39.07	27.31	35.52	35.6	2.30
1992	16.10	5.06	11.72	5.95	45.63	30.26	40.57	31.60	23.36	36.7	1.85
1993	8.33	6.77	3.55	23.88	45.85	14.85	39.32	6.44	18.62	49.3	1.33
1994	16.87	18.58	29.47	37.14	35.56	21.76	17.95	50.39	28.46	23.4	2.50
1995	0.33	8.67	5.68	77.48	41.82	55.57	28.05	28.27	30.73	29.7	2.34
1996	128.87	25.28	86.98	46.27	36.98	59.78	18.92	53.58	57.08	16.2	3.56
1997	98.57	20.55	66.74	21.75	47.74	39.98	37.79	24.27	44.67	11.4	3.67
1998	14.65	8.33	3.55	3.04	35.19	54.83	25.37	52.10	24.63	9.4	3.27
1999	4.11	51.34	29.82	25.32	41.88	30.45	41.44	74.00	37.29	12.5	3.40
2000	10.43	105.10	56.45	0.09	43.90	61.08	28.28	46.62	43.99	6.3	4.25
2001	21.42	66.57	57.51	21.68	23.47	75.65	29.38	22.42	39.76	6	4.19
2002	9.32	68.64	43.31	39.31	18.48	36.61	21.90	16.28	31.73	6.4	3.90
2003	219.78	82.02	24.85	72.72	32.36	45.67	13.82	17.69	63.61	8.8	4.28
2004	2.09	97.91	19.53	68.38	26.01	15.13	26.70	21.31	34.63	4.7	4.30
2005	143.75	42.93	113.60	70.64	52.20	33.16	18.11	21.31	61.96	6.7	4.53
2006	0.40	1.74	30.89	9.03	16.59	22.51	15.81	28.93	15.74	4.5	3.55
2007		106.12			42.47	15.32		42.03	51.49		

**Table C9.3-1.** Pearson correlation (r) matrix relating the three weakfish response variables consisting of surplus production (SURPT) blended weakfish biomass (WkW) and juvenile mortality (Z0) with each of the 10 potential explanatory variables. The P value indicates the level of statistical significance.

<i>Explanatory Variable</i>	<i>Response Variable</i>					
	SURPt		WkW		Z0	
	r	P	r	P	r	P
<b>Striprec2</b>	-0.75	0.0001*	-0.44	0.02*	0.88	0.0001*
<b>Fluke</b>	-0.30	0.13	0.20	0.31	-0.18	0.37
<b>Menhaden</b>	0.76	0.0001*	0.47	0.01*	-0.68	0.0001*
<b>Bluefish</b>	0.44	0.02**	0.47	0.01**	-0.57	0.002**
<b>Spiny Dogfish</b>	-0.64	0.0003*	-0.65	0.0003*	0.57	0.002*
<b>DeviationsTemperature</b>	-0.30	0.12	-0.32	0.10	-0.36	0.07
<b>NAO</b>	0.23	0.25	-0.002	0.99	-0.43	0.03*
<b>FWt</b>	0.51	0.0007**	0.06	0.74	-0.55	0.003**
<b>Discards</b>	.		.		-0.22	0.27
<b>Fdisn</b>	.		.		0.01	0.95

- \* a statistically significant (P < 0.05) correlation with dependent variable.
- \*\* a statistically significant (P < 0.05) correlation with dependent variable but in an implausible direction.

**Table C9.3-2.** Three stepwise regression models with weakfish surplus production (SURPt), weakfish biomass (WkW) and juvenile mortality (Z0) used as response variables. The explanatory variables included a blended predator index (Tpred) of striped bass and spiny dogfish, bluefish, and fluke as well as mean annual water temperature, deviations in the North Atlantic Oscillation Index, fishing mortality (FWt) and discards (Disn). Given below are the explanatory variables that were selected by the stepwise model. The slope (b) of the regression, its standard error (SEb), Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and the probability (P) level associated with each explanatory variable.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Response Variables</i>											
	SURPt				WkW				Z0			
	b	SEb	r	P	b	SEb	r	P	b	SEb	r	P
<b>Tpred</b>	-0.84	0.16	-0.80	0.0001	-0.37	0.08	0.79	0.0002	0.29	0.04	0.84	0.0001
<b>FWt</b>					-0.44	0.15	0.79	0.007				

**Table C9.3-3.** Parameter estimates (r, K, C) and steady-state overfishing thresholds (Fmsy, Fcoll, Bmsy) for weakfish derived from the Gompertz Surplus Production Model (see equation 6 in text) with and without the inclusion of blended predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish. These models were fitted by nonlinear iterative reweighting least squares, 1981-2008. The standard error (SE) is given for each parameter estimate, as well as the coefficient of determination ( $r^{**2}$ ).

Parameters	<i>Straight Gompertz</i>		<i>Gompertz with Predation</i>	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
r	0.26	0.10	0.54	0.05
K	156,095 mt	50,116 mt	52,466 mt	4,722 mt
C*			-0.31	0.05
$r^{**2}$	0.54		0.84	

*Equilibrium Overfishing Thresholds*

Fmsy	0.26	0.10	0.54	0.05
Fcoll	0.71	0.27	1.47	0.25
Bmsy	57,388 mt	18,394 mt	19,289 mt	1,736 mt

- \* C = exponent for predation effects

**Table C9.3-4.** Parameter estimates (A,B) of the Ricker Stock-Recruitment (S-R) model for weakfish (see equation 6 in text) with and without the inclusion of blended predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish. These alpha (A) and beta (B) parameters were estimated by nonlinear iterative reweighting least squares, 1981-2008. The standard error (SE) is given for each parameter estimate, as well as the coefficient of determination ( $r^{**2}$ ).

Parameters	<i>Straight Ricker</i>		<i>Ricker with Predation</i>	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
A	0.016	0.004	0.00048	0.002
B	-0.00015	0.000027	-0.00008	0.00003
C*			0.00011	0.00004
$r^{**2}$	0.52		0.81	

- \* C = exponent for predation effects

**Table C9.3-5.** Estimated weakfish predation losses (DT, MT), predation mortality (MP), fishing mortality (FW), total mortality (Z), fishing to total mortality ratio (FZ ratio), non-equilibrium FMSY, non-equilibrium BMSY, fraction maximum spawning potential (MSP) based on the Steele-Henderson production model with blended predation from striped bass and weakfish.

YEAR	DT	MP	FW	Ztotal	FZRATIO	FMSY	FCOLL	BMSY	msp
1981	467.83	0.02	0.71	0.83	0.86	0.78	2.12	20274.63	0.42
1982	532.68	0.03	0.69	0.82	0.84	0.77	2.10	20209.78	0.35
1983	810.11	0.06	0.86	1.02	0.84	0.75	2.04	19932.36	0.24
1984	1521.90	0.13	1.16	1.38	0.84	0.70	1.90	19220.57	0.27
1985	355.71	0.03	0.86	0.98	0.87	0.77	2.10	20386.76	0.29
1986	2817.90	0.22	1.10	1.42	0.77	0.64	1.73	17924.56	0.26
1987	1700.80	0.16	0.94	1.19	0.79	0.68	1.85	19041.67	0.21
1988	2492.42	0.32	1.30	1.72	0.76	0.58	1.57	18250.05	0.12
1989	3216.11	0.67	1.37	2.13	0.64	0.41	1.11	17526.36	0.08
1990	1185.29	0.27	1.32	1.68	0.78	0.61	1.65	19557.18	0.11
1991	2798.77	0.54	1.05	1.69	0.62	0.46	1.26	17943.69	0.12
1992	2831.72	0.46	0.79	1.35	0.58	0.50	1.36	17910.75	0.15
1993	3182.35	0.38	0.59	1.08	0.55	0.54	1.47	17560.12	0.21
1994	5304.54	0.45	0.48	1.03	0.46	0.51	1.38	15437.92	0.30
1995	5088.90	0.36	0.35	0.81	0.43	0.55	1.51	15653.57	0.31
1996	5200.18	0.40	0.38	0.88	0.44	0.53	1.45	15542.29	0.25
1997	7015.28	0.66	0.50	1.27	0.40	0.41	1.11	13727.19	0.20
1998	6435.14	0.69	0.69	1.48	0.47	0.40	1.08	14307.32	0.20
1999	6124.05	0.66	0.57	1.33	0.43	0.41	1.12	14618.42	0.20
2000	5866.88	0.71	0.54	1.35	0.40	0.39	1.06	14875.58	0.16
2001	7287.29	1.25	0.65	2.00	0.33	0.23	0.62	13455.18	0.10
2002	5879.04	1.64	0.81	2.55	0.32	0.15	0.42	14863.43	0.06
2003	3602.11	1.21	0.58	1.89	0.31	0.24	0.65	17140.36	0.07
2004	5663.27	1.80	0.41	2.31	0.18	0.13	0.36	15079.20	0.07
2005	4990.96	1.86	0.48	2.44	0.20	0.12	0.34	15751.50	0.05
2006	4076.38	2.01	0.48	2.59	0.19	0.11	0.29	16666.09	0.04
2007	2034.71	1.34	0.56	2.00	0.28	0.21	0.57	18707.76	0.03
2008	1061.03	0.80	0.61	1.50	0.40	0.36	0.98	19681.44	0.03

**Table C9.3-6.** Parameter estimates ( $r$ ,  $K$ ,  $c$ ,  $A$ ) and weakfish steady-state overfishing thresholds ( $F_{msy}$ ,  $F_{coll}$ ,  $B_{msy}$ ) derived from the Steele-Henderson Production Model (see equation 9 in text) with blended predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish fitted by nonlinear least squares and by nonlinear iterative reweighting least squares, 1981-2008. The standard error (SE) is given for each parameter estimate, as well as the coefficient of determination ( $r^{**2}$ ).

Parameters	<i>Least Squares</i>		<i>Iterative Reweighting</i>	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
<b>r</b>	0.75	0.22	0.72	0.09
<b>K</b>	49,095 mt	13,620 mt	46,264 mt	5,410 mt
<b>c</b>	1.35	0.53	1.28	0.23
<b>A</b>	5,364 mt	1,810 mt	4,034 mt	715 mt
<b>r**2</b>	0.84		0.94	
<i>Equilibrium Overfishing Thresholds</i>				
<b>Fmsy</b>	0.75	0.22	0.72	0.09
<b>Fcoll</b>	2.04	0.60	1.96	0.25
<b>Bmsy</b>	18,050 mt	5,001 mt	17,009 mt	1,989 mt

**Table C9.3-7.** Weakfish losses due to predation (DT, MT), coast-wide harvest (HARVW, MT) and discards (discards, MT), 1981-2008.

YEAR	DISCARDS	HARVW	DT
1981	929.9	19269.1	467.83
1982	814.7	12593.3	532.68
1983	601.7	13247.3	810.11
1984	858.9	12151.1	1521.90
1985	539.9	10180.1	355.71
1986	651.5	14211.5	2817.90
1987	505.5	10805.5	1700.80
1988	507.6	12182.4	2492.42
1989	453.1	7411.9	3216.11
1990	272.5	4892.5	1185.29
1991	296.6	4909.4	2798.77
1992	304.7	4015.3	2831.72
1993	402.6	3608.4	3182.35
1994	1036.7	3622.3	5304.54
1995	777.9	4062.1	5088.90
1996	1061.4	4474.6	5200.18
1997	925.2	4985.8	7015.28
1998	812.2	5655.8	6435.14
1999	789.3	4557.7	6124.05
2000	621.8	4334.2	5866.88
2001	1195.0	3503.0	7287.29
2002	502.2	3159.8	5879.04
2003	262.4	1300.6	3602.11
2004	237.9	1112.1	5663.27
2005	209.2	1240.8	4990.96
2006	235.3	898.7	4076.38
2007	214.8	752.2	2034.71
2008	254.6	556.4	1061.03

**Table C10.4-1.** Summary of catch-and-release mortality experiment results.

Study	Malchoff and Heins 1997	Swihart et al. 2000	Swihart 2000	Gearhart 2002
Location	NY, Great South Bay	VA, Chesapeake Bay Mouth	VA, Chesapeake Bay Mouth	NC estuaries
Dates	Aug 14 – Sept 8, 1995	June, 1995	July 29-Aug 5, 1999	2000-2001, April-Nov
Mode	Pier	Boat	Pier	Boat
Bait type	Bait and artificial (no difference)	Bait	Artificials	Artificials and bait
Water temperature range °C	22 – 27	Mean = 23	26.7 - 30.8 Mean =28.7	13.8 -26.5
Mortality range	0 – 6.5%			0.0-32.1%
Mean mortality	2.6%, 95% CI = 0.6-7.0%	2%	14.5%	10.4-17.6% (high vs low salinity)
Fish Size	Mostly sublegal (< 405 mm) 315-425 mm	235-338 mm, mean = 283 mm	225-382 mm, mean = 298 mm	Not reported
N	90; 4 trials	360	145	180
Trial	72 h	Up to 23 days All deaths < 61 h	96 h	72 h



**Table C10.4-2.** Correlations of initial weight based indices (based on Uphoff 2006a) and other indicators of stock status. Shading indicates  $P < 0.05$ . EBI = exploitable biomass index. WRI = MRFSS catch per trip index. NJGM EBI is based on geometric mean counts during August and October rounds. NJPT EBI is based on proportion of tows with weakfish during August and October rounds. VPA B = biomass from converged portion of “best” VPA in Kahn (2006; run 20). Losses = all estimated fishery-related losses. All data are for 1981-2006, but N varies due to time-series.

		WRI	DE EBI	NJGM EBI	NJPT EBI	VPA B
DE EBI	r	0.75				
	P	0.0005				
	N	17				
NJGM EBI	r	0.21	0.48			
	P	0.39	0.05			
	N	18	17			
NJPT EBI	r	0.59	0.43	0.59		
	P	0.01	0.09	0.01		
	N	18	17	18		
VPA B	r	0.34	0.54	0.56	0.20	
	P	0.16	0.09	0.06	0.45	
	N	19	11	12	12	
Losses	r	0.91	0.54	-0.24	0.09	0.33
	P	<0.0001	0.02	0.32	0.72	0.17
	N	26	17	18	18	19
Grand NJGM	r	0.82	0.92	0.70		
Grand NJPT	r	0.92	0.85		0.49	

**Table C10.4-3.** Correlations of revised NJ EBI with indicators of weakfish biomass. Shading indicates  $P < 0.05$ . EBI = exploitable biomass index. WRI = MRFSS catch per trip index. P = proportion of tows with weakfish, W = mean weight of all weakfish, E = exploitable fraction of weight. VPA B = biomass from converged portion of “best” VPA in Kahn (2006; run 20). Losses = all estimated fishery-related losses. Grand Mean = average of Z+2 transformed WRI, DE EBI, and each of the trial NJ EBI. All data are for 1989-2006, but N varies due to time-series.

Indicators	Correlation	NJ Index			
		Aug P*W	Aug P*W*E	Oct P*W	Oct P*W*E
WRI	r	0.54674	0.6212	0.33207	0.5899
	P	0.0189	0.0059	0.1782	0.01
	N	18	18	18	18
DE	r	0.63182	0.42801	0.57519	0.35851
	P	0.0065	0.0865	0.0157	0.1576
	N	17	17	17	17
Losses	r	0.70675	0.42839	0.25463	0.09881
	P	0.001	0.0761	0.3079	0.6965
	N	18	18	18	18
VPA B	r	0.65561	0.07927	0.34805	0.319
	P	0.0206	0.8065	0.2676	0.3122
	N	12	12	12	12
Grand mean	r	0.84511	0.81844	0.78084	0.78199

**Table C10.4-4.** Harvest-related loss estimates used for biomass dynamic models.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Commercial harvest MT</b>	<b>Commercial discards MT</b>	<b>Recreational harvest MT</b>	<b>Recreational discards mt</b>	<b>Total Harvest Losses</b>
1981	11,958.5	925.5	7305.2	4.3	20,193.4
1982	8,835.3	811.8	3758.2	2.9	13,408.2
1983	7,926.6	597.6	5321.0	4.1	13,849.3
1984	8,969.2	855.2	3181.4	3.7	13,009.5
1985	7,690.0	534.6	2489.8	5.3	10,719.7
1986	9,610.8	616.9	4600.3	34.6	14,862.6
1987	7,743.9	492.8	3061.7	12.7	11,311.1
1988	9,310.7	495.3	2872.0	12.3	12,690.3
1989	6,424.3	450.4	987.6	2.7	7,864.9
1990	4,281.2	265.9	611.1	6.6	5,164.8
1991	3,943.0	284.8	966.4	11.8	5,206.0
1992	3,381.0	294.1	634.6	10.6	4,320.3
1993	3,108.8	385.5	500.0	17.1	4,011.5
1994	2,808.0	990.2	814.4	46.5	4,659.2
1995	3,219.9	716.3	841.7	61.6	4,839.5
1996	3,148.0	985.8	1326.9	75.6	5,536.3
1997	3,310.3	864.9	1675.0	60.3	5,910.5
1998	3,820.7	762.5	1834.8	49.7	6,467.7
1999	3,132.2	746.9	1425.8	42.4	5,347.3
2000	2,449.7	548.7	1884.6	73.1	4,956.1
2001	2,267.8	1,139.4	1235.0	55.6	4,697.8
2002	2,165.1	470.4	994.6	31.8	3,661.8
2003	907.8	238.4	392.3	24.0	1,562.5
2004	691.2	209.6	420.5	28.3	1,349.6
2005	520.4	174.0	720.0	35.2	1,449.6
2006	481.7	199.1	417.2	36.2	1,134.2

**Table C10.4-5.** Rescaled indices (z-transformed based on common time period + 2 to remove values less than zero), striped bass and Atlantic menhaden biomass estimates (mt), and their ratio used as inputs in weakfish biomass dynamic models.

Year	MRFSS	NJ	DE	Bass Biomass	Menhaden Biomass	Menhaden:Bass
1981	15.4			8789	686249	78.1
1982	7.7			10020	877809	87.6
1983	8.2			7159	551590	77.0
1984	5.0			7534	555868	73.8
1985	4.2			9003	704552	78.3
1986	6.0			11302	778336	68.9
1987	5.2			15597	898324	57.6
1988	4.7			21091	507110	24.0
1989	2.1	2.6		28134	844023	30.0
1990	1.3	1.8	0.9	33116	862413	26.0
1991	1.6	1.7	1.0	37770	805784	21.3
1992	1.6	2.7	1.1	47590	806223	16.9
1993	1.1	1.5	1.8	55335	1062836	19.2
1994	1.9	2.7	2.2	65038	743954	11.4
1995	2.3	3.0	3.0	82562	854719	10.4
1996	3.3	3.1	4.8	96180	739099	7.7
1997	3.2	4.2	2.7	105788	636684	6.0
1998	4.0	2.0	2.8	96550	575810	6.0
1999	3.1	1.6	2.0	95744	482853	5.0
2000	3.1	2.8	2.7	100037	522825	5.2
2001	2.0	2.3	2.1	98382	643163	6.5
2002	2.0	1.5	2.1	100019	491495	4.9
2003	0.8	0.2	1.2	99256	693816	7.0
2004	0.7	1.3	1.2	95472	475986	5.0
2005	1.3	1.2	1.1	94438	496006	5.3
2006	0.9	0.5	1.3	88366	449784	5.1

**Table C10.5-1.** AIC<sub>c</sub> for 12 modeled hypotheses. N = 60 for all models.

Hypothesis	Production fc	Predator-prey fc	K	AICc	Delta AICc	Aikike wt
Depensatory	Gompertz	Bass biomass & menhaden:bass	5	-31.9	0	0.978
Depensatory	Gompertz	Bass biomass only	5	-23.3	8.6	0.013
Predator-prey	Gompertz	Type II weakfish:bass	6	-22.5	9.4	0.009
Depensatory	Schaefer	Bass biomass & menhaden:bass	5	0.8	32.7	0.000
Predator-prey	Schaefer	Type II weakfish:bass	6	10.2	42.1	0.000
Predator-prey	Schaefer	Type III weakfish:bass	6	10.3	42.3	0.000
Fishing	Schaefer	None	4	13.6	45.6	0.000
Predator-prey	Schaefer	Type I weakfish:bass	5	14.1	46.1	0.000
Fishing	Gompertz	None	4	16.1	48.0	0.000
Depensatory	Schaefer	Bass biomass	5	16.3	48.2	0.000
Predator-prey	Gompertz	Type III weakfish:bass	6	19.7	51.6	0.000
Predator-prey	Gompertz	Type I weakfish:bass	5	26.9	58.8	0.000

**Table C10.5-2.** Parameter estimates and their distribution based on jackknifing. N = 60. Original is the base run with all data.

Statistic	r	K	B <sub>1981</sub>	c
Mean	0.482	51,481	81,631	0.288
Median	0.482	51,521	82,471	0.292
Maximum	0.484	51,788	82,473	0.292
Minimum	0.469	48,698	70,164	0.242
5th%	0.481	51,511	79,980	0.272
95th%	0.483	51,555	82,472	0.292
Original	0.482	51,521	82,472	0.292

**Table C10.5-3.** Parameter estimates and their distribution based on bootstrapping. N = 500, excluding the initial run. Original is the base run with all data.

Statistic	r	k	B <sub>1981</sub>	c
Mean	0.48190	51522	82472	0.2924
Median	0.48190	51521	82472	0.2924
Min	0.48190	51521	82466	0.2923
Max	0.48195	51529	82472	0.2924
5th%	0.48190	51521	82472	0.2924
95th%	0.48192	51525	82472	0.2924
Original				
1	0.48190	51521	82472	0.2924

**Table C10.5-4.** Estimates of model parameters when blocks of years were removed from the beginning of the time-series or biomass in 1981 was constrained to be less than K. MSR = mean of the squared residuals.

Treatment	year 0	r	K	Bo	c	MSR
All	1981	0.48	51521	82472	0.29	0.087
1982 +	1982	0.47	48672	70534	0.24	0.090
1983 +	1983	0.47	47339	47392	0.25	0.089
1984 +	1984	0.46	47748	42343	0.27	0.112
1985 +	1985	0.44	45979	35334	0.21	0.106
1986 +	1986	0.34	59197	30501	0.20	0.110
1987 +	1987	0.35	58297	21384	0.20	0.106
1988 +	1988	0.35	59365	18352	0.24	0.108
1989 +	1989	0.33	78130	12951	0.35	0.089
Constrain K	1981	0.31	72800	67907	0.26	0.102

**Table C10.5-5.** Changes in GDR model parameters when different weights were assigned to released MRFSS weakfish catch in the WRI and recreational discard losses.

Weight assigned (kg)	r	k	Bo	c
Base - 0.15	0.48	51521	82472	0.29
Discard = 0.2	0.44	56783	62349	0.28
Discard = 0.3	0.44	58539	55852	0.31
Discard = 0.4	0.41	57148	79360	0.27
Harvest wt (median=0.7)	0.43	61322	49899	0.34

**Table C10.6-1.** Predicted mean weight-at-age of 340 mm weakfish sampled in the NEFSC fall trawl survey during 1992-2006. Slopes and intercepts describe ln-transformed total length (cm).

Year	Intercept	Slope	Predicted kg
1992	-11.60	3.02	0.39
1993	-11.82	3.08	0.38
1994	-11.34	2.95	0.39
1995	-11.38	2.94	0.37
1996	-11.35	2.93	0.36
1997	-11.39	2.94	0.35
1998	-11.32	2.93	0.37
1999	-11.47	2.98	0.38
2000	-11.25	2.90	0.36
2001	-11.54	2.99	0.37
2002	-11.67	3.02	0.36
2003	-10.54	2.67	0.32
2004	-11.35	2.92	0.35
2005	-11.39	2.93	0.35
2006	-11.49	2.96	0.35

**Table C10.6-2.** Statistics and parameter estimates of predicted weight of weakfish at 340 mm ( $Q_{wt}$ ) during 1992-2006. Models tested for linear trend of  $Q_{wt}$  with year (Model = Year), striped bass biomass estimates (Model = Bass), and the ratio of menhaden to striped bass biomass (Model = Ratio). Statistics and parameter estimates are presented for all years and with a potential outlier removed.

Model	$r^2$	$P$	Slope	Slope SE	Intercept	Intercept SE
<u>All years</u>						
Year	0.57	0.0011	-0.003	0.0007	6.36	1.45
Bass	0.51	0.0027	$-7.2 \cdot 10^{-07}$	$1.94 \cdot 10^{-07}$	0.43	0.02
Ratio	0.41	0.0107	0.0025	0.0008	0.34	0.01
<u>2003 removed</u>						
Year	0.62	0.0009	-0.00256	0.0006	5.48	1.16
Bass	0.61	0.0010	$-6.3 \cdot 10^{-07}$	$1.46 \cdot 10^{-07}$	0.42	0.01
Ratio	0.56	0.0020	0.0024	0.0006	0.35	0.01

**Table C10.6-3.** Estimates of annual biomass of food consumed per biomass of striped bass (Ct) from three Chesapeake Bay bioenergetics studies. Years = years included in bioenergetics estimates; 1955-1959 = Griffin (2001) and Griffin and Margraf (2003); 1990-1992 = Hartman and Brandt (1995a: 1995b); and 1998-2000 = Overton (2003). Shading highlights minimum, maximum, and median estimates of Ct.

Years	1955-1959	1990-1992	1998-2000	1998-2001	1998-2002
Region	Bay	Bay	Upper Bay	Middle Bay	Lower Bay
Age	Ct	Ct	Ct	Ct	Ct
2	6.2	6.3	4.1	6.2	7.9
3	5.6	5.6	5.1	6.1	5.3
4	5.1	5.5	5.6	6.2	6.3
5	4.7	5.4	5.5	6.2	5.9
6	4.3	5.0	5.1	4.2	4.9

**Table C10.6-4.** Annual percentage of striped bass stomachs with food (SSt; Overton et al. 2008) and model estimates of weakfish biomass consumed per striped bass biomass (Dt / Pt) annually. MR<sub>t</sub> = time category assigned to menhaden: striped bass (> 10 = 1 or < 10 = 0).

Year	SSt (%)	MR <sub>t</sub>	Dt / Pt
1994	99	0	0.026
1995	100	0	0.028
1996	74	0	0.038
2000	84	1	0.056
2002	77	1	0.060
2003	84	1	0.042
2005	23	1	0.059
2006	28	1	0.056
2007	81	1	0.057



**Table C10.6-5.** Summary of results of final multiple regression models describing the relationships of annual weakfish biomass consumed (Dt / Pt) and percentage of striped bass stomachs with food (SSt; Overton et al. 2008)

Dependent	1 / (Dt / Pt)
Independent	SSt
Slope	0.20442
Slope SE	0.041
Intercept	15.35
Intercept SE	3.31
Category	N/A
Category SE	N/A
Slope shift	-0.16
Slope Shift SE	0.03
P	0.0013
R <sup>2</sup>	0.89

**Table C10.7-1.** Comparison of AIC<sub>c</sub> for Gompertz production models excluding and including additional loss terms that describe striped bass related or additional bycatch estimates. GDR is the model selected to represent biomass dynamics.

Model	Loss fc	K	AICc	Delta AICc	Aikike wt
GDR	Bass biomass & menhaden:bass	5	-41	0	0.908
Added Bycatch	Constant * estimated bycatch	5	17	58	0.000
Fishery Only	No additional losses	5	16	57	0.000
Added Bycatch	Power fc since 1996	6	-24	16	0.000
Added Bycatch	Linear since 1996	6	-27	14	0.001
Added Bycatch	Quadratic since 1996	7	-34	7	0.031
Added Bycatch	Constant addition since 1996	5	-35	5	0.060

**Table C11.3-1.** Results of correlation analysis between Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) and weakfish commercial landings. A) NMFS landings only; B) Landings from Joseph (1972) for years 1929 to 1949 and NMFS landings 1950 to present.

	No lag	1 yr lag	2 yr lag	3 yr lag	4 yr lag	5 yr lag	6 yr lag	7 yr lag	8 yr lag	9 yr lag	10 yr lag
A)											
r	-0.62416	-0.68332	-0.73352	-0.77764	-0.8094	-0.8303	-0.81922	-0.78916	-0.74835	-0.68789	-0.61433
P	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
N	54	55	56	57	58	58	58	58	57	56	55
B)											
r	-0.15067	-0.23159	-0.2832	-0.31004	-0.33631	-0.34733	-0.35973	-0.37929	-0.38121	-0.37908	-0.35678
P	0.2131	0.0555	0.0193	0.0101	0.0054	0.0043	0.0032	0.002	0.0019	0.0022	0.0044
N	70	69	68	68	67	66	65	64	64	63	62

**Table C11.3-2.** Correlation of NEFSC weakfish food habit data with biomass weighted Z for ages 1-5 estimated by ADAPT. \* = strong negative correlation at  $\alpha = 0.10$ ; \*\* = strong positive correlation  $\alpha = 0.10$ .

		<b>Amphi_Iso</b>	<b>Crab_Shrimp</b>	<b>Empty</b>	<b>Forage</b>
5"	r	0.5184	-0.7412	0.7706	0.7413
	P	0.1023	0.009*	0.0055**	0.009**
	N	11	11	11	11
6"	r	0.6154	-0.7411	0.7178	-0.6568
	P	0.0438**	0.0091*	0.0129**	0.0281*
	N	11	11	11	11
7"	r	0.6320	-0.5050	0.6198	-0.2746
	P	0.037**	0.1131	0.0419**	0.4138
	N	11	11	11	11
8"	r	0.8188	-0.1846	0.1784	-0.7272
	P	0.0021**	0.5868	0.5996	0.0112*
	N	11	11	11	11
9"	r	0.7016	-0.6440	0.4331	-0.5495
	P	0.0161**	0.0325*	0.1834	0.08*
	N	11	11	11	11
10"	r	0.6694	-0.5237	0.8578	-0.8543
	P	0.0243**	0.0983*	0.0007**	0.0008*
	N	11	11	11	11
11"	r	0.2441	-0.4096	0.7312	-0.1466
	P	0.4695	0.2110	0.0106**	0.6672
	N	11	11	11	11
12"	r	-0.1972	0.0005	0.1715	-0.2782
	P	0.5610	0.9989	0.6142	0.4075
	N	11	11	11	11
All	r	0.6764	-0.6086	0.7993	-0.7305
	P	0.0223**	0.0469*	0.0032**	0.0107*
	N	11	11	11	11

**Table C12.4-1.** Comparison of reference point estimates and weakfish stock status determinations under equilibrium and non-equilibrium conditions from ADAPT VPA, the full Steele-Henderson production model incorporating predation, and the Gompertz production model incorporating predation-competition losses as a function of striped bass biomass and the menhaden:striped bass ratio (GDR). Fishing mortality rates are numbers weighted for ADAPT and biomass weighted for Steele-Henderson and GDR.


Model	Reference point	Equilibrium Conditions		Non-equilibrium Conditions	
		Threshold value	2007 value exceeds threshold*	Threshold value	2007 value exceeds threshold*
ADAPT VPA	F <sub>20%</sub>	0.42	Yes	--	--
	SSB <sub>20%</sub>	10,179 MT	Yes	--	--
Steele-Henderson	F <sub>MSY</sub>	0.72	No	0.36	Yes
	SSB <sub>MSY</sub>	17,009 MT	Yes	19,681 MT	Yes
	MSP			20%	Yes
GDR	F <sub>MSY</sub>	0.48	No	Z <sub>MSY</sub> = 0.48	Yes
	SSB <sub>MSY</sub>	18,941 MT	Yes	--	--
	MSP			20%	Yes

\* "Exceeds" interpreted here as  $F_{2007} > F_{\text{threshold}}$  or  $SSB_{2007} < SSB_{\text{threshold}}$


**Table C13.2-1.** Relative weakfish recruitment (Rec0), fully recruited fishing mortality (F) and natural mortality (M) used in the HCM projections of weakfish SSB among the three scenarios from 1980 to 2020.

	Rec0	Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3	
		F	M	F	M	F	M
1980	230	1.29	0.25	1.29	0.25	1.29	0.25
1981	55.7	1.73	0.25	1.73	0.25	1.73	0.25
1982	18.4	1.40	0.25	1.40	0.25	1.4	0.25
1983	35	1.61	0.25	1.61	0.25	1.61	0.25
1984	33.9	2.21	0.25	2.21	0.25	2.21	0.25
1985	18.3	1.35	0.25	1.35	0.25	1.35	0.25
1986	8	1.73	0.25	1.73	0.25	1.73	0.25
1987	5.9	2.66	0.25	2.66	0.25	2.66	0.25
1988	7.4	1.81	0.25	1.81	0.25	1.81	0.25
1989	1.9	2.12	0.25	2.12	0.25	2.12	0.25
1990	5.7	2.76	0.25	2.76	0.25	2.76	0.25
1991	5.5	0.84	0.25	0.84	0.25	0.84	0.25
1992	43.4	1.03	0.25	1.03	0.25	1.03	0.25
1993	88.6	0.71	0.25	0.71	0.25	0.71	0.25
1994	28.5	0.98	0.25	0.98	0.25	0.98	0.25
1995	10.7	0.32	0.25	0.32	0.25	0.32	0.25
1996	17.1	0.53	0.25	0.53	0.25	0.53	0.25
1997	14.7	0.56	0.25	0.56	0.25	0.56	0.25
1998	4.6	0.72	0.25	0.45	0.25	0.45	0.25
1999	17.3	2.67	0.25	1.02	0.65	0.37	0.65
2000	4	2.82	0.25	1.17	0.65	0.52	0.75
2001	9.8	2.04	0.25	1.19	0.65	0.54	0.75
2002	11.7	2.34	0.25	0.99	0.65	0.34	0.95
2003	3.6	2.38	0.25	1.03	0.65	0.38	1.00
2004	4.6	2.06	0.25	1.11	0.65	0.46	1.00
2005	12	2.52	0.25	1.17	0.65	0.52	1.00
2006	5.7	2.47	0.25	1.12	0.65	0.47	1.00
2007	21.5	2.13	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2008	8.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2009	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2010	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2011	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2012	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2013	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2014	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2015	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2016	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2017	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2018	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2019	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00
2020	16.5	2.20	0.25	1.08	0.65	0.43	1.00


**Figures**




**Figure C4.6-1.** Commercial harvest of weakfish on the Atlantic coast.



**Figure C4.6-2.** Proportion of annual commercial weakfish harvest by dominant states.




**Figure C4.6-3.** Proportion of annual coastwide commercial weakfish harvest by dominant gears.




**Figure C4.6-4.** Standardized commercial CPUE and effort from eight North Carolina fisheries. All CPUE = CPUE from all positive trips; “Targeted” = trips with greater than 150 lbs of weakfish.







**Figure C4.6-4 (continued).** Standardized commercial CPUE and effort from eight North Carolina fisheries. All CPUE = CPUE from all positive trips; “Targeted” = trips with greater than 150 lbs of weakfish.




**Figure C4.6-5.** Standardized commercial CPUE and effort from three Virginia fisheries. A) CPUE; B) Effort. GN 150+ = gillnet trips with 150 pounds or more of weakfish.




**Figure C4.6-6.** Standardized commercial CPUE and effort from Delaware's gillnet fishery.




**Figure C4.6-7.** Standardized commercial CPUE and effort from the Potomac River pound net fishery.




**Figure C4.6-8.** Recreational catch (thousands), harvest numbers (thousands) and harvest weight (MT) of weakfish on the Atlantic coast.





**Figure C4.6-9.** Proportion of annual recreational weakfish harvest by dominant states.





**Figure C4.6-10.** Recreational discard losses assuming a 10% discard mortality rate.



**Figure C4.6-11.** Total weakfish removals. A) Harvest weight (metric tons) for the two principal sectors and all four sectors combined; B) Percent of total biomass removals by sector.




**Figure C5.1-1.** Comparison of state and federally reported landings on an annual basis for A) Delaware and B) Virginia.




**Figure C5.1-2.** Comparison of state and federally reported data by gear for A) Delaware and B) Virginia







**Figure 6.1-1.** Results of the NEFSC fall trawl survey. A) Age aggregated CPUE and CV in true survey year; B) Age specific CPUE progressed one year and age




**Figure 6.1-2.** Results of the New Jersey ocean trawl survey August cruise. A) Age aggregated PPT with 90% confidence intervals; B) Age specific PPT. Survey is not lagged, so all values are in the true survey year.



**Figure 6.1-3.** Results of the DNREC Delaware Bay 30-foot trawl survey. A) Age aggregated CPUE (ages 1+) and CV (ages 0+); B) Age specific CPUE. Survey is not lagged, so all values are in the true survey year.



**Figure 6.1-4.** Results of the SEAMAP trawl survey in North Carolina waters. A) Age aggregated CPUE and CV in true survey year; B) Age specific CPUE progressed one year and age.



**Figure 6.1-5.** Results of the NCDMF gillnet survey in Pamlico Sound. A) Age aggregated CPUE; B) Age specific CPUE. Survey is not lagged, so all values are in the true survey year.




Figure C6.2-1. Massachusetts and Rhode Island YOY indices of abundance.




Figure C6.2-2. Connecticut YOY and 1+ indices of abundance.




Figure C6.2-3. New York and Delaware YOY indices of abundance.




Figure C6.2-4. Maryland and Virginia YOY indices of abundance.









Figure C6.2-5. North Carolina YOY and 1+ indices of abundance.







**Figure C6.4-1.** Fishery dependent (MRFSS) indices of abundance. A) Age aggregated (1+) catch per trip in true fishing year; B) Age specific catch per trip progressed forward one year and age.




**Figure C7.2-1.** Summary results of preliminary ADAPT VPA runs. Tuning indices used are as follows: Base = All available aged and young of year indices; FI+YOY = All aged fishery independent indices plus all YOY indices; FI only = All aged fishery independent indices only; FD+YOY = All fishery dependent aged indices plus all YOY indices; FD only = Fishery dependent indices only.




**Figure C7.2-2.** Retrospective patterns in fishing mortality (unweighted average age 4-5) from preliminary ADAPT VPA runs. Tuning indices used are as follows: Base = All available aged and young of year indices; FI+YOY = All aged fishery independent indices plus all YOY indices; FI only = All aged fishery independent indices only; FD+YOY = All fishery dependent aged indices plus all YOY indices; FD only = Fishery dependent indices only.




**Figure C7.2-3.** Retrospective patterns in spawning stock biomass from preliminary ADAPT VPA runs. Tuning indices used are as follows: Base = All available aged and young of year indices; FI+YOY = All aged fishery independent indices plus all YOY indices; FI only = All aged fishery independent indices only; FD+YOY = All fishery dependent aged indices plus all YOY indices; FD only = Fishery dependent indices only.




**Figure C7.2-4.** Summary results of ADAPT VPA run using indices selected from scored criteria (Scores) compared to Base and Fishery Dependent only runs. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass. Indices used in the Scores run include NEFSC ages 1-2, DE 30 foot trawl age 1, NC gillnet age 1, SEAMAP ages 1-6+, and RI, CT, NY, DE, MD, and NC YOY indices.



**Figure C7.2-5.** Retrospective results of ADAPT VPA run using indices selected from scored criteria. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass. Patterns are more severe (longer and greater magnitude) than those presented in Figures C7.2-2 and C7.2-3. Notice the difference in scale between 7.2-5B and 7.2-3.




**Figure C7.2-6.** Comparison of ADAPT VPA results using standardized and non-standardized tuning indices for all age fishery independent surveys and all YOY surveys. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass.




**Figure C7.2-7.** Comparison of typical retrospective pattern, expressed as the ratio of parameter estimates in terminal year 2004 relative to terminal year 2007, using standardized and non-standardized tuning indices for all aged fishery independent surveys and all YOY surveys. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass.







**Figure C7.2-8.** Comparison of ADAPT VPA results for the last 10 years using tuning indices from individual surveys. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass.




**Figure C7.3-1.** Summarized parameter estimates from the preferred ADAPT VPA run. A) Fishing mortality; B) Biomass; C) Abundance.




**Figure C7.3-2.** Retrospective results for the preferred ADAPT VPA run. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass; C) Total January 1 stock abundance; D) Recruitment to age 1.




**Figure C7.3-3.** Survey residuals from the preferred ADAPT VPA run using Delaware and New Jersey trawl survey indices, North Carolina gillnet survey indices, and fishery dependent indices.




**Figure C7.3-3 (continued).** Survey residuals from the preferred ADAPT VPA run using Delaware and New Jersey trawl survey indices, North Carolina gillnet survey indices, and fishery dependent indices.



**Figure C7.3-3 (continued).** Survey residuals from the preferred ADAPT VPA run using Delaware and New Jersey trawl survey indices, North Carolina gillnet survey indices, and fishery dependent indices.




**Figure C7.3-3 (continued).** Survey residuals from the preferred ADAPT VPA run using Delaware and New Jersey trawl survey indices, North Carolina gillnet survey indices, and fishery dependent indices.




**Figure C7.3-4.** Frequency distributions of parameter estimates for a range of terminal years based on 500 bootstrap iterations per year. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass.







**Figure C7.3-5.** Retrospective corrected parameter estimates from ADAPT VPA. A) Unweighted average fishing mortality, ages 4-5; B) Spawning stock biomass; C) Total January 1 stock abundance; D) Recruitment to age 1.




**Figure C7.3-6.** Comparison of results from the preferred ADAPT run and preliminary ASAP model runs. A) Biomass weighted fishing mortality; B) Spawning stock biomass.




**Figure C8.2-1.** Plot of scaled New Jersey (ANJN), Delaware (ADEN) and recreational CPUE (RelNt) weakfish indices in number, 1981-2007.




**Figure C8.2-2.** Plot of scaled New Jersey (ANJW), Delaware (ADEW) and recreational CPUE (RelWt) weakfish indices in weight, 1981-2007.




**Figure C8.3-1.** Plot of ages 1+ fishing mortality (FW, FN) on weakfish and fishing mortality due to discards (Fdisw, Fdisn).




**Figure C8.3-2.** Plot of ages 1+ weakfish biomass (BIOW,mt), surplus production (SURP,mt) and coast-wide landings (CATCHW, mt), 1981-2008.




**Figure C8.3-3.** Relationship between weakfish surplus production and striped bass and spiny dogfish relative abundance, 1981-2007.




**Figure C8.3-4.** Relationship between weakfish surplus production and blended predation from striped bass and spiny dogfish, 1981-2008 .




**Figure C8.4-1.** Comparison of biomass weighted Z from ADAPT and biomass weighted F from relative F calculations to indicate the expected trend in natural mortality.



**Figure C9.3-1.** Plot of relative juvenile abundance of weakfish based on the average of nine juvenile indices, 1981-2007.




**Figure C9.3-2.** Relationship between weakfish juvenile mortality ( $z_0$ ) and average predator abundance ( $T_{pred}$ ) based on striped bass and spiny dogfish, 1981-2007.




**Figure C9.3-3.** Anamalous residual pattern from Gompertz External model for weakfish without predation, 1981-2008.







**Figure C9.3-4.** Residual pattern from Gompertz model for weakfish with blended dogfish and striped bass predation effects, 1981-2008.




**Figure C9.3-5.** Ricker stock-recruitment fit to average coast-wide recruitment and weakfish biomass




**Figure C9.3-6.** Serial correlation of residuals for the Ricker S-R model for weakfish without predation, 1981-2008.




**Figure C9.3-7.** Residual plot for the Ricker S-R model with striped bass and spiny dogfish predation, 1981-2007.




**Figure C9.3-8.** Residual plot for discrete Gompertz Production Model on weakfish without predation, 1981-2008.




**Figure C9.3-9.** Residual plot for Steele-Henderson model for weakfish with predation from spiny dogfish and striped bass, 1981-2008.




**Figure C9.3-10.** Plot of observed weakfish biomass and predicted biomass from the Steele-Henderson Model.




**Figure C9.3-11.** Plot of predation mortality (MP), total fishing mortality (FW) and discard fishing mortality




**Figure C9.3-12.** Contribution of predation losses (DT) to total harvest (HARVW) and discards (DISCARDS).



**Figure C9.3-13.** Relationship between ages 1+ biomass weighted F on weakfish and equilibrium FMSY from 1981 to 2008.



**Figure C9.3-14.** Relationship between weakfish biomass (MT) and equilibrium BMSY from 1981-2008.



**Figure C10.3-1.** The Atlantic Coast of the United States. Prominent states and locations are listed. States from FL to MA participate in weakfish management. (Apologies to Canada)




Figure C10.4-1. Standardized indices (Z+2) from 1981-2003 assessment: NJ, MRFSS, and DE.






Figure C10.4-2. Proportion of trawls with weakfish based on exploitable biomass indices based on August or October rounds of the NJ survey. P = proportion of trawls with weakfish; MWT = mean weight of all weakfish; and E = exploitable fraction of total trawl biomass.





**Figure C10.4-3.** Striped bass biomass estimated from SCAM and known biomass production model. Square indicates estimate for 1981.



**Figure C10.4-4.** Biomass of ages 1+ Atlantic menhaden estimated from forward projection (FP) and predicted from categorical regression. Square indicates estimate for 2006.




Figure C10.5-1. Observed and estimated indices. Indices have been z-transformed to the 1990-2006 time series and had 2 added to eliminate negative values.






Figure C10.5-2. Residuals of the GDR versus year.



**Figure C10.5-3.** Estimates of biomass / unfished stock biomass ( $B_t / K$ ) for sensitivity runs with time-blocks removed from the beginning or  $B_{1981}$  constrained to be less than  $K$ . Start of time-series is indicated by year in legend.



**Figure C10.5-4.** Estimates of  $Z_t / Z_{msy}$  for sensitivity runs with time-blocks removed from the beginning or  $B_0$  constrained to be less than  $K$ . Start of time-series is indicated by year in legend.




Figure C10.5-5. Estimates of  $F_t / Z_{msy}$  for sensitivity runs with time-blocks removed from the beginning or  $B_0$  constrained to be less than  $K$ . Start of time-series is indicated by year in legend.






Figure C10.5-6. Estimates of biomass / unfished stock biomass ( $B / K$ ) for sensitivity runs with time-blocks removed from the end of the time series.



**Figure C10.5-7.** Estimates of biomass for sensitivity runs with different mean weights applied to recreational discards in the MRFSS index and fishery losses.



**Figure C10.5-8.** Trends in estimates of weakfish biomass and losses due to fisheries and striped bass predation-competition. Note separate axes for biomass and harvest or striped bass related losses.




Figure C10.5-9. Jackknife estimates of weakfish biomass 90% confidence intervals.




Figure C10.5-10. Bootstrapped estimates (N = 500) of biomass 90% confidence intervals.




Figure C10.5-11. Jackknife estimates of 90% confidence intervals of weakfish biomass lost to striped bass.




Figure C10.5-12. Bootstrapped estimates (N = 500) of 90% confidence intervals of weakfish biomass lost to striped bass.




Figure C10.5-13. Estimates of F and  $M_p$  and  $Z_{msy}$ .




Figure C10.5-14. Estimates of F, equilibrium  $F_{msy}$ , or non-equilibrium  $F_{psyt}$  ( $= F_{msy} - M_{pt}$ ).






Figure C10.5-15. Biomass, surplus production (less striped bass related losses), and production.




Figure C10.5-16. Ratios of biomass to unfished stock size (B/K) and fishing mortality (F) to total mortality ( $Z = F + M_{pt}$ ).




Figure C10.5-17. F estimated by the GDR model and relative F.




Figure C10.5-18. Trends in  $\log_e$ -transformed catchability for the three exploitable biomass indices. Mean is for the all indices combined.




Figure C10.5-19. Jackknife estimates of the 90% confidence interval of F.




Figure C10.5-20. Bootstrap (N = 500) estimates of the 90% confidence interval of F.




Figure C10.5-21. Jackknife estimates of the 90% confidence interval of  $M_p$ .




Figure C10.5-22. Bootstrap (N = 500) estimates of the 90% confidence interval of  $M_p$ .




Figure C10.5-23. Ratio of menhaden to striped bass and estimates of weakfish loss per striped bass ( $D_t / P_t$ ; both based on biomass).




Figure C10.5-24. Weakfish loss per striped bass (biomass) versus weakfish biomass. Note shift in functional response between 1983-1993 and 1997-2006.




Figure C10.6-1. Ratio of ages 1+ menhaden biomass to ages 2+ striped bass biomass derived from coastal stock assessments and from Chesapeake Bay indices during 1959-2006.







Figure C10.6-2. Chesapeake Bay menhaden to striped bass ratio index, weakfish commercial harvest, and DE PSD Q+ indices during 1959-2006.




**Figure C10.7-1.** Comparison of model estimates of weakfish killed by striped bass or as extra bycatch / unreported harvest (starts in 1996) and discard estimates.



**Figure C10.8-1.** Commercial landings of weakfish during 1929-2006 and biomass during 1983-2006. Landings for 1929-1950 were estimated from Joseph (1972; Figure 4).




**Figure C11.2-1.** Relation between mean stock biomass, total removals, and fishing mortality (unweighted average, ages 4-5). The dashed vertical line indicates the year weakfish abundance began to decline in the absence of increased removals.




**Figure C11.2-2.** Comparison of fishing mortality rates calculated by ADAPT VPA and relative F calculations. Fishing mortality expressed as biomass weighted F on ages 1+.







**Figure C11.2-3.** Comparison of natural mortality as a result of predation from the full Steele-Henderson model (M\_SH) with M calculated as  $Z_{VPA} - F_{rel}$ .




**Figure C11.3-1.** Relation of Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) to reported weakfish commercial landings. A) NMFS landings only; B) Joseph (1972) plus NMFS landings




**Figure C11.3-2.** Relationship between the prevalence of empty stomachs (3 year average) observed in weakfish from the NEFSC food habits database and biomass weighted Z (ages 1-5) estimated by ADAPT.




**Figure C11.3-3.** Comparison of age-specific weakfish diets (by weight) in Chesapeake during 1990-1992 and 2002-2003. Data for 1990-1992 were from Hartman and Brandt (1995) and data for 2002-2003 were provided by R. Latour (VIMS).




**Figure C12.1-1.** Weakfish stock status relative to equilibrium Thompson Bell reference points. A) Fishing mortality; B) Spawning stock biomass.




**Figure C12.2-1.** Weakfish stock status relative to non-equilibrium fishing mortality reference points calculated using the Steele-Henderson model.



**Figure C13.1-1.** Biomass projections under varying scenarios of fishing and natural mortality. Projections are calculated relative to ADAPT VPA terminal year estimates. A) Harvest moratorium; B)  $F = 0.25$ .




**Figure C13.2-1.** Effects of a simulated moratorium to harvest ( $F=0$ ) in 2009 on rebuilding future weakfish TSSB under scenario #1, fixed  $M=0.25$ , approximate BMSY is 110.



**Figure C13.2-2.** Effects of a simulated moratorium to harvest ( $F=0$ ) in 2009 on rebuilding future weakfish TSSB under scenario #2,  $M$  rises from 0.25 to 0.65. The projection is based on the assumption that  $M = 0.25$  from 1981-1998, followed by a rise to  $M=0.65$  thereafter. All values in the figure, including SSB20% have been scaled, so they are indicative of relative trends in biomass in relation to SSB20%, and not absolute biomass. SSB20% was estimated assuming constant natural mortality of  $M = 0.25$ . Projections were conducted based on results of the Steele-Henderson model described in section C9.0 of the stock assessment report.





**Figure C13.2-3.** Effects of a simulated moratorium to harvest ( $F=0$ ) in 2009 on rebuilding future weakfish TSSB under scenario #3,  $M$  rises to 0.25 to 1.0, approximate BMSY is 110.

**Appendixes**  
**to the 2009 Weakfish Assessment**  
**C-1 – C-5**

**SAW/SARC 48**  
**June 1-4, 2009**  
**Woods Hole, MA**

<b>Appendix C-1</b>	<b>Weakfish Technical Committee’s response to Data Poor Meeting comments</b>
<b>Appendix C-2</b>	<b>Proportional Stock Density Indices for Weakfish</b>
<b>Appendix C-3</b>	<b>SAS-based application of the Harvest Control Model to conduct weakfish stock projections.</b>
<b>Appendix C-4</b>	<b>Index Standardization</b>
<b>Appendix C-5</b>	<b>Preferred Run ADAPT output</b>

## C-1 Appendix

*Appendix C-1 was written in February 2009 by the Weakfish Technical Committee (i.e., Assessment Scientists), and is a response to written comments from the Peer Review of the December 2008 NE Data Poor Stock Meeting*

---

Weakfish portion of the 2008 Data Poor Workshop Report (Miller et al 2009) and the Weakfish Technical Committee's response to the Panel's comments.

**SAW/SARC 48  
June 1-4, 2009  
Woods Hole, MA**

*This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination peer review. It has not been formally disseminated by NOAA. It does not represent any final agency determination or policy.*

**ASMFC Weakfish Technical Committee Report**  
**Weakfish Management Board**  
**February 5, 2009**

The Weakfish Stock Assessment was presented to the Data Poor Workshop (DPW) by Jeff Brust, chair of the ASMFC Weakfish Stock Assessment Subcommittee (SAS) in December. In preparation for the meeting, the Review Panel (Panel) was provided with access to a range of working papers (ASMFC Weakfish TC 2008a, b, c, Uphoff 2008) that outlined the approach taken in several key aspects of the assessment. The Panel, although aware of past assessment methodologies and information most likely did not have sufficient time to review those materials. Weakfish was allotted close to four hours of time for review.

The Weakfish Technical Committee (TC) and SAS held a conference call on January 22, 2009 to discuss the DPW report which was released on January 20<sup>th</sup>. Overall, the TC/SAS believes the DPW reviewers to be too general in their comments without specific recommendations regarding how to improve the current assessment. Many of their “concerns” have been thoroughly vetted through past assessments as well as during current analysis. Also, the time frame required to perform a proper review was lacking in this case, including both for SAS Chair and the Panel. This did not allow the SAS Chair to discuss previous assessments which could have answered many of the reviewers concerns and thus in the end may not have been concerns at all. The following comments, **in bold**, represent the consensus view of the TC/SAS on the DPW process.

### **3.1 Background**

The stock assessment for weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*) that is being conducted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission’s technical committee (ASMFC - TC) was presented to the Panel by Mr. Jeff Brust, chair of the ASMFC weakfish TC on the afternoon of Thursday December 11th. The discussion on this first afternoon focused on the application of an age structured virtual population analysis to the weakfish stock. The remainder of the presentation, which focused on biomass dynamic models of weakfish that include covariates, was given on Friday morning.

In preparation for the meeting, the review Panel was provided with access to a range of working papers (ASMFC Weakfish TC 2008a, b, c, Uphoff 2008) that outlined the approach taken in several key aspects of the assessment.

The Panel did not have time to provide a full and careful consideration of all elements of the assessment including the quality of all data inputs and the appropriateness of the inferences drawn. Thus, the comments that follow should not be considered as representing a detailed peer review of the weakfish assessment. However, the Panel considered that it had adequate time to provide some general overview comments which we hope will be of help to the ASMFC in providing guidance to the weakfish TC as it seeks to complete its assessment. Discussions between Panel members and the TC chair were open and cordial.

- **The SAS Chair did not have sufficient time to fully elaborate on the data sources and analytical methods of the stock assessment. Many of the Panel’s comments are based on insufficient information due to lack of time.**
- **There was no review of previous assessments and methodologies which could have assisted the Panel during their deliberations.**
- **The DPW review should have been conducted as a brief review of highly condensed data and methodologies and not a hyper critical review trashing all of the data.**

- **The TC/SAS did not ask for a general overview from the DPW. There were specific questions, in terms of assistance, which the Panel never answered.**
- **The whole DPW process cost the SAS a lot in lost time and didn't return much advice. The Board should be concerned about lost time of their state's employees.**
- **Due to time constraints, the Panel saw a lot of what the last peer review saw. It is not too surprising that the reviews are similar. It would have been useful to have had something reflecting more of the new work rather than the old.**

### ***3.2. Virtual Population Analysis***

At their core stock assessments examine the consequences of observations under a suite of assumptions to explain the dynamics of the stock. Thus, it is critical that the assessment team be confident of the observations entering the assessment model. Errors and uncertainties in the observations on which the assessment is based can lead to spurious patterns in the inferred dynamics that may not be reflective of the true underlying dynamics.

- **Not only should the TC/SAS be confident of the observations, it is also important that the TC/SAS is confident in the assumptions on which the model is constructed. One of the main concerns the TC has with VPA is the assumption of constant M. This is not a new concern with this committee, nor is it constrained to just weakfish. Members of the TC have been opposed to the use of this assumption for years, if not decades, for weakfish as well as striped bass, lobster, and others. As noted above, if the data your model is based upon are not valid, results of the model could be suspect. This extends to the assumptions the model is based upon as well. Therefore, errors and uncertainties in the assumptions on which the assessment is based can lead to spurious patterns in the inferred dynamics that may not be reflective of the true underlying dynamics. Unfortunately, the assumptions rarely receive the same level of scrutiny as the data.**

The Panel expressed serious concerns over the reliability of input data used in the weakfish Virtual Population Analysis (VPA). The Panel concluded that until apparent inconsistencies in the input data are more fully explored, the TC's conclusion that the lack of fit of the VPA to the observations is due solely to an increasing natural mortality (M) rate is premature. The Panel recognizes that increasing M could be a possibility. This has been observed in other stocks at low population sizes (e.g. northwest Atlantic Cod) where predator – prey dynamics can maintain prey at low levels of abundance. However, before concluding that M is increasing, it is essential that the TC fully address the data input issues. The Panel does not consider that the VPA results are indicative of a pattern of increasing M to the exclusion of other plausible explanations.

- **The data used for the current run of the VPA have changed little since the first peer reviewed weakfish assessment. In fact, data have gotten better – otolith based ages, expanded commercial sampling, fishery specific CAA. The VPA model passed one peer review (the 30<sup>th</sup> SARC) with no problems, yet now the data are no longer valid in this Panel's perspective. The results of past VPAs were used for management with the apparent positive result of a partial stock rebuilding. If the data are as bad as this review suggests, can we believe any of the trends and management results from previous assessments? (One would think not.) On the other hand, if the past**

assessments are valid, then why are they no longer valid when the data have actually improved?

- **The TC/SASC has never said that the lack of fit of the VPA is due solely to an increasing natural mortality (M). It has been documented that a rise in M helps explain why the VPA shows a rise in total mortality as suggested by the VPA.**
- **If the Panel disagrees with a dynamic M, why didn't the Panel recommend using only a constant M? Could it be that they realize the outputs would not show a clear picture of what is actually happening with the weakfish stock.**
- **The TC/SAS believes it has fully addressed all data input "issues" to the best of their ability. These are the same issues that affect all assessments and are not solely restricted to the weakfish assessment.**
- **If there were other plausible explanations that the Panel is aware of and the TC/SAS has not attempted to analyze, why do they not share them with us at this time?**
- **Would it be useful to the Board if the TC/SAS were to provide a table that lists or provides examples of other assessments that use the same types of data or data grinding processes as the weakfish TC/SAS? For instance, which assessments use NMFS landings (all), MRFSS estimates (all), bycatch from observer data (?), MRFSS index (At least three other ASMFC assessments feature MRFSS indices: Atlantic croaker, striped bass and bluefish), regional indices (all assessments are likely to).**

The concerns noted by the Panel centered on the following issues:

a) Reliability of catch information: While the Panel did not have sufficient time to examine the catch records in detail, there was some suggestion from the presentation that catches in some fisheries may have been underestimated substantially. For example, the TC chair and the Panel discussed uncertainties in the NC landings, particularly with regard to allocation to different gear types. It is important that not only the total catch is known, but that it is allocated accurately to the different sectors given the different biological catch characteristics in those sectors.

- **There seems to be no factual basis for concern of the catch information. Harvest weight is taken from NMFS and/or state weigh-out sources as with any other assessed species. The TC/SAS recognizes there is some uncertainty with all commercial and recreational landings estimates. Regardless, they are commonly used throughout ASMFC assessment work and should be of no concern to the Panel.**
- **The issue of uncertainties of the North Carolina landings seems unwarranted according to their sampling methodologies. The TC/SAS believes the sampling of North Carolina's commercial fisheries to be exceptional.**
- **Patrick Campfield from ASMFC has provided analysis in the past on potential bias in NMFS landings versus individual state weigh-outs.**
- **Trends in recreational and commercial landings follow similar patterns, even though they are determined using very different methods.**
- **What specific information was presented that suggested the catch was underestimated? The Panel does not provide sufficient information for us to fully evaluate this concern.**

b) Expansion of discard estimates based on catch per haul of targeted species on observed vessels to total discard for the fleet is likely biased: Related to the concerns expressed over the reliability of the

catch data, similar concerns were expressed over the reliability of the discard data. The Panel suggested alternative approaches to the TC chair that might ameliorate these concerns.

- **As with the harvest information, it appears that the concern of bias in discard estimates is more speculative than factual. The DPW Panel does not seem to be aware of Janaka de Silva's 2004 paper where he investigated a variety of discard estimation methodologies, with the current method selected as the most reliable estimates of discards. He performed similar analysis during the last assessment of Atlantic croaker, an approved ASMFC assessment.**
- **It is possible for the SAS to:**
- **Provide a table of the number of hauls or trips sampled by year/gear/target species to show low number of instances of weakfish discards at this fine of analysis.**
- **Summarize findings of regression method, trip based method, etc. Conduct sensitivity runs of VPA.**
- **Reference and summarize Jim Uphoff's report that estimates amount of "unaccounted catch" necessary to fit trend. The estimates of discards would have to be enormous (15 to 20 times higher than the original estimate in recent years).**
- **Are there any other species with better, or even different, estimate of discards? Doubtful, the TC/SAS believes these estimates to be the best available.**
- **Reviewers could not agree on direction of bias in estimates, so where does that leave us?**
- **The Panel should have provided the alternative approaches mentioned in this section.**

c) Reliability of catch at age information: The catch and discard tonnage are partitioned in the catch at age matrix. The key assumption of the VPA is that the catch at age is known with no or negligible error. For weakfish, catch at age is not fully described and estimates from one region and one sector have to be applied to other regions and sectors to provide a full catch at age matrix. The Panel concluded that the catch at matrix is of unknown precision.

- **The TC/SAS recognizes that substitution affects precision and agrees that there may be errors in the CAA matrix. However, weakfish is not the only species where substitutions are made to develop catch estimates (e.g. bluefish). Substitutions were made in the past and passed the 30<sup>th</sup> SARC. Issues such as this require a great deal of review of past techniques. The SAS has already completed some work in this area including comparison of NJ CAA with substitutions of different data. Have other species' assessments utilized similar methodology of applying estimates from one sector to another when necessary? Did these estimates pass peer review?**
- **The SAS may also, time permitting, attempt to develop a 1993+ VPA to eliminate scale-otolith conversion concerns.**
- **The data concerns are minimal in recent years and continue to improve with the addition of commercial ages from NJ and NY.**
- **One option is to justify not using VPA (or any age structured assessment) until have sufficient number of years with better sampling from NJ north (started in 2004, so ignore VPA until 2014?).**
- **Try SCAM or other age based assessment modeling? Would have been completed but too much time wasted on the DPW.**

d) Spatial and temporal coverage of the indices: Although the VPA could have used more than 40 separate indices, many were found to be inappropriate by the TC for several valid reasons. However, the fishery-independent indices that were selected did not cover the entire population area, but rather were restricted to limited spatial areas within the overall weakfish stock area. Such indices may not be reflective of the entire population. If such indices are used, the implicit assumption is that each index represents a constant proportion of the overall population across the entire time series. When this assumption is not met, the overall results of the assessment are likely not reliable. While the TC spent considerable effort selecting those indices whose aggregate trends were comparable, the Panel remained concerned that these indices may have been coherent because they contained little information, rather than because they are reliable indices of population abundance.

- **There are 44 indices available, including five (5) fishery dependent (MRFSS 3-6+ and 2+) as well as 12 from NEFSC (1-6+) and SEAMAP (1-6+) that were omitted. The remainder, including nine (9) young-of-year, the NJ (6), DE (6), and NC (6) indices are all localized indices. The panel apparently recognized that the NEFSC survey (the only coastwide FI index) was inappropriate, so there is no “coastwide survey” besides the MRFSS CPUE index (see (e) below). The TC/SAS does believe that the indices used cover the core area as suggested from the SAW 40 review. Also, NC has the majority of commercial landings, NJ the majority of recreational landings, and DE is a major spawning area. These three State’s have the only aged FI surveys within core area and all show the same trend.**
- **The trends in FI indices are similar to trends in MRFSS and commercial CPUE.**
- **The Panel says these indices may be coherent because they contain little information. Once again there is no factual evidence that would warrant such a determination from the Panel. Only 2 aged indices (NEFSC and SEAMAP) showed a different trend, and their removal from the analysis was justified and approved by the Panel. Also, the trends observed in these indices are also observed in commercial and recreational harvest trends and commercial CPUE. Are all these data sources uninformative? Does the Panel suggest there is better data out there somewhere? If we cannot use these data, we have no data left to perform an assessment.**
- **The assessed trends of indices are too directional to be uninformative. There isn’t that much inter-annual variation in recruited ages as we have them configured. The MRFSS index suggests that in the long-term they may be more of a one-way trip. Basically, they are a steady decline with a blip at recovery. However a recent paper by Magnusson and Hilborn (Magnusson, A. and R. Hilborn. 2007. What makes fisheries data informative? Fish and Fisheries. 8:337-358) found that one-way trip data was surprisingly informative.**
- **Dr. Yan Jiao's work of standardizing the indices may assist in proving the worth of the indices. Another way of measuring the indices is to compare them against the converged portion of VPA.**
- **DE and NJ are at the center of the core area and both indices correlate with FD indices.**

e) MRFSS CPUE index: The use of a MRFSS index is not inherently inappropriate and the assessment team appeared to be aware of potential issues in the use of such indices. However, the Panel noted particular concerns given that the MRFSS index was one of the few that exhibited any



clear signal or contrast. When such indices dominate the input data set, these concerns become magnified. The Panel was appreciative of the efforts by the TC that have been made since the previous assessment to improve the index but still had concerns over the reliability of this index. For example, the index could have declined because anglers switched the rigging of tackle used to favor striped bass. The MRFSS weakfish CPUE would be expected to decline for this reason alone, particularly as all private and party boat trips were used as the index of effort. The Panel could not suggest a better estimator of effort for use in the calculations given the time available. The Panel remained concerned over the reliability of this fishery-dependent index, particularly given its pivotal role in the VPA.

- **The MRFSS index was one of four (4) indices that showed similar signals, along with other indicators as mentioned above. To be fair, commercial CPUE was not covered during DPW. Only two “aged” indices (NEFSC and SEAMAP) did not show this trend.**
- **Once again there is no recommendation on how to make the MRFSS index better or why it is unreliable. During the workshop, one participant suggested a revised calculation methodology. Preliminary analysis suggests this modification did not change the overall pattern.**
- **The thought that anglers have “switched rigging” has caused the decrease in CPUE is not a very good example of why the index may be flawed. In many areas, the same methodologies are used for catching both species. It would be possible to evaluate this assumption by recalculating the trend with directed striped bass trips removed to see how the trend responds?**
- **The DPW Panel is mistaken in its assumption that party boat trips were used to develop the MRFSS index of effort.**
- **MRFSS VPA run preferred mainly because it gave the shortest retrospective pattern, not because it had the trend the TC/SAS was looking for. It also has a relatively large sample size and incorporates the entire core area (not localized like FI indices).**
- **It is the pattern of the index that is important!**

f) Coherence of fishery-independent indices: The Panel was troubled by the apparent coherence of the aggregate fishery independent indices used as input to the model compared to the different trajectories estimated as output by the VPA when different groupings of these indices were used as inputs. The Panel considered that the differences between the coherence of the input time series and the model outputs may reflect differences in the age-specific catchabilities and thus abundances monitored by these surveys. The Panel felt that detailed exploration of this apparent discrepancy should be conducted.

- **The TC/SAS agreed that this was the most useful of the DPW concerns and recommendations.**
- **All FI runs show a similar pattern although the Panel seemed to be concerned about the difference in FI vs. FD runs for indices that show same aggregate trend. Jeff Brust looked into these differences. The short retrospective of the FD run is driven by the MRFSS 3 to 6+ indices. Using just the MRFSS 2+ gives the same VPA result as using FI indices. Catchability does change when regulations change. This was described in the plot of the residuals from these indices in the 2006 assessment. The TC/SAS will continue exploration of this and provide results in assessment.**

- **Need to take all indices of a given age (all age 1, all age 2, etc) and compare them. Maybe something will jump out at us.**

g) Weights at age: The Panel noted substantial discrepancies in the weights at age in the catch at age (e.g., age-4 weakfish in one year were heavier than age-5 fish in the subsequent year). These discrepancies could be a consequence of estimation of the catch at age for one fleet using catch at age data from a different fleet.

- **How bad is this compared to other species? All assessments have this and it will affect estimates of biomass but not estimates of stock size (in numbers) or mortality rates. We are currently looking into historic data in attempt to find any problems with the WAA. It could also reflect real phenomena from heavy fishing or poor feeding. Plus there might be some effect of mixed ageing currencies (scales converted to otolith ages and actual otolith ages).**
- **Someone should look at length at age over time as well. Might provide insight into changing productivity over time.**

Overall the review Panel believed that the conclusion that a time varying M was the principal explanation for the pattern of low biomass and high F's observed in the MRFSS tuned VPA was unwarranted. The review Panel felt that other alternative explanations, even assuming inputs were correct, including missing catch, changing catchabilities and inappropriateness of information in the input surveys should be fully explored before the results of the VPA can be used as a spring board to suggest the need to explain an increasing pattern in M. The Panel noted that many of these concerns had been raised by the previous peer review team and has yet to be adequately addressed. Given the nature of the concerns regarding the catch at age, the assessment team should consider a statistical catch at age approach rather than VPA.

- **The results of the VPA provided in this assessment are not intended as spring board to explain an increasing pattern in M. The VPA estimates total mortality (Z) based on changes in age structure, then divides Z into F & M by subtracting the input M. Relative F analysis showed that the increase in Z was not due to F, so the SAS initiated analysis to determine an increase in M. The TC/SAS is aware of the limitations of the VPA such as the assumption of constant M, retrospective patterns and known error in CAA but it is still useful for total mortality estimates and stock size estimates.**
- **The 30<sup>th</sup> SARC reviewed data through 1998. Regardless of indices used, all runs of current model show same trends through 2001 or 2002. Therefore, the entire converged portion of the VPA output has passed peer review. Could changes to the inputs affect the converged portion of VPA? It is not apparent from the Panel's comments if they think trends prior to 2000 are inaccurate.**
- **With regard to missing catch, this could really be any unaccounted losses, such as harvest, mortality, bycatch, etc. The TC/SAS has developed estimates of the amount of unaccounted losses necessary to improve the model fit. In recent years, unaccounted losses would need to be 15-20 times our current discard estimates – an amount that would be difficult to overlook in our sampling.**
- **With regard to changing survey catchabilities, biomass and abundance estimates from the converged portion of the VPA – which is not dependent on survey data –clearly**

indicate a declining abundance. The decline can not therefore be entirely due to trends in catchability.

- **With regard to inappropriate info in the indices, there is evidence that abundance is declining outside the influence of survey data (such as commercial CPUE from VA and NC), as explained in the above bullet as well as sensitivity runs made without any tuning indices during the 2006 assessment. The 2004 peer review recommended using a recreational CPUE index because of problems with the trawl surveys. We followed their recommendations.**
- **So they just trashed ALL of our VPA input data, yet suggest a model that uses the exact same inputs. The SCAM has more flexibility, but enough to compensate for what they consider to be such inappropriate data? A model can only do so much with the data you give it. The SAS initiated development of an ASAP model, but haven't been able to continue development because of the preparation for and dealing with the DPW review.**
- **There were no comments regarding Relative F modeling which is a good predictor of trends in fishing mortality without the reliance on actual measured abundance. It also is not dependent on an estimate of M which the SAS considers its strong point.**
- **It is puzzling that the panel never recommends performing the analysis with a constant M.**
- **Tuning indices only affect estimates in the most recent years. The TC feels the panel was too focused on indices.**

### ***3.3. Biomass dynamic modeling***

The Panel was very interested in the results of the biomass dynamic models that were presented during the meeting. The Panel felt that they were an interesting exploration of potential ecological mechanisms acting on weakfish. However, if such models are to form the foundation for management there needs to be compelling and direct empirical evidence for the mechanisms being hypothesized. In general, the Panel considered that such evidence was lacking. The Panel was further concerned that the implications of the results for management (e.g., if surplus production in weakfish is truly negative currently, then no viable weakfish fishery is possible) had not been fully considered by the TC.

- **Biomass modeling shows fisheries are not responsible for the most recent decline in weakfish. Evidence of potential predation/competition assists this hypothesis. Jim Uphoff and Vic Crecco have developed biomass models that take into account the various potential causes including environmental, predation and competition factors.**
- **There is empirical evidence that is in synch with the modeling results. Members of the SAS performed a large-scale review of diet literature as well as spatial and temporal overlap. Statistical analysis of the literature was used to determine main candidates for modeling. This analysis was not available to the DPW but it was in the last assessment. It will also be presented at the final review in June.**
- **The TC/SAS has fully considered the implications of these findings, but really that's not the job of the TC/SAS as the implications are not a technical or analytical issue. The job of the TC/SAS is to determine the status of the weakfish population. It's up to the managers to discuss the implications of the findings and decide what needs to be**

done. The alternative is to pretend that fishing mortality is the only factor influencing stock dynamics, and fishermen need to bear the brunt of “fixing” the population.

- **The SAS has presented a convincing case (hypothesis) that biotic factors in the form of enhanced predatory mortality, rather than overfishing, was the main reason for the recent unexpected and steady decline of weakfish abundance from 2000 to 2007. The recent trend in overall juvenile weakfish recruitment has been high since the late 1990's, but these dominant year-classes no longer translate through the age structure in subsequent years, suggesting the recent emergence of a demographic bottleneck in recruitment. Unless there has been a steady rise in weakfish juvenile discards since 1999, the emergence of a demographic bottleneck is consistent with enhanced predation on smaller weakfish. Has any other single species stock assessment conducted thus far examined the recruitment data to see whether such a phenomenon might exist?**

The Panel again noted the central role of the MRFSS index in determining the results of the biomass dynamic modeling. When an index with a strong, almost exponentially declining pattern is used to drive a model, any variable that shows an opposite trend will appear as a strong covariate in model fits – particularly given the latitude in parameters implied by the assumption of the form of a type III functional response. However, such correlations obviously do not imply causation. Under such circumstances, the Panel noted that documentation of weakfish consumption by striped bass needs to be more fully documented to provide the causation strongly implied by the assumptions of the models presented to the Panel. The TC needs to consider the pattern of spatial and temporal overlap of the two species and the influence of this dynamic on the levels of consumption required. Such consideration appeared lacking from the material presented to the Panel.

- **MRFSS was only one of three equally weighted indices used in the two biomass models. The empirical evidence is not limited to predation. The TC/SAS will continue to look into forage data (e.g. menhaden and FHDBS), environmental data (oscillations, buoy data), changes in growth parameters (Vaughan data), changes in M (Lorenzen), and indices of forage (SVDBS engraulids and clupeids).**
- **The SAS has developed hypotheses, presented data, and evaluated plausibility. Regardless of cause, weakfish are at low abundance. The Panel even implies they agree with this statement in several of their responses. With regard to predation, there does not need to be a large number of weakfish eaten per predator, or even a trend in number eaten, because the trend in predators has increased, and there is an increased abundance of predators, even small consumption of weakfish might affect the stock.**
- **The temporal/spatial overlap of the two species is considerable, particularly during fall migration and overwintering areas.**
- **The SAS has produced an update on discards which gives a brief description of the relative level of consumption.**

The assumption of a type III functional response appears arbitrary. There are several valid alternatives that have been used in other predator-prey models – ranging from type I and II, to foraging arena concepts (Walters and Juanes 1993, Walters and Martell 2004). Each of the different functional responses would have extremely different consequences for the dynamics of weakfish inferred by such models. It was not apparent from the material presented that an adequate exploration of this aspect of the biomass dynamic models with covariates had been undertaken.

- **This comment is largely due to the time limitations of the workshop. The first day (2+ hours) was spent discussing data inputs, VPA, and relative F. The second day, due to time limitations, the Panel considered both biomass models in less than an hour, so they may not have picked up on the differences between the predator hypothesis and the forage hypothesis.**
- **Regardless, the forage hypothesis investigated 4 functional responses, including Type I, II, III and depensatory. Type III actually performed poorly, so the SAS has already addressed this. It will be thoroughly discussed text of the final assessment.**
- **Residual errors were clarified through adding a predation factor. Through analysis, the SAS has not been able to falsify the striped bass/dogfish predation factor.**

The Panel noted that when a resource is in a depleted condition, such as in the case of weakfish, a number of factors can be responsible for maintaining the stock in the depressed state. Examples in the literature of “predator pits” preventing recovery in predator - prey models have been reported (Bundy and Fanning 2005). There is a continuing debate in Atlantic Canada on the role of grey seals maintaining Atlantic cod at their low level of abundance (Chouinard et al. 2005, Trzcinski et al. 2006). However, the mechanisms maintaining the prey species at low levels of abundance and the mechanism that caused the reduced abundance in the first place are not necessarily the same thing. Thus, for weakfish, predation may be maintaining the population at low levels, without having contributed to the original decline of the stock.

- **The TC/SAS agrees that the weakfish stock is at a low level and that the influence(s) that is keeping it there could be different than what put it there in the first place. The question is what put it there in the first place, especially since we were starting to rebuild (and have lots of different data sources that indicate this). To change from rebuilding to declining stock, total mortality would have had to increase and/or recruitment decrease. Relative F indicates that fishing mortality was probably not the leading cause.**
- **The SAS looked at other factors such as recruitment (environmental?) or mortality (other anthropogenic or natural).**
- **The DPW Panel appears to concede that the stock is at low levels. If it is due to predation, we probably can’t have a viable fishery until that predation pressure is removed. These are the same implications they accused us of not fully considering?**
- **If the Panel agrees the stock is at low levels, they are implicitly “accepting” the index and harvest data, thereby contradicting many of their concerns.**

The Panel felt that the attempts of the TC to develop a minimum realistic model (MRM) for weakfish trophic interactions, as recommended by Plagányi (2007), were laudable. However, the Panel also felt that the biomass dynamic models were not yet at the stage to provide a reliable basis for the determination of weakfish stock status.

- **The DPW Panel believes that the input data and the results of the VPA are inappropriate,**
-

- **the biomass models are unreliable, and SCAM uses same data as VPA. So what is left? Weakfish has become the ultimate example of “data poor” after the last 2 reviews. The data has been shot down as unacceptable and ASMFC is worse off now than prior to the last assessment. Back to the drawing board?**

The Panel did not have sufficient time to provide responses to a number of specific questions raised by the TC themselves (ASMFC Weakfish TC 2008a). However, the Panel noted that it has provided guidance on several questions. Most importantly, perhaps for the management of weakfish, the Panel feels that the VPA is not yet sufficiently developed or its results sufficiently explored to support the conclusion of an increasing pattern in M. While the Panel appreciated the spirit of the exploration of ecological mechanisms to explain a pattern of increasing M, these analyses are not of sufficient reliability, given concerns over the MRFSS index and the lack of empirical evidence for the hypothesized predator-prey interaction involving striped bass and weakfish, to be a current assessment tool of the weakfish resource.

- **It appears on several levels that the Assessment presentation needs adjustment. The SAS may need to make some concessions on the cause of stock decline by generalizing, but it can do this without saying it is all due to F. Also, the focus should be on the findings of all the models – i.e. that the stock appears to be at low levels currently. The Panel appears to agree that the stock is depressed, which is a positive step since the last peer review didn’t even agree that we were in a depressed state. The Board needs to know that the stock is in a depressed state, so we need to figure out how to get the Panel to make a statement about status regardless of how that status came about.**
- **It will not take much to address the concerns of this Panel. In a few places the SAS will need to do some additional exploratory work with models and such. Much of the work will come from just expanding the text of the assessment to acknowledge the Panel’s concerns and to reference and summarize other reports where that work was done.**

## **Appendix C-2**

### **Proportional Stock Density Indices for Weakfish**

**SAW/SARC 48  
June 1-4, 2009  
Woods Hole, MA**

Amendment 4 requires that descriptors of age or size structure be reported to the Management Board as part of each stock assessment. Proportional stock densities (PSDs) are standardized methods for analyzing length-frequency data that quantify size structure of a fish population (typically gamefish) into categories of sizes that are of interest to recreational anglers (Gablehouse 1984). These techniques allow comparisons of size quality across species. Used commonly for freshwater stock assessment, they have been applied on a limited basis in marine management; Maryland DNR uses them routinely to assess size quality of several species of estuarine and marine gamefish (J. Uphoff, MD DNR, personal observation). Length-frequency data, indexed by PSDs, contains much of the information contained in age-frequency data and even cursory examination of a length-frequency can give useful insights into population dynamics of a stock (Powell 1979; Hoenig et al. 1987). A population's length-frequency distribution results from its recent history of recruitment and mortality, integrated with growth (Barry and Tegner 1989).

The Quality+ PSD (PSD Q+) equaled the proportion of weakfish greater than or equal to 210 mm (8.3 inches) that were 340 mm (13.4 inches) or larger (Kahn et al. 2006). Sample sizes in the DE and NJ surveys were large enough for precise estimates of PSD Q (Kahn et al. 2006). The normal distribution approximation of the binomial distribution was used to calculate the SD (Ott 1977). The DE Quality+ PSD represents the longest fishery-independent data set available for weakfish. The DE PSD Q+ index was significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ) and positively associated with recreational fishing quality (trophy citations) over a broad (DE, MD, VA) area, commercial and recreational yield along the Atlantic Coast, recreational harvest per trip in the mid-Atlantic (VA-NY), and the proportion of recreational harvest outside of 3 miles (Uphoff 2004). Proportion of recreational harvest in bays and sounds was negatively associated with DE PSD Q+ (Uphoff 2004).


The PSD Q+ size quality indices for DE (1966-1971, 1979-1984, and 1990-2006; Appendix 1, Figure 1) and NJ (1989-2006; August and October; Appendix 1, Figure 2) indicated that size quality of weakfish in recent years was truncated at smaller lengths. A recovery in size quality after Amendment 3 (1996) faltered after 1998. Weakfish PSD Q+ has the potential to be a good bit higher than the peak observed in 1998 (Appendix 1, Figure 1). Values in the early 1980s were twice as high as this peak. Values were lower during 1966-1968 than current indices (Appendix 1, Figure 1).

## References


- Barry JP, Tegner MJ. 1989. Inferring demographic processes from size-frequency distributions: simple models indicate specific patterns of growth and mortality. *Fish Bull.* 88: p13-19.
- Gabelshouse DW. 1984. A length-categorization system to assess fish stocks. *N Am J Fish Manage.* 4:273-285.
- Hoenig JM, Heisey DM, Lawing WD, Schupp DH. 1987. An indirect rapid methods approach to assessment. *Can J Fish Aqua Sci.* 44:324-338.
- Kahn DM, Uphoff J, Crecco V, Vaughan D, Murphy B, Brust J, O'Reilly R, Paramore L. 2006. Weakfish Stock Assessment Report for Peer Review (Kahn et al. 2006). Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife, Dover.
- Ott L. 1977. An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis. Duxbury Press. North Scituate, Massachusetts
- Powell DG. 1979. Estimation of mortality and growth parameters from the length frequency of catch. *Rapp. P.-v. Reun Cons Int Explor Mer.* 175:167-169.



Uphoff JH, Jr. 2004. Indicators of weakfish size quality: proportional and relative stock density indices for weakfish. A report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's Weakfish Technical Committee. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Stevensville.



Appendix C-2, Figure 1. 95% CI of Delaware survey Quality+ PSD and trend



Appendix C-2, Figure 2. NJ survey Quality+ PSD 95% CI and trend

**SAW 48 Weakfish Appendix C-3**  
**May 15, 2009**

**Appendix C-3**

**SAS-based application of the Harvest Control  
Model to conduct weakfish stock projections**

**SAW/SARC 48**  
**June 1-4, 2009**  
**Woods Hole, MA**

\*-APPENDIX C-3-----\*

-----\*  
 | Run-Specific Macro Variables HARVEST CONTROL MODEL FOR WEAKFISH FIXED M OF  
 0.25, 1980-2020 |

```
*-----*
%let MaxAge = 10;           /* Maximum age Considered          */
%let A = 0.75;             /* A in Stock Recruitment Relationship-not used
*/
%let B = 1.5;              /* B in Stock Recruitment Relationship-not used
*/
%let K = 4000;             /* K in Stock Recruitment Relationship-not used
*/
```

```
*-----*
| Read in Annual Data: |
|           CstF..      Coast      F-      BASED      ON      recent      ADAPT      run
|           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|           |           | Juv1..      age           1           recruitment      (REC0)
|           |           |
|           |           |
|           |           | M .. NATURAL MORTALITY RATE-TIME VARYING
|           |           |
*-----*
```

```
data YearClas;
  input Year CstF REC0 ;
  if _n_ = 1 then call symput('FrstYear',put(Year,4.));
*-----*
Year BayF CstF REC0 BayR CstR BayD CstD JUV2 JUV3 JUV4 M RECC RECH
*-----*
```

```
cards;
```

1970	0.44	0.44	160	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.7	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1971	0.22	0.72	140	24	24	0.00	0.00	1.8	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1972	0.24	0.64	80	24	24	0.00	0.00	1.5	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1973	0.22	0.82	190	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.3	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1974	0.22	0.82	60	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.9	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1975	0.42	0.42	150	24	24	0.00	0.00	1.3	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1976	0.24	0.74	170	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.7	0.16	.	0.15	..	.	.
1977	0.40	0.90	140	24	24	0.00	0.00	1.8	0.16	.	0.25	..	.	.
1978	0.35	0.95	170	24	24	0.00	0.00	1.8	0.16	.	0.25	..	.	.
1979	1.21	1.21	130	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.3	0.01	.	0.25	..	.	.
1980	1.29	1.29	230	24	24	0.00	0.00	0.9	0.01	.	0.25	..	.	.
1981	1.73	1.73	55.7	12	17	0.00	0.00	1.3	0.01	1393	0.25	56	53	.
1982	1.40	1.40	18.4	12	17	0.00	0.00	2.1	0.30	2785	0.25	56	11	.
1983	1.61	1.61	35.0	14	24	0.00	0.00	2.4	0.08	2441	0.25	56	11	.
1984	2.21	2.21	33.9	14	24	0.00	0.00	2.3	0.73	2964	0.25	59	8	.
1985	1.35	1.35	18.3	14	24	0.00	0.00	0.3	0.05	2876	0.25	32	0	.
1986	1.73	1.73	8.0	14	29	0.00	0.00	0.4	0.70	3642	0.25	161	0	.
1987	2.66	2.66	5.9	14	31	0.00	0.00	2.4	1.03	4740	0.25	82	0	.
1988	1.81	1.81	7.4	14	33	0.00	0.00	5.0	0.88	5972	0.25	82	0	.
1989	2.12	2.12	1.9	14	33	0.00	0.00	3.2	2.58	8100	0.25	30	0	.
1990	2.76	2.76	5.7	18	34	0.00	0.00	2.9	2.50	7342	0.25	171	0.7	.
1991	0.84	0.84	5.5	18	34	0.00	0.00	0.55	1.18	6790	0.25	243	71	.
1992	1.03	1.03	43.4	18	34	0.00	0.00	1.7	2.92	8129	0.25	356	92	.
1993	0.71	0.71	88.6	18	32	0.00	0.00	1.9	4.45	10042	0.25	543	66	.
1994	0.98	0.98	28.5	18	32	0.00	0.00	2.6	2.40	6391	0.25	664	154	.
1995	0.32	0.32	10.7	18	29	0.00	0.00	2.4	4.95	7838	0.25	1593	221	.

```

1996 0.53 0.53 17.1 18 29 0.00 0.00 1.3 4.25 7876 0.25 1411 238
1997 2.56 2.56 14.7 18 29 0.00 0.00 3.3 2.53 9105 0.25 1604 144
1998 2.72 2.72 4.6 18 28 0.00 0.00 2.0 3.28 9518 0.25 1132 122
1999 2.67 2.67 17.3 18 28 0.00 0.00 4.0 4.75 6302 0.25 1337 88
2000 2.82 2.82 4.0 18 26 0.00 0.0 0.5 4.4 . 0.25 1120 99
2001 2.04 2.04 9.8 18 26 0.00 0.00 . . . 0.25 1254 52
2002 2.34 2.34 11.7 18 26 0.0 0.00 . . . 0.25 1591 67
2003 2.38 2.38 3.6 18 26 0.0 0.00 . . . 0.25 1666 78
2004 2.06 2.06 4.6 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 1807 63
2005 2.52 2.52 12.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 1584 51
2006 2.47 2.47 5.7 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 1266 91
2007 2.13 2.13 21.5 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . 103
2008 2.20 2.20 8.5 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . 38
2009 2.20 2.20 13.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2010 2.20 2.20 13.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2011 2.20 2.20 12.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2012 2.20 2.20 21.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2013 2.20 2.20 9.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2014 2.20 2.20 12.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2015 2.20 2.20 22.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2016 2.2 2.2 22.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2017 2.20 2.20 9.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2018 2.20 2.20 12.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2019 2.20 2.20 22.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .
2020 2.2 2.2 22.0 18 26 0.0 0.0 . . . 0.25 . .

```

```

;
run;

```

```

*-----*
| Read in Population Parameters:
| AGE .....AGE GROUP
| MigR ... Migration Rate (not used in this version)
| MatR ... Maturation Rate (fraction mature)
| RcrR ... Partial Rec Rate (fraction recruited to the fishery)
| PERR .....FRACTION AGES 8+
*-----*

```

```

data PopParms;
input Age MigR MatR rcrbr RCRBbR RCRCR RCRCcR PERR;

```

```

*-----*
Age MigR MatR RcrBr RCRBbR RCRCR RCRCcR PERR
*-----*

```

```

cards;
0 1.00 0.00 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
1 0.00 0.9 0.34 0.16 0.34 0.16 0.0
2 0.0 1.0 0.58 0.47 0.58 0.47 0.0
3 0.0 1.0 0.75 0.73 0.75 0.73 0.0
4 0.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.0
5 0.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.0
6 0.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.0
7 0.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 0.0
8 0.0 1.00 1.00 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0
9 0.0 1.00 1.00 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0
10 0.0 1.00 1.00 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0

```

```

;
run;

```

```

*-----*
| Read in Age at Length Data:
|

```

```

| Lgth ... Length (inches)
| Age .... Age (years)
*-----*
data LngthAge;
  input Lgth Age;
  if _n_ = 1 then call symput('MinLngth',put(Lgth,2.));
  else call symput('MaxLngth',put(Lgth,2.));
*-----*
Lgth Age
*-----*
cards;
12 2.0
14 2.5
17 3.2
18 4.0
24 4.9
26 5.7
28 6.8
29 7.2
30 7.5
32 7.3
31 7.1
33 7.7
34 8.1
36 9.0
;
run;

%put;
%put FrstYear = &FrstYear;
%put MaxAge = &MaxAge;
%put MinLngth = &MinLngth;
%put MaxLngth = &MaxLngth;

*-----*
| The Model
*-----*
data Model (keep = Year BAYR CSTR M BayF CstF Juv1 BayR CstR JUV2 JUV3 JUV4 REC
RECC RECH
          LREC JUV5 LREC2 TSSB TBES TCES TN_Bay TN_CST TBAYCAT TBAYLD
TCatch TYIELD STK MT TCOASTYD TCSTCAT WEIGHT Z FZ)
  Debug (keep = Year BAYR CSTR Age Migrate
          N_Bay ZB1 ZB2 FB1 FB2
          BayF1 BayF2 BayDeath BayCatch BAYIELD BES
          N_Cst ZC1 ZC2 FC1 FC2
          CstF1 CstF2 FPrimeC1 FPrimeC2 CstDeath CstCatch
          COASTYLD Wt SSB BES CES );

array Mig{0:&MaxAge}; /* Migration Rate */
array Mat{0:&MaxAge}; /* Maturation Rate */
array RcrB{0:&MaxAge}; /* PARTIAL REC BAY */
array RcrBb{0:&MaxAge}; /* PARTIAL REC BAY */
array RcrC{0:&MaxAge}; /* PARTIAL REC CST */
array RcrCc{0:&MaxAge}; /* PARTIAL REC CST */
ARRAY PER{0:&MAXAGE};
array L_Age{&MinLngth:&MaxLngth}; /* Age-Length Key */
array BayPop{0:&MaxAge}; /* Bay Population Array */
array CstPop{0:&MaxAge}; /* Coast Population Array */

```

```

A=&A; B=&B; K=&K; /* Stock Recruitment Params */

do until (EOP); /* Read in PopParms Data Set */
  set PopParms end=EOP;
  Mig{Age}=MigR;
  Mat{Age}=MatR;
  RcrB{Age}=RcrBr;
  Rcrbb{Age} = Rcrbbr;
  RcrC{Age}=RcrCr;
  Rcrcc{Age}= Rcrccr;
  PER{AGE} = PERR;

  if Age = &MaxAge then EOP=1;
end;

do until (EOL); /* Read in Age at Length Key */
  set LngthAge end=EOL;
  L_Age{Lgth}=Age;
end;

do Age = 0 to &MaxAge; /* Nobody home */
  BayPop{Age}=0;
  CstPop{Age}=0;
end;

** ASSUMPTION: REC0 of Age 0 fish at beginning of year 0 ;
** i.e. before mortality (natural and discard) ;

do until (EOY);

  set YearClas end=EOY; /* Read a year class obs */
  if Juv1 = . then Juv1 = 0;
  IF JUV2 = . THEN JUV2 = 0;
  IF JUV3 = . THEN JUV3 =0;
  REC = JUV1;
  LREC = LOG(REC);
  JUV5 = JUV4*0.002;
  LREC2 = LOG(JUV1);
  Disc_Bay = 0.1 * BayD; /* Bay Discard Mortality Rate */
  Disc_Cst = 0.1 * CstD; /* Cst Discard Mortality Rate */
  do Age = 10 to 0 by -1; /* COMPUTE F's AND Z's */

    M_Age = L_Age{BayR}; /* Mean age at min length (Bay) */
    D_Age = M_Age - Age; /* Delta age */
    if 0 < D_Age < 0.5 then do; /* Sublegal during all or part of */
      Ratio = D_Age / 0.5; /* the first half the the year. */
      FPrimeB1 = Disc_Bay * Ratio; /* F prime 1st half the year */
      FPrimeB2 = 0; /* F prime 2nd half the year */
      BayF1 = BayF*0.5 * (1.0-Ratio); /* F 1st half the year */
      BayF2 = BayF*0.5; /* F 2nd half the year */
    end;
    else if D_Age >= 0.5 then do; /* Sublegal during all or part of */
      if D_Age > 1.0 then D_Age = 1.0; /* the second half the the year. */
      Ratio = (D_Age-0.5) / 0.5;
      FPrimeB1 = Disc_Bay; /* F prime 1st half the year */
      FPrimeB2 = Disc_Bay * Ratio; /* F prime 2nd half the year */
      BayF1 = 0; /* F 1st half the year */
      BayF2 = BayF*0.5 * (1.0-Ratio); /* F 2nd half the year */
    end;
  end;
end;

```

```

else do;
    FPrimeB1 = 0;
    FPrimeB2 = 0;
    BayF1 = BayF*0.5;
    BayF2 = BayF*0.5;
end;

M_Age = L_Age{CstR};
D_Age = M_Age - Age;
if 0 < D_Age < 0.5 then do;
    Ratio = D_Age / 0.5;
    FPrimeC1 = Disc_Cst * Ratio;
    FPrimeC2 = 0;
    CstF1 = CstF*0.5 * (1.0-Ratio);
    CstF2 = CstF*0.5;
end;
else if D_Age >= 0.5 then do;
    if D_Age > 1.0 then D_Age = 1.0;
    Ratio = (D_Age-0.5) / 0.5;
    FPrimeC1 = Disc_Cst;
    FPrimeC2 = Disc_Cst * Ratio;
    CstF1 = 0;
    CstF2 = CstF*0.5 * (1.0-Ratio);
end;
else do;
    FPrimeC1 = 0;
    FPrimeC2 = 0;
    CstF1 = CstF*0.5;
    CstF2 = CstF*0.5;
end;

if year > 1993
then
FB1 = BayF1*RcrBb{Age} + FPrimeB1*RcrBb{Age}; /* Bay F 1st half of year*/
else FB1=BAYF1*RCRB{AGE} + FPRIMEB1*RCRB{AGE};
IF YEAR>1993 THEN
FB2 = BayF2*RcrBb{Age} + FPrimeB2*RcrBb{Age}; /* Bay F 2nd half of year*/
ELSE FB2= BAYF2*RCRB{AGE}+FPRIMEB1*RCRB{AGE};
IF YEAR> 1993
THEN
FC1 = CstF1*RcrCc{Age} + FPrimeC1*RcrCc{Age}; /* Cst F 1st half of year*/
ELSE FC1= CSTF1*RCRC{AGE}+FPRIMEC1*RCRC{AGE};
IF YEAR>1993
THEN
FC2 = CstF2*RcrCc{Age} + FPrimeC2*RcrCc{Age}; /* Cst F 2nd half of year*/
ELSE FC2= CSTF2*RCRC{AGE}+FPRIMEC2*RCRC{AGE};

If AGE < 3 THEN ZB1= (0.10/2)+FB1;
ELSE ZB1 = (M/2) + FB1;
IF AGE < 3 THEN ZB2 = (0.10/2) + FB2; /* Bay Z 1st half of year */
ELSE ZB2 = (M/2) + FB2; /* Bay Z 2nd half of year */
IF AGE < 3 THEN ZC1 = (0.10/2) + FC1; /* Cst Z 1st half of year */
ELSE ZC1 = (M/2) + FC1; /* Cst Z 1st half of year */
IF AGE < 3 THEN ZC2 = (0.10/2) + FC2; /* Cst Z 2nd half of year */
ELSE ZC2 = (M/2) + FC2; /* Cst Z 2nd half of year */

/* BIRTH, DEATH, MIGRATION */

```



```

if Age > 0 then BayPop{Age}=BayPop{Age-1}; /* Celebrate Bay Birthday */
else BayPop{Age} = juv1; /* New Year Class */
Survive = exp(-ZB1*0.5) * BayPop{Age}; /* Bay survivors 1st half */
Deaths1 = BayPop{Age} - Survive; /* Deaths 1st half of year */
Catch1 = (BayF1/ZB1) * Deaths1; /* Catch 1st half of year */
Migrate = Survive * (1.0-Mig{Age}); /* Nbrs migrate to coast */
Survive = Survive - Migrate; /* Bay Surv after migrate */
BayPop{Age} = exp(-ZB2*0.5) * Survive; /* Bay Surv at end of year */
Deaths2 = Survive - BayPop{Age}; /* Deaths 2nd half of year */
Catch2 = (BayF2/ZB2) * Deaths2; /* Catch 2nd half of year */

BayDeath = Deaths1 + Deaths2; /* Bay death and destruction */
BayCatch = Catch1 + Catch2; /* Bay catch */

if Age > 0 then CstPop{Age}=CstPop{Age-1}; /* Celebrate Coast Birthday */
Survive = exp(-ZC1*0.5) * CstPop{Age}; /* Cst survivors 1st half */
Deaths1 = CstPop{Age} - Survive; /* Deaths 1st half of year */
Catch1 = (CstF1/ZC1) * Deaths1; /* Catch 1st half of year */
Survive = Survive + Migrate; /* Cst Surv after immigrate */
CstPop{Age} = exp(-ZC2*0.5) * Survive; /* Cst Surv at end of year */
Deaths2 = Survive - CstPop{Age}; /* Deaths 2nd half of year */
Catch2 = (CstF2/ZC2) * Deaths2; /* Catch 2nd half of year */

/* ACCUMULATE TOTALS */
CstDeath = Deaths1 + Deaths2; /* Cst death and destruction */
CstCatch = Catch1 + Catch2; /* Cst catch */
Catch = BayCatch + CstCatch; /* Cst & Bay Catch */

N_Bay = BayPop{Age}; /* debug */
N_Cst = CstPop{Age}; /* debug */

Wt = 9.1*(1-exp(-0.15*(Age-0.68)))**3.0; /* Weight at Age */
SSB = (CstPop{Age}+BayPop{Age})*Wt*Mat{Age}; /* Spawning stock biomass */
BES = BAYPOP{AGE}*PER{AGE}*wt; /* EXPLOITABLE STOCK BIOMASS */
CES = CSTPOP{AGE}*WT*PER{AGE}; /* EXPLOIABLE STOCK BIOMASS */
BAYIELD = WT* BAYCATCH;
COASTYLD= WT*CSTCATCH;
YIELD = BAYIELD + COASTYLD;

TSSB + SSB; /* Total Spawning Stock Biomass*/

TBES + BES;
TCES + CES;
STK =TBES+TCES;
TBayCat + BayCatch;
TCstCat + CstCatch;
TCatch + Catch;
TN_Cst + N_Cst;
TN_BAY + N_BAY;
TBAYLD+ BAYIELD;
TCOASTYD+COASTYLD;
TYIELD+YIELD;
MT = 78.31+999.27*TYIELD;
IF TCATCH > 0 THEN
WEIGHT = TYIELD/TCATCH;
PROP = TCES/TN_CST;
Z = CSTF+M;
FZ = CSTF/Z;
output Debug;

```

```

end; /* do Age */

output Model;

TSSB=0;   TBayCat=0; TBAYLD=0; TYIELD=0;
TCatch=0; TCstCat=0; TCOASTYD=0;
TN_Cst =0; TBES=0; TCES=0; TN_BAY=0;

end; /* do Year */

stop;
run;

*-----*
| Print the Results                                     |
*-----*
title1 " TABLE 1.weakfish PROJECTION (TOTAL STOCK) MODEL FOR coast-wide stock
1980-2020, M IS FIXED";

title2 "Age-Specific Model Parameters";
proc print data=PopParms NOOBS;
  id Age;
run;

title2 "HARVEST CONTROL Summary Statistics, M FIXED, STOCK BASED THE 1970-2008
REC 0";
proc print data=Model NOOBS;
where year > (&frstyear + &maxage-1);
  VAR YEAR CSTF  M Juv1 tssb TN_CST TCES WEIGHT  Z FZ ;
run;

PROC CHART DATA= MODEL;
WHERE YEAR> (&FRSTYEAR + &MAXAGE -1);
VBAR YEAR/DISCRETE SUMVAR = Tssb;
TITLE'FIGURE 1. SIMULATED WEAKFISH SSB UNDER CURRENT MINIMUM SIZE LIMITS';
TITLE2'FROM COASTAL POPULATION UNDER A FIXED M FROM 1980 TO 2020';
RUN;

PROC CHART DATA = MODEL;
WHERE YEAR> (&FRSTYEAR + &MAXAGE -1);
  VBAR YEAR/DISCRETE SUMVAR = TCES;
  TITLE' FIGURE 2.TREND IN PROPORTION OF AGES 8+ WEAKFISH UNDER CURRENT SIZE
LIMITS)';
  TITLE2'FROM THE COASTAL POPULATION UNDER A FIXED M FROM 1980 TO 2020 ';
  RUN;

/*

PROC CHART DATA= MODEL;
WHERE YEAR> (&FRSTYEAR + &MAXAGE -1);
VBAR YEAR/DISCRETE SUMVAR = TBES;
TITLE'FIGURE 1. SIMULATED REC CATCH (#-RELATIVE UNITS) OF PRE-MIGRANT BASS';
TITLE2'FROM UPPER BAY,1982 TO 2004 UNDER TIME VARYING M FROM 1982 TO 2011';
title3' sex ratio of landings assumed to be 80% males';
RUN;

PROC CHART DATA = MODEL;

```

```

WHERE YEAR> (&FRSTYEAR + &MAXAGE -1);
VBAR YEAR/DISCRETE SUMVAR = TN_BAY;
TITLE' FIGURE 2.TREND IN TOTAL STRIPER population in number';
TITLE2'FROM UPPER BAY MARYLAND FROM 1982 TO 2011 ';
RUN;

```

```

PROC NLIN METHOD = MARQUARDT HOUGAARD DATA= MODEL;
WHERE YEAR> (&FRSTYEAR + &MAXAGE-1);
PARMS A = 0.5, B = -0.0000002;
BOUNDS A>0, B<0;
RJ= A*TSSB*exp(-b*tssb);
MODEL LREC = LOG(RJ);
OUTPUT OUT = SHEP P =PRED R=RESID;
QUIT;
DATA SHEP;
SET SHEP;
RP = EXP(PRED);
PROC PLOT DATA= SHEP;
PLOT rec*TSSB = 'O' RP*TSSB = 'P'/OVERLAY;
QUIT;
PROC MEANS DATA= MODEL;
VAR JUV1 JUV2 JUV3 JUV4 JUV5 REC;
Run;

```

```

title2 "Year Class Statistics-BAY";
proc print data=Debug;
by Year;
id Age;
var N_Bay ZB1 ZB2 BAYF1 BAYF2 BayDeath BayCatch Migrate
BAYIELD BES SSB;
sum N_Bay BayDeath BayCatch Migrate BAYIELD
BES CES SSB;
format N_Bay BayDeath BayCatch Migrate
BAYIELD BES SSB 9.5;
run;

```

```

title2 "Year Class Statistics-COAST";
proc print data=Debug;
by Year;
id Age;
var N_Cst ZC1 ZC2 CSTF1 CSTF2 CstDeath CstCatch COASTYLD CES SSB ;
sum N_Cst CstDeath CstCatch COASTYLD CES SSB;
format N_Cst CstDeath CstCatch COASTYLD CES SSB 9.5;
run;

```

## **Appendix C-4**

### **Weakfish** **CPUE estimates calculated with GLM and GAM standardizations**

Andreas Winter<sup>1</sup>, Hao Yu<sup>1</sup>, Rob O'Reilly<sup>2</sup>, Don Orth<sup>1</sup>, Jim Berkson<sup>1</sup> and Yan Jiao<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Tech University

<sup>2</sup> Virginia Marine Resources Commission

**SAW/SARC 48**  
**June 1-4, 2009**  
**Woods Hole, MA**

## Abstract

Current management of weakfish in the US is hampered by disparities among the various survey catch rate indices that are used for stock assessment. To improve consistency among the indices we calculated standardizations of catch rate based on geographic and environmental data collected in each survey, using generalized linear models (GLM) and generalized additive models (GAM). Results of the analyses showed that GAM gives better fit for modeling weakfish catch rates than GLM. Comparisons by cross-correlation showed that standardization with GAM or GLM improved consistency (positively or negatively) among most surveys when high or low years were correlated. Juvenile weakfish surveys tended to have higher positive correlation than adult surveys.

## Introduction

Weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*) is a commercially and recreationally valuable migratory fish that inhabits the western Atlantic coastal waters from Nova Scotia to northern Florida. Current management of weakfish in the US is hampered by disparities among the survey catch rate indices collected by various state agencies that are included in the stock assessments. The disparities include different gear types that are used, different variables that are measured, and different methods for summarizing data; e.g., arithmetic vs. geometric mean catches. Many spatial, temporal, and environmental factors are known to influence the catch rates of fishes, and standardizing catch rate indices in relation to these factors improves their utility in stock assessments (Harley et al. 2001; Maunder and Punt 2004). Our objective in this paper is therefore to develop standardizations of weakfish catch rate indices using generalized linear and/or generalized additive models, in an effort to increase the consistency of the catch rate indices among different survey databases.

## Methods

Catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) estimates of weakfish are compiled from survey data provided by state, inter-state, and federal agencies along the Atlantic coast. All available survey databases comprise differences in the time range covered, sampling intensity, the gear that was used, and the environmental and geographic variables that were measured along with weakfish catches. Therefore, available survey databases were used opportunistically to calculate weakfish CPUE estimates on the scale of inter-annual (yearly) variation and the scale of annual (usually monthly) variation. CPUE estimates were calculated by numbers of weakfish using four methods: arithmetic mean ( $\bar{N}$  where  $N$  is the number of weakfish caught per sample for, e.g., a given year in a given survey), geometric mean ( $\exp(\log(N + 1)) - 1$ , Gottschall et al. 2008), generalized linear model GLM (McCullagh and Nelder 1989), and generalized additive model GAM (Wood 2006).

GLM and GAM were calculated using the environmental and geographic variables of the surveys as predictor variables. Geographic coordinates (i.e., latitude and longitude), when available, were particularly important because Moran's Index tests (Moran, 1950) calculated on several survey data sets showed strong spatial autocorrelation among catch samples. Variables that were not significant in the GLM or GAM models (model coefficients  $p \geq 0.10$ ) were removed by backward selection. Variables were also excluded if they were missing from >20% of samples, or reduced the total number of useable samples by >20% (e.g., two variables might be missing from just 15% of samples each, but if they were non-overlapping so as to reduce the total number of useable samples by 30%, then the lesser significant of the two would be excluded). Because of high proportions of zero catches in many surveys, GLM and GAM were calculated using a delta-lognormal approach (Lo et al. 1992), as follows: presence or absence (0/1) of weakfish catch, and catch numbers of only

positive catch, were first analyzed separately by either GLM or GAM. Presence / absence was modeled on the binomial distribution, while positive catches were log-transformed and modeled on the normal distribution. Fit of the log positive catches to the normal distribution was verified by chi-square tests. The year (or month) effects in both the presence/absence and the positive catch models were extracted by setting all other variables to their median (Maunder and Punt 2004) and calculating the sum of variables  $\times$  their GLM (or GAM) coefficients. The presence / absence proportions and positive catch model predictions were then back-transformed to linear domain, and multiplied together to give relative estimates of yearly (or monthly) average CPUE. GLM and GAM values were scaled to the arithmetic means of each survey. Year and month were always treated as categorical variables in the analyses. Environmental and geographic variables were treated as continuous unless otherwise noted in the survey summaries, below. For each survey, the goodness of fit of the GLM and GAM were compared by the Akaike information criterion (AIC; Akaike 1973).

## Results

### Catch rate standardization

GLM and GAM yearly standardizations of catch rate indices are summarized in Table 1 for the three coast-wide surveys (NMFS, MRFSS, and SEAMAP), in Table 2 for the adult surveys (RI, NJ, DE, MD and NC), and in Table 3 for juvenile surveys (CT, NY, DE, VIMS, NC and Maryland ‘blue crab’). Time series of yearly log-transformed standardized CPUE are also plotted together in Figures 1 and 2. The designation of an ‘adult’ survey actually means that all age classes were targeted. Each survey is separately described below and all versions of its yearly and monthly indices (arithmetic mean, geometric mean, GLM, GAM) are listed in the Appendix. Numbers of samples in the Appendix tables refer to useable samples, i.e., after data were edited for errors or omissions. Significance values of GLM and GAM variables for each survey, together with  $R^2$  of the models, are also summarized as tables in the Appendix.

#### *NMFS*

The NMFS fall survey by the NEFSC includes 1894 samples from 1972 to 2006 (Tables A1 and A2), taken with a Yankee #36 bottom trawl (18 m headrope, 24 m footrope). Samples were geographically referenced by latitude and longitude (range: 34.90 to 41.60° N and 69.52 to 76.07° W), and depth and bottom temperature were measured in the survey as environmental variables. Both depth and bottom temperature were included in the GLM and GAM analyses. However, bottom temperature was not recorded for 328 samples, reducing the total number of data entries analyzed to 1566. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A3.

Log catch rate generally increased from south to north and decreased from west to east (i.e., nearshore to offshore) (Fig. 3).

#### *MRFSS*

The MRFSS survey includes 13477 samples for weakfish from 1981 to 2007 (Tables A4 and A5). Catch and effort data are collected by telephone interview and angler intercept sampling (see [www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/overview/overview.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/overview/overview.html) for procedures and data access). Samples, coming from recreational fishers, did not have latitude and longitude data but were referenced to the state where the catch was taken. We used state as an ordinal index from south to north: FL = 1, GA = 2, SC = 3, NC = 4, VA = 5, MD = 6, DE = 7, NJ = 8, NY = 9, CT = 10, RI = 11, MA = 12, NH = 13, ME = 14, and treated this index as a continuous variable in the GLM and

GAM analyses. The approximate distance from shore of the catch was categorized in the MRFS survey as “inland”, “ocean  $\leq 3$  mi.”, “ocean  $> 3$  mi.”, and in a few cases “ocean  $\leq 10$  mi.”, or “ocean  $> 10$  mi.”. We likewise transferred these categories to an ordinal index as distances 1, 2, 3, 6.67, and 10 respectively, and treated this index as a continuous variable. However, for GAM this index had to be excluded because it resulted in too few distinct values for smoothing. The one other variable available for analysis of these data (and used for both GLM and GAM) was the fishing mode, consisting of categories “beach/bank”, “man made”, “private/rental”, “party/charter”, “shore”, and “charter”. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A6.

The along-coast state index showed a parabolic relationship to log catch rate: catch increased south-to-north until approximately the mid-Atlantic, the decreased again further north (Fig. 4).

### *SEAMAP*

The SEAMAP survey database includes 4388 samples from 1990 to 2006 (Tables A7 and A8), collected from tows of paired 22.9-m mongoose-type Falcon trawl nets (ASMFC 2000). Samples ranged from 28.76 to 35.23° N and 75.59 to 81.44° W, and environmental variables included depth, bottom temperature, and bottom salinity. However, bottom temperature was excluded from GLM as non-significant, and both bottom temperature and depth were excluded from GAM as non-significant. Three samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A9.

Log catch rate increased south-to-north from approximately 31°N to 33°N, and generally decreased west to east (Fig. 5).

### *RI fall trawl survey*

The RI fall trawl survey collected 565 samples from 1979 to 2007 (Tables A10 and A11). This survey did not report any zero catches, and therefore the presence / absence component of the GLM and GAM analyses was not used. Latitude and longitude were not given but data were indexed by area (Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island Sound, Block Island Sound), and 11 strata nested within areas. Numbers of samples per strata were very uneven (6 strata had  $< 10$  data, 4 strata had between 15 and 69 data, and one stratum had 389 data). Therefore strata were not used for analysis, but area was used as a categorical variable. Since both other available variables (year and month) were categorical too, only GLM was calculated. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A12.

### *NJ trawl survey*

The New Jersey trawl survey collected 3430 samples from 1988 to 2006 (Tables A13 and A14). Samples were referenced by start latitude and longitude and end latitude and longitude, which were averaged per sample. Average latitude and longitude ranged from 38.52 to 40.48° N and from 73.74 to 75.05° W. Other recorded variables included start depth, end depth, minimum depth, and maximum depth, which were averaged per trawl, and tow duration. Average depth was significant and used in both GLM and GAM analyses, while tow duration was not significant. Significance values of variables in the model are given in Table A15.

Log catch rate increased south to north and decreased west to east (Fig. 6).

### *DE 30-ft trawl survey*

The Delaware 30-ft trawl survey collected 2246 samples from 1966 to 2007. Years 1972-1973, 1975-1978, and 1985-1989 were skipped (Tables A16 and A17). Beginning and end latitude and

longitude were averaged per sample, and average latitude and longitude ranged from 38.80 to 39.39° N and from 75.02 to 75.48° W. Variables depth, tow duration, bottom salinity and bottom temperature were included in both GLM and GAM analyses. Surface salinity, surface temperature, surface DO, and bottom DO were excluded from the analyses as non-significant. Variables of weather, tide, and sea state were not examined. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A18. 151 samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries.

Log catch rate increased and decreased variably with latitude, albeit over a survey range of only 0.6 degrees. Log catch rate decreased with longitude from 75.3°W to 75.1°W (Fig. 7).

#### *MD coastal bay survey*

The Maryland coastal bay survey included 956 samples from 1972 to 2007. Samples were taken by beach seine (BCHS), bottom trawl (BTRW), and 25-ft trawl (T25). BTRW accounted for 879 of the samples (92%) and therefore only samples by this method were used, to prevent a confounding gear factor. Bottom trawls were not taken in the years 1974, 1983, and 1988 (only beach seines were taken), and therefore these years are excluded from the analyses (Tables A19 and A20). This survey did not report any zero catches, and therefore the presence / absence component of the GLM and GAM analyses was not used. The 20 different sample sites were the only catch information besides date included in the data file, and were used as a categorical variable. Since only categorical variables were available for analysis, only GLM was used. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A21.

#### *NC Pamlico Sound Gillnet survey*

The North Carolina Pamlico Sound survey collected 2142 samples from 2001 to 2007 (Tables A22 and A23). Sample latitude and longitude ranged from 35.05 to 35.82° N and 75.47 to 76.52° W. Environmental variables measured in the surveys included depth, bottom temperature, DO, and salinity, and surface temperature, DO, and salinity. Bottom temperature, bottom DO and surface temperature were not significant and excluded from GLM, while bottom DO and surface temperature were not significant and excluded from GAM. Significance values of variables used in the models are given in Table A24. 45 samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries.

Log catch rate decreased slightly with latitude increasing from 35.6 to 35.8°N. Log catch rate increased slightly west to east from 76.4°W to 75.8°W, then decreased from 75.8°W to 75.5°W (Fig. 8).

#### *Connecticut trawl survey*

The Connecticut trawl survey collected 3492 samples from 1989 to 2008, except 1991 (Tables A25 and A26). Sample latitude and longitude ranged from 40.87 to 41.33° N and from 71.19 to 73.71° W. Environmental variables in the surveys included depth, tow duration, surface temperature, salinity, DO and conductivity, and bottom temperature, salinity, DO and conductivity. Bottom type was also scored in the survey but was not considered for analysis. Bottom DO and conductivity and surface DO and conductivity had too few measures to be included in analyses. Bottom salinity and bottom temperature were not significant and excluded from GLM, while bottom salinity was not significant and excluded from GAM. 294 additional samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries in the environmental variables. Significance values of variables used in the models are given in Table A27.

Log catch rate varied intermittently with latitude over the range of the survey (40.8°N to



41.4°N). Log catch rate first increased slightly then decreased with longitude west to east (Fig. 9).

#### *NY juvenile trawl survey*

The New York juvenile trawl survey collected 8092 samples from 1987 to 2007 (Tables A28 and A29). Latitude and longitude were not included in the data file, but samples were referenced to 77 stations. No other environmental variables were included in the data file. Since only the categorical variables year, month, and station were available, only GLM was calculated. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A30.

#### *DE 16-ft trawl survey*

The Delaware 16-ft trawl survey, targeted on juvenile fish, includes 7228 samples from 1980 to 2007 (Tables A31 and A32). Beginning latitude and longitude and ending latitude and longitude were averaged per sample. Average latitude and longitude ranged from 38.88 to 39.75° N and 75.21 to 75.60° W. Variables included depth, tow duration, surface temperature, surface salinity, and surface dissolved oxygen (DO). Surface DO and surface salinity were not significant and excluded from GLM, while depth, duration, and surface DO were not significant and excluded from GAM. 757 samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A33.

Log catch rate decreased south to north from 39.3°N to 39.5°N, and decreased west to east from 75.5°W to 75.4°W (Fig. 10).

#### *VIMS y-o-y trawl survey*

The VIMS young-of-year trawl survey collected 20877 samples from 1988 to 2007 (Tables A34 and A35). Sample latitude and longitude ranged from 36.85 to 38.19° N and from 75.73 to 76.98° W. Variables included trawl depth, Secchi depth (water transparency), temperature, salinity and DO, and, as a categorical variable, the river the sample was taken from. Salinity and Secchi depth were not significant and were excluded from GLM and GAM analyses. 1043 samples were removed from analyses due to missing data entries. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A36.

Log catch rate increased and decreased variably with latitude, and generally decreased with longitude over the range of the survey (Fig. 11).

#### *NC juvenile trawl survey*

The North Carolina juvenile trawl survey collected 1685 samples from 1987 to 2007 (Tables A37 and A38). Sample latitude and longitude ranged from 34.95 to 36.08° N and from 75.52 to 76.97° W. This survey did not report any zero catches, and therefore the presence / absence component of the GLM and GAM analyses was not used. Survey variables included depth, surface temperature, DO and salinity, and bottom temperature, DO and salinity. Bottom temperature, surface temperature and surface salinity, as well as latitude, were not significant and excluded from the GLM analysis. Depth, bottom temperature, surface temperature and surface salinity were excluded from the GAM analysis. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A39.

Log catch rate peaked at the intermediate latitude over the range of the survey (approx. 35°N to 36.1°N). Log catch rate increased with longitude from 77°W to 75.8°W, then decreased with longitude from 75.8°W to 75.5°W (Fig. 12).

#### *Maryland Chesapeake "blue crab" survey*

The Maryland “blue crab” survey collected 1190 samples from 1989 to 2008 (Tables A40 and A41). Latitude and longitude were not included in the data file, but samples were assigned to nine areas. The areas were treated as categorical variables. The survey also recorded wind speed, salinity, depth and temperature measurements. However, all combinations of these environmental variables were either not significant or excluded too many samples through missing data. Only the categorical variables year, month, and area were analyzed, and therefore only GLM was calculated. The survey had too few zero catches (<7%) to derive a presence / absence model that converged, and therefore only a single CPUE model in the normal distribution was calculated. Catches were log-transformed as  $\log(N + 1)$  instead of  $\log(N)$  to include the zero catches that were recorded. Significance values of model variables are given in Table A42.

### **Comparison between GLM and GAM models**

AIC values calculated from GAM were lower than AIC values from GLM for all survey CPUE indices in which the two models could be compared, except one (Delaware 16 ft. trawl; Table 4). As noted for some individual surveys, above, GAM cannot be calculated when only categorical data are available to include in the model. In all cases in Table 4, the presence/absence models were more improved by using GAM vs. GLM than the positive catch models (for example, for the NMFS survey the ratio of GLM over GAM AIC for presence/absence is  $11998.2/10206.5 \cong 1.18$ ; an improvement of 18%, the ratio of GLM over GAM AIC for positive catch is  $12433.3/11628.0 \cong 1.07$ ; an improvement of 7%). The results suggest that GAM is better than GLM for modeling catch rates of weakfish. Therefore GAM was used in the following consistency analyses.

### **Consistency among indices**

Log catch rate generally increased south-to-north and decreased west-to-east over surveys spanning at least 2° of latitude or longitude respectively. Spatially more restricted surveys were more variable.

Cross-correlation analyses of yearly CPUE indices showed no consistent pattern of positive or negative correlation among adult surveys, for either geometric mean or GAM/GLM standardized CPUE indices. GAM/GLM standardized CPUEs more frequently showed negative correlations than geometric mean CPUEs, especially in the SEAMAP and Maryland surveys. Most correlations were not very strong, with only 4 geometric correlations and 3 GAM/GLM correlations  $> \pm 0.5$  (Tables 5 and 6). However, pair-wise plots of the adult surveys’ CPUE indices suggest that correlations are stronger when only salient years are considered, i.e., those years in which catches were higher or lower than usual. Figure 13 shows the geometric and GAM/GLM pair-wise plots of the NMFS survey vs. the other adult surveys; in effect the data corresponding to the first row or column of Tables 5 and 6. On each plot a subsample was selected by eye, consisting of a block of the data that were highest or lowest on the x-axis and highest or lowest on the y-axis. These data are shaded in black on each plot and fitted with a linear regression. Subsamples were selected separately for the geometric and GAM/GLM indices of each survey pair, but with the constraint that they had to have the same number of data, and could only be selected by making one ‘cut’ along each axis. For example (Figure 13, top row), low NMFS CPUE co-occurred with any size of MRFSS CPUE, but high NMFS CPUE only co-occurred with low MRFSS CPUE. The linear regressions indicate that indices of salient years correlated more strongly with GAM/GLM standardization than with geometric mean for the NMFS survey vs. MRFSS, SEAMAP, RI, NJ, and DE, and less strongly or indifferently for the NMFS survey vs. MD and NC. Among all adult survey pairs, GAM/GLM indices of salient years correlated more strongly than geometric indices of salient years in 14 of 28

comparisons, and correlated more poorly in 4 comparisons (Tables 7 and 8). More strongly correlated GAM/GLM indices occurred especially in the NMFS and MRFSS surveys.

Among juvenile surveys, cross-correlations were positive for geometric indices in 13 of 15 comparisons, and positive for GAM/GLM standardized indices in 14 of 15 comparisons (Tables 9 and 10). GAM/GLM standardized indices were more strongly positive than the corresponding geometric indices in 10 of the 15 comparisons.

## Discussion

The 14 surveys analyzed in this study presented a high diversity in their patterns of inter-annual CPUE variability. Coast-wide and adult surveys showed relatively little consistency in their tendencies to be positively or negatively correlated with each other, for both geometric mean and GAM/GLM standardized indices. When only years of higher or lower than usual CPUE were considered, GAM/GLM correlations were typically stronger than geometric mean correlations, suggesting that exceptionally strong or weak yearly catches occur in relation to geographic and environmental conditions, while average yearly catches don't. Of the three broadest surveys, NMFS and SEAMAP were positively correlated with each other over salient (high/low) years, while both were negatively correlated with MRFSS. Although it can't be verified from the available data, a possible explanation for this pattern is that weakfish were further inshore some years and more likely to be taken in the recreational fishery, while further offshore in other years and more likely to be captured in the surveys.

Juvenile surveys showed much more consistently positive cross-correlations than adult surveys. This suggests that the inconsistency among adult surveys may largely be due to variability in the age class distributions that different surveys – using different equipment – capture. In addition, some of the state-wide surveys that are more restricted to nearshore embayments may have captured local subpopulations (e.g., Thorrold et al. 2001) that are more distinct from each other than the overall weakfish stock. More detailed analyses of size/age distributions within the different surveys will likely be useful in resolving these questions.

## References

- Akaike H. 1973. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. 2<sup>nd</sup> International symposium on information theory. p 267- 281.
- ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 2000. SEAMAP-SA 10-year trawl report: results of trawling efforts in the coastal habitat of the South Atlantic bight, FY 1990-1999. Special Report No. 71 of the ASMFC. 153 p.
- Gottschall KF, Pacileo DJ, Molnar DR. 2008. Job 2: Marine finfish survey. In: A Study of Marine Recreational Fisheries in Connecticut. Annual Performance Report, State of Connecticut, Dept. of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Natural Resources, Marine Fisheries Division. 206 p.
- Harley SJ, Myers RA, Dunn A. 2001. Is catch-per-unit-effort proportional to abundance? *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 58:1760-1772.
- Lo NC-h, Jacobson LD, Squire JL. 1992. Indices of relative abundance from fish spotter data based on delta-lognormal models. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* 49: p 2515-2526.
- Maunder MN, Punt AE. 2004. Standardizing catch and effort data: a review of recent approaches. *Fish Res.* 70: p 141-159.
- McCullagh P, Nelder JA. 1989. Generalized linear models (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Chapman and Hall, London.

- Moran, P.A.P. 1950. Notes on continuous stochastic phenomena. *Biometrika*. 37: p17-23.
- Thorrold SR, Latkoczy C, Swart PK, Jones CM. 2001. Natal homing in a marine fish metapopulation. *Science* 291: p 297-299.
- Wood SN. 2006. Generalized additive models. An introduction with R. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida.

Table 1. Summary of yearly GLM and GAM CPUE standardizations for coast-wide weakfish surveys.

Year	NMFS		MRFSS		SEAMAP	
	GLM	GAM	GLM	GAM	GLM	GAM
1972	45.696	160.871				
1973	134.668	95.469				
1974	79.345	62.627				
1975	93.467	120.150				
1976	208.078	252.409				
1977	104.461	89.489				
1978	125.966	162.478				
1979	132.597	160.136				
1980	190.607	115.854				
1981	75.968	82.151	0.098	0.148		
1982	136.621	83.983	0.045	0.064		
1983	103.618	123.044	0.101	0.136		
1984	298.990	265.316	0.182	0.089		
1985	292.836	201.726	0.236	0.108		
1986	131.395	108.814	0.207	0.173		
1987	29.230	28.933	0.145	0.131		
1988	14.217	10.200	0.115	0.080		
1989	145.636	133.904	0.078	0.066		
1990	121.816	83.889	0.071	0.054	16.558	44.204
1991	87.236	64.502	0.080	0.073	10.587	34.687
1992	49.265	42.708	0.056	0.053	9.514	35.278
1993	34.159	43.714	0.102	0.082	4.268	17.896
1994	216.526	190.233	0.129	0.143	4.980	20.190
1995	388.507	384.356	0.123	0.131	8.612	30.480
1996	176.093	185.752	0.199	0.169	11.245	35.217
1997	46.998	35.781	0.168	0.183	5.431	20.529
1998	54.462	47.842	0.161	0.179	8.195	32.341
1999	342.856	340.655	0.121	0.174	6.143	22.384
2000	214.908	191.984	0.166	0.196	11.188	33.146
2001	93.215	105.926	0.102	0.120	17.469	46.824
2002	204.121	240.488	0.102	0.115	4.637	20.967
2003	707.552	593.502	0.043	0.050	11.559	40.473
2004	255.548	263.958	0.098	0.115	13.528	41.899
2005	241.607	256.965	0.079	0.109	7.881	32.597
2006	600.830	849.290	0.052	0.091	10.070	38.306
2007			0.033	0.062		

Table 2. Summary of yearly GLM and GAM CPUE standardizations for states' adult weakfish surveys.

Year	NJ			DE		MD	NC	
	RI	GLM	GAM	GLM	GAM	GLM	GLM	GAM
1966				246.840	121.522			
1967				136.597	93.710			
1968				63.825	81.686			
1969				169.587	144.138			
1970				234.109	152.384			
1971				368.205	210.422			
1972						4.604		
1973						5.698		
1974				64.298	27.112			
1975						52.877		
1976						86.563		
1977						4.564		
1978						29.689		
1979	12.145			26.813	51.640	11.244		
1980	46.050			17.057	37.644	22.791		
1981	58.100			13.978	32.445	104.490		
1982	57.910			36.012	54.971	39.662		
1983	16.858			32.232	60.836			
1984	38.980			23.216	24.105	5.391		
1985	34.956					7.583		
1986	11.610					50.215		
1987	19.358					156.013		
1988	19.568	81.915	8.351			9.765		
1989	10.137	44.501	30.721			15.357		
1990	64.315	26.260	7.088	19.419	39.224	25.501		
1991	34.391	49.852	32.367	74.751	57.253	51.628		
1992	31.508	22.886	30.354	17.617	43.255	31.418		
1993	26.020	28.200	23.772	80.430	99.656	21.295		
1994	87.130	53.636	54.054	49.284	82.335	16.630		
1995	9.295	101.073	153.508	181.130	199.226	16.672		
1996	165.436	148.785	277.406	237.120	293.148	6.487		
1997	108.072	141.378	114.073	140.978	198.421	4.512		
1998	29.996	19.049	21.592	316.731	196.982	9.783		
1999	20.648	37.108	39.913	164.496	245.189	18.591		
2000	32.200	39.814	45.519	125.841	260.535	11.708		
2001	58.833	53.517	31.719	149.125	163.924	21.899	2.678	1.873
2002	33.456	197.973	195.490	204.106	116.800	9.294	1.342	1.468
2003	246.854	92.913	65.222	93.277	142.299	5.881	1.018	1.420
2004	19.180	245.019	220.879	59.774	81.985	8.068	1.058	1.163
2005	105.235	131.107	152.807	32.859	45.505	5.760	1.167	1.292
2006	6.941	22.579	32.730	82.233	105.427	14.340	0.891	0.905
2007	78.251			103.979	91.555		0.506	0.539
2008								

Table 3. Summary of yearly GLM and GAM CPUE standardizations for states' juvenile weakfish surveys.

Year	CT		NY		DE		MD(blue crab)	VIMS		NC	
	GLM	GAM	GLM	GLM	GLM	GAM	GLM	GLM	GAM	GLM	GAM
1980					12.116	9.889					
1981					19.766	17.541					
1982					24.776	24.957					
1983					13.530	12.612					
1984					18.437	28.226					
1985					2.249	24.066					
1986					28.425	27.733					
1987			3.904		20.623	18.753				13.669	13.430
1988			0.977		18.167	22.226		14.276	17.422	17.277	16.481
1989	1.348	0.609	0.152		23.922	24.670	10.276	16.201	11.433	11.305	11.776
1990	0.628	0.554	0.201		25.242	23.848	14.574	14.377	8.567	17.817	15.807
1991			28.780		38.577	40.395	19.394	9.363	8.318	9.872	9.387
1992	0.982	0.585	6.328		40.047	43.430	30.694	15.450	21.378	19.690	18.275
1993	0.836	0.652	1.432		38.966	47.640	22.144	12.418	13.834	14.354	15.324
1994	1.125	1.240	16.677		54.135	61.629	23.681	12.342	13.859	18.676	19.551
1995	0.377	0.460	6.622		45.430	47.161	53.642	16.084	17.908	19.755	19.520
1996	0.760	0.883	56.713		36.791	38.679	46.622	13.819	14.767	23.117	23.806
1997	1.755	1.198	1.705		47.419	52.432	44.013	12.915	15.169	24.530	25.922
1998	0.283	0.914	1.103		32.846	37.557	38.454	10.304	9.545	28.397	27.731
1999			51.880		33.377	36.227	52.043	15.731	17.293	30.380	32.394
2000	1.678	1.672	100.122		63.135	50.196	56.037	16.717	22.554	26.094	26.742
2001	1.552	1.407	42.470		21.618	20.362	69.271	22.344	19.102	14.857	15.245
2002	1.316	0.986	95.765		20.555	18.364	32.382	15.444	14.499	12.362	11.846
2003	0.845	2.001	47.478		31.441	31.460	32.456	11.634	13.983	12.803	13.024
2004	1.181	1.298	6.749		26.766	29.277	15.945	10.504	8.708	18.064	17.821
2005	1.114	1.020	10.111		52.974	49.500	32.193	8.801	8.766	15.963	15.160
2006	0.335	0.440	5.206		17.794	17.814	7.629	13.868	15.705	22.869	23.041
2007	1.530	1.541	105.074		43.132	38.389	5.307	14.628	13.584	18.849	18.415
2008	0.060	0.337					8.355				

Table 4. Comparison of AIC from GLM and GAM for surveys in which both models were used. The lowest AIC by row (for positive catch or presence/absence) is highlighted in yellow.

Surveys	GAM		GLM	
	Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
MRFSS	11628.0	10206.5	12433.3	11998.2
NMFS	3495.9	1866.2	4204.8	2026.7
SEAMAP	7580.2	5260.9	7695.5	5741.7
NJ	4351.8	2683.6	4459.0	2895.0
DE 30	5368.0	1358.4	5466.9	1429.9
CT	2547.5	2028.3	2576.0	2171.8
DE 16	14766.8	4216.0	14680.9	4343.2
VIMS	27277.8	15451.7	27541.2	16781.5
NC juv.	4764.1	*	4837.9	*
NC gill.	1902.0	2414.4	1928.0	2524.7



Table 5. Cross-correlation of annual CPUEs of coastal wide and adult weakfish surveys averaged by geometric mean. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

NMFS	MRFSS	SEAMAP	RI	NJ	DE	MD	NC
1	-0.238	0.235	0.125	0.202	0.202	0.470	-0.600
-0.238	1	-0.209	-0.068	0.154	0.530	0.014	0.805
0.235	-0.209	1	0.414	0.148	0.088	0.265	0.189
0.125	-0.068	0.414	1	0.280	0.290	0.233	0.029
0.202	0.154	0.148	0.280	1	0.491	0.065	-0.278
0.202	0.530	0.088	0.290	0.491	1	0.003	0.374
0.470	0.014	0.265	0.233	0.065	0.003	1	0.655
-0.600	0.805	0.189	0.029	-0.278	0.374	0.655	1

Table 6. Cross-correlation of annual CPUEs of coast-wide and adult weakfish surveys standardized by GAM, or GLM if GAM was not appropriate. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

NMFS	MRFSS	SEAMAP	RI	NJ	DE	MD	NC
1	-0.145	0.206	0.278	0.157	0.226	-0.254	-0.597
-0.145	1	-0.383	-0.091	0.322	0.688	0.074	0.495
0.206	-0.383	1	0.152	-0.054	-0.159	-0.195	0.153
0.278	-0.091	0.152	1	0.294	0.213	-0.158	0.180
0.157	0.322	-0.054	0.294	1	0.259	-0.172	-0.170
0.226	0.688	-0.159	0.213	0.259	1	-0.334	0.544
-0.254	0.074	-0.195	-0.158	-0.172	-0.334	1	0.155
-0.597	0.495	0.153	0.180	-0.170	0.544	0.155	1

Table 7. Cross-correlation of salient annual CPUEs of coastal wide and adult weakfish surveys averaged by geometric mean. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

NMFS	MRFSS	SEAMAP	RI	NJ	DE	MD	NC
1	-0.769	0.787	0.747	-0.590	-0.598	0.980	0.599
-0.769	1	-0.589	-0.515	0.590	0.692	-0.898	0.898
0.787	-0.589	1	0.887	0.642	0.748	0.609	0.295
0.747	-0.515	0.887	1	-0.393	0.627	0.875	0.063
-0.590	0.590	0.642	-0.393	1	0.710	-0.623	0.680
-0.598	0.692	0.748	0.627	0.710	1	0.152	0.528
0.980	-0.898	0.609	0.875	-0.623	0.152	1	0.941
0.599	0.898	0.295	0.063	0.680	0.528	0.941	1

Table 8. Cross-correlation of salient annual CPUEs of coast-wide and adult weakfish surveys standardized by GAM, or GLM if GAM was not appropriate. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

NMFS	MRFSS	SEAMAP	RI	NJ	DE	MD	NC
1	-0.839	0.908	0.867	-0.913	-0.979	-0.960	-0.597
-0.839	1	-0.611	-0.750	0.932	0.890	-0.912	0.896
0.908	-0.611	1	0.884	0.754	0.755	-0.399	0.595
0.867	-0.750	0.884	1	-0.363	0.625	-0.516	0.258
-0.913	0.932	0.754	-0.363	1	0.606	-0.619	0.404
-0.979	0.890	0.755	0.625	0.606	1	-0.671	0.805
-0.960	-0.912	-0.399	-0.516	-0.619	-0.671	1	0.962
-0.597	0.896	0.595	0.258	0.404	0.805	0.962	1

Table 9. Cross-correlation of annual CPUEs of juvenile weakfish surveys averaged by geometric mean. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

CT	NY	DE	MD (blue crab)	VIMS	NC
1	0.364	0.149	0.093	0.182	-0.346
0.364	1	0.070	0.040	0.202	0.312
0.149	0.070	1	0.065	-0.064	0.325
0.093	0.040	0.065	1	0.478	0.458
0.182	0.202	-0.064	0.478	1	0.267
-0.346	0.312	0.325	0.458	0.267	1

Table 10. Cross-correlation of annual CPUEs of juvenile weakfish surveys standardized by GAM or GLM if GAM was not appropriate. Negative correlations are highlighted in yellow.

CT	NY	DE	MD (blue crab)	VIMS	NC
1	0.445	0.132	0.160	0.020	-0.248
0.445	1	0.007	0.217	0.323	0.113
0.132	0.007	1	0.195	0.091	0.336
0.160	0.217	0.195	1	0.583	0.412
0.020	0.323	0.091	0.583	1	0.359
-0.248	0.113	0.336	0.412	0.359	1




Figure 1. Summary of the standardized abundance indices (coast-wide and state adult surveys).




Figure 2. Summary of the standardized abundance indices (state juvenile surveys)




Figure 3. NMFS survey: Effect of latitude and longitude on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 4. MRFS survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 5. SEAMAP survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals




Figure 6. New Jersey survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 7. Delaware 30 ft. trawl survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 8. North Carolina gillnet survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 9. Connecticut survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 10. Delaware 16 ft. trawl survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.






Figure 11. VIMS survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 12. North Carolina juvenile survey: Effect of the along-coast state index on log catch rate. Dotted lines around the trend line represent the 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 13. Pairwise plots of NMFS CPUE indices vs . those of other adult surveys, with black shading indicating the salient (high or low) yearly indices that are most likely to have significant correlations (shown as dotted lines).









Figure 13 cont.







Figure 13 cont.

Appendix.

Table A1. NMFS survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1972	80	57.438	8.592	45.69604	160.8706
1973	72	86.653	7.797	134.6679	95.46888
1974	55	149.891	2.520	79.34548	62.62724
1975	63	59.333	8.419	93.46729	120.1499
1976	49	187.388	20.770	208.0777	252.4089
1977	48	196.167	9.291	104.4608	89.48942
1978	49	296.959	19.023	125.9659	162.4776
1979	47	160.681	15.126	132.5966	160.1355
1980	37	105.459	8.001	190.6066	115.854
1981	50	191.280	9.102	75.96795	82.15111
1982	32	39.313	8.250	136.6211	83.98266
1983	53	55.604	4.663	103.618	123.0438
1984	43	210.209	32.264	298.9904	265.3157
1985	23	30.391	8.129	292.8357	201.726
1986	36	54.833	9.888	131.3955	108.814
1987	13	4.077	0.610	29.23047	28.93322
1988	14	131.214	1.282	14.21662	10.19952
1989	18	47.111	6.323	145.6362	133.9036
1990	18	176.722	3.969	121.816	83.88865
1991	55	90.473	2.283	87.23552	64.50227
1992	31	111.677	4.125	49.26488	42.70775
1993	51	13.451	1.369	34.1585	43.71365
1994	52	141.135	7.231	216.5262	190.2331
1995	40	460.200	141.957	388.5071	384.3564
1996	47	168.915	15.652	176.0929	185.7516
1997	51	37.078	2.903	46.99831	35.78076
1998	47	123.872	7.162	54.46245	47.84231
1999	49	384.612	49.758	342.8563	340.655
2000	51	374.176	21.311	214.9083	191.9837
2001	52	154.788	8.679	93.21527	105.926
2002	53	328.717	25.609	204.1207	240.488
2003	48	586.625	119.729	707.5523	593.5019
2004	44	266.136	30.171	255.5483	263.9581
2005	47	329.383	25.628	241.6068	256.9651
2006	48	290.625	95.527	600.8297	849.2897

Table A2. NMFS survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
9	1113	189.801	70.755	47.367	44.103
10	326	193.699	69.682	34.166	42.889
11	121	40.471	27.985	34.468	52.790
12	6	458.167	187.079	742.952	719.171

Table A3. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the NMFS CPUE. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002	0.425
Depth		< 0.001	0.004	0.043	< 0.001
Bottom temperature		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.635	0.485
Month	9	0.016	0.310	0.026	0.299
	10	0.012	0.323	0.010	0.466
	11	0.004	0.074	0.002	0.191
	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Year	1972	0.038	0.407	0.003	0.310
	1973	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.005	< 0.001
	1974	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1975	0.006	0.008	0.014	0.021
	1976	0.015	0.025	0.047	0.126
	1977	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001	0.022
	1978	< 0.001	0.022	< 0.001	0.041
	1979	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001	0.015
	1980	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001
	1981	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001	0.012
	1982	< 0.001	0.147	0.002	0.989
	1983	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1984	0.003	0.129	0.097	0.418
	1985	0.002	0.048	0.152	0.473
	1986	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.008
	1987	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1988	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1989	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002	0.003
	1990	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1991	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1992	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1993	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1994	< 0.001	< 0.001		< 0.001
	1995	0.031	0.877		0.671
	1996	< 0.001	0.002		0.011
	1997	< 0.001	< 0.001		< 0.001
1998	< 0.001	< 0.001		< 0.001	
1999	0.018	0.136		0.326	
2000	< 0.001	0.001		0.006	
2001	< 0.001	< 0.001		< 0.001	
2002	0.001	0.023		0.059	
2003	0.454	0.679		0.799	
2004	0.004	0.011		0.058	
2005	0.003	0.013		0.033	
2006	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
$R^2$		0.380	0.283	0.251	0.219
Composite $R^2$		0.242		0.181	

Table A4. MRFSS yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1981	462	0.162	0.076	0.098	0.148
1982	498	0.081	0.037	0.045	0.064
1983	496	0.122	0.068	0.101	0.136
1984	537	0.063	0.041	0.182	0.089
1985	552	0.092	0.055	0.236	0.108
1986	475	0.288	0.113	0.207	0.173
1987	451	0.184	0.094	0.145	0.131
1988	441	0.148	0.073	0.115	0.080
1989	467	0.054	0.042	0.078	0.066
1990	468	0.099	0.053	0.071	0.054
1991	465	0.091	0.054	0.080	0.073
1992	457	0.068	0.041	0.056	0.053
1993	451	0.090	0.054	0.102	0.082
1994	485	0.198	0.075	0.129	0.143
1995	478	0.139	0.079	0.123	0.131
1996	467	0.179	0.103	0.199	0.169
1997	481	0.162	0.098	0.168	0.183
1998	474	0.191	0.105	0.161	0.179
1999	476	0.124	0.080	0.121	0.174
2000	483	0.150	0.091	0.166	0.196
2001	486	0.080	0.055	0.102	0.120
2002	488	0.066	0.050	0.102	0.115
2003	500	0.053	0.029	0.043	0.050
2004	483	0.067	0.048	0.098	0.115
2005	651	0.063	0.043	0.079	0.109
2006	645	0.043	0.032	0.052	0.091
2007	660	0.039	0.027	0.033	0.062

Table A5. MRFSS wave (bi-monthly) CPUE averages.

Wave	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1	273	0.028	0.015	0.030	0.085
2	2167	0.018	0.013	0.027	0.028
3	2944	0.117	0.067	0.104	0.089
4	3030	0.111	0.073	0.094	0.115
5	2905	0.238	0.115	0.241	0.193
6	2158	0.038	0.027	0.054	0.039

Table A6. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the MRFSS CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that the area index was not included as a variable in GAM. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
State index		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Area index				< 0.001	< 0.001
Mode	beach/bank	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	charter	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	man made	0.633	< 0.001	0.205	< 0.001
	party	< 0.001	0.986	< 0.001	0.435
	party/charter	< 0.001	0.008	< 0.001	< 0.001
	private/rental	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	shore	0.013	< 0.001	0.003	0.078
Wave	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	0.203	< 0.001	0.037	0.322
	3	0.017	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001
	4	0.005	< 0.001	0.027	< 0.001
	5	0.480	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	6	0.038	0.066	0.016	0.039
Year	1981	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1982	0.124	0.012	0.312	0.008
	1983	0.166	0.184	0.465	0.528
	1984	0.582	0.036	0.872	0.007
	1985	0.024	0.286	0.171	0.699
	1986	0.557	0.090	0.746	0.005
	1987	0.005	0.003	0.119	< 0.001
	1988	0.027	0.568	0.330	0.513
	1989	< 0.001	0.029	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1990	< 0.001	0.594	< 0.001	0.064
	1991	< 0.001	0.203	0.002	0.007
	1992	< 0.001	0.569	< 0.001	0.065
	1993	< 0.001	0.153	0.020	0.007
	1994	0.006	< 0.001	0.115	< 0.001
	1995	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.033	< 0.001
	1996	0.048	< 0.001	0.580	< 0.001
	1997	0.018	< 0.001	0.175	< 0.001
	1998	0.001	< 0.001	0.065	< 0.001
	1999	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.007	< 0.001
	2000	0.006	< 0.001	0.045	< 0.001
2001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001	
2002	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	
2003	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001	< 0.001	
2004	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001	< 0.001	
2005	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.008	< 0.001	
2006	< 0.001	0.004	0.001	< 0.001	
2007	< 0.001	0.017	< 0.001	< 0.001	
$R^2$		0.393	0.313	0.215	0.191
Composite $R^2$		0.052		0.014	



Table A7. SEAMAP yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1990	231	21.381	2.801	16.558	44.204
1991	233	18.339	2.283	10.587	34.687
1992	234	24.906	1.960	9.514	35.278
1993	234	37.333	1.318	4.268	17.896
1994	234	13.107	1.354	4.980	20.190
1995	234	19.000	2.282	8.612	30.480
1996	232	17.289	2.966	11.245	35.217
1997	234	15.991	1.487	5.431	20.529
1998	234	44.893	2.854	8.195	32.341
1999	234	16.415	1.712	6.143	22.384
2000	234	14.239	2.012	11.188	33.146
2001	306	24.072	3.244	17.469	46.824
2002	303	10.904	1.258	4.637	20.967
2003	302	28.805	3.759	11.559	40.473
2004	302	62.288	3.495	13.528	41.899
2005	302	147.818	2.922	7.881	32.597
2006	302	30.639	2.062	10.070	38.306

Table A8. SEAMAP monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
4	953	62.313	2.447	75.677	30.922
5	512	40.693	3.111	31.156	38.149
7	1242	22.899	1.994	39.225	56.561
8	220	15.695	2.103	26.837	36.876
9	19	3.579	1.244	31.441	22.655
10	1215	14.113	2.203	25.092	26.905
11	224	86.906	2.421	16.771	34.131

Table A9. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the SEAMAP CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that depth was not included as a variable in the GAM. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.060
Depth				< 0.001	0.638
Bottom salinity		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Month	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	5	0.307	0.200	0.109	0.014
	7	< 0.001	0.029	< 0.001	0.057
	8	0.570	0.435	0.342	0.332
	9	0.926	0.253	0.652	0.959
	10	0.043	0.232	0.048	0.083
	11	0.637	0.027	0.851	0.020
Year	1990	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1991	0.435	0.258	0.217	0.269
	1992	0.789	0.041	0.458	0.054
	1993	0.044	< 0.001	0.050	< 0.001
	1994	0.047	< 0.001	0.029	< 0.001
	1995	0.494	0.007	0.296	0.021
	1996	0.401	0.442	0.056	0.668
	1997	0.183	< 0.001	0.237	< 0.001
	1998	0.843	< 0.001	0.410	0.003
	1999	0.053	0.002	0.016	0.017
	2000	0.348	0.212	0.231	0.498
	2001	0.795	0.886	0.641	0.249
	2002	0.155	< 0.001	0.179	< 0.001
	2003	0.663	0.036	0.986	0.501
2004	0.570	0.044	0.389	0.540	
2005	0.168	< 0.001	0.230	< 0.001	
2006	0.046	< 0.001	0.008	< 0.001	
$R^2$		0.256	0.146	0.202	0.061
Composite $R^2$		0.114		< 0.001	

Table A10. Rhode Island fall trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
1979	11	9.636	3.337	12.145
1980	26	32.346	11.364	46.050
1981	44	63.773	15.124	58.100
1982	40	33.725	13.310	57.910
1983	22	9.682	4.893	16.858
1984	10	31.200	6.788	38.980
1985	32	37.156	9.107	34.956
1986	21	5.048	2.802	11.610
1987	8	8.375	5.288	19.358
1988	14	32.571	5.524	19.568
1989	10	5.300	3.054	10.137
1990	19	60.263	15.766	64.315
1991	17	58.294	9.069	34.391
1992	20	25.400	7.332	31.508
1993	14	18.214	6.142	26.020
1994	13	49.000	20.215	87.130
1995	4	2.750	2.310	9.295
1996	17	235.824	35.453	165.436
1997	27	138.185	22.898	108.072
1998	17	32.588	7.896	29.996
1999	17	8.882	4.349	20.648
2000	21	17.857	7.636	32.200
2001	19	42.737	13.990	58.833
2002	20	16.800	8.431	33.456
2003	32	259.875	41.927	246.854
2004	9	8.778	4.236	19.180
2005	29	177.828	25.480	105.235
2006	7	2.143	1.798	6.941
2007	25	59.200	16.995	78.251

Table A11. Rhode Island fall trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
9	468	72.511	12.556	59.317
10	96	22.125	5.333	29.040
11	1	1.000	1.000	7.279

Table A12. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GLM for the Rhode Island survey CPUE. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. The last line of the table is the  $R^2$  of the model.

Variable		GLM
		Positive catch
Area	BIS	n/a
	NB	< 0.001
	RIS	< 0.001
Month	9	n/a
	10	0.980
	11	0.727
Year	1979	n/a
	1980	0.065
	1981	0.025
	1982	0.024
	1983	0.662
	1984	0.149
	1985	0.121
	1986	0.941
	1987	0.603
	1988	0.557
	1989	0.817
	1990	0.029
	1991	0.169
	1992	0.199
	1993	0.344
	1994	0.012
	1995	0.794
	1996	< 0.001
	1997	0.003
	1998	0.242
	1999	0.490
2000	0.182	
2001	0.041	
2002	0.167	
2003	< 0.001	
2004	0.594	
2005	0.002	
2006	0.530	
2007	0.011	
$R^2$		0.252

Table A13. New Jersey trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1988	68	65.971	2.144	81.915	8.351
1989	192	42.411	1.366	44.501	30.721
1990	171	14.865	0.900	26.260	7.088
1991	189	58.481	1.332	49.852	32.367
1992	191	15.298	1.210	22.886	30.354
1993	187	66.658	1.095	28.200	23.772
1994	186	78.957	1.576	53.636	54.054
1995	188	91.479	3.008	101.073	153.508
1996	189	119.233	3.910	148.785	277.406
1997	187	62.684	2.360	141.378	114.073
1998	188	20.622	0.761	19.049	21.592
1999	186	58.527	1.247	37.108	39.913
2000	187	67.374	1.409	39.814	45.519
2001	186	57.677	1.279	53.517	31.719
2002	188	164.473	3.252	197.973	195.490
2003	188	85.287	1.742	92.913	65.222
2004	187	179.882	3.381	245.019	220.879
2005	186	158.199	2.636	131.107	152.807
2006	186	129.484	1.252	22.579	32.730

Table A14. New Jersey trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1	348	0.086	0.042	0.025	0.154
2	171	0.029	0.011	0.231	0.037
3	23	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
4	662	0.363	0.137	0.073	0.316
5	24	10.958	2.067	16.494	17.015
6	675	93.287	1.429	9.004	12.166
7	39	35.103	1.652	17.765	5.937
8	630	135.479	2.955	38.750	46.250
9	102	174.078	7.447	67.021	272.652
10	644	161.120	8.586	502.652	166.633
11	86	93.302	4.751	54.984	162.056
12	26	6.731	0.824	3.538	27.321

Table A15. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the New Jersey survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that month 3 (March) never had positive catch. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001
Depth		0.017	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	0.729	0.041	0.574	0.017
	3		1.000		0.958
	4	0.519	< 0.001	0.553	< 0.001
	5	0.053	< 0.001	0.042	< 0.001
	6	0.001	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001
	7	0.036	0.001	0.638	0.133
	8	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	9	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	10	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	11	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	12	0.006	< 0.001	0.009	< 0.001
Year	1988	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1989	0.181	0.045	0.493	0.073
	1990	0.803	0.920	0.951	0.845
	1991	0.120	0.062	0.164	0.044
	1992	0.268	0.016	0.687	0.093
	1993	0.396	0.050	0.962	0.122
	1994	0.009	0.084	0.025	0.149
	1995	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.004	< 0.001
	1996	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1997	0.031	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1998	0.541	0.042	0.727	0.071
	1999	0.036	0.121	0.067	0.148
	2000	0.040	0.034	0.079	0.032
	2001	0.096	0.126	0.131	0.080
	2002	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
2003	0.003	0.088	0.004	0.048	
2004	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001	0.001	
2005	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	
2006	0.087	0.147	0.065	0.049	
$R^2$		0.395	0.383	0.306	0.325
Composite $R^2$		0.079		0.062	

Table A16. Delaware 30-ft trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith.mean	Geo.mean	GLM	GAM
1966	56	202.054	44.818	246.840	121.522
1967	75	140.960	10.987	136.597	93.710
1968	37	143.892	6.471	63.825	81.686
1969	40	170.075	19.729	169.587	144.138
1970	37	142.351	25.265	234.109	152.384
1971	38	203.184	33.142	368.205	210.422
1974	18	52.833	18.744	64.298	27.112
1979	91	27.209	5.987	26.813	51.640
1980	92	24.099	3.174	17.057	37.644
1981	98	15.194	3.226	13.978	32.445
1982	41	38.390	10.817	36.012	54.971
1983	38	31.921	5.721	32.232	60.836
1984	45	17.489	6.825	23.216	24.105
1990	55	25.400	5.862	19.419	39.224
1991	72	52.648	7.626	74.751	57.253
1992	86	54.372	3.816	17.617	43.255
1993	82	113.976	14.067	80.430	99.656
1994	71	223.971	5.617	49.284	82.335
1995	86	212.174	19.299	181.130	199.226
1996	76	346.760	37.109	237.120	293.148
1997	83	129.195	16.359	140.978	198.421
1998	80	158.150	21.722	316.731	196.982
1999	85	142.482	17.036	164.496	245.189
2000	66	198.697	12.876	125.841	260.535
2001	69	96.087	13.932	149.125	163.924
2002	68	194.672	19.482	204.106	116.800
2003	63	83.516	14.248	93.277	142.299
2004	83	69.519	9.741	59.774	81.985
2005	85	42.447	6.467	32.859	45.505
2006	90	129.764	11.618	82.233	105.427
2007	89	82.438	8.809	103.979	91.555

Table A17. Delaware 30-ft trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1	24	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2	21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
3	162	0.013	0.009	3.255	6.542
4	187	8.770	1.555	48.150	45.741
5	211	135.029	15.089	149.129	124.141
6	219	204.124	25.726	116.181	118.988
7	210	249.548	33.683	89.830	114.896
8	251	196.799	41.033	107.451	109.719
9	233	167.589	49.680	181.007	189.873
10	201	101.164	35.929	272.733	212.557
11	209	15.635	3.703	81.732	111.310
12	167	2.192	0.357	31.395	42.694

Table A18. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the Delaware survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that depth was not used as a variable in GAM, and positive catches were not observed in months 1 and 2 (January and February). “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid overfitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	0.002	0.013	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.010	< 0.001
Depth				< 0.001	0.276
Duration		0.005	0.270	< 0.001	0.601
Bottom temperature		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Bottom salinity		0.151	0.006	0.005	0.003
Month	1		n/a		n/a
	2		1.000		0.998
	3	n/a	1.000	n/a	0.980
	4	0.385	1.000	0.289	0.974
	5	0.096	1.000	0.029	0.973
	6	0.104	1.000	0.038	0.975
	7	0.102	1.000	0.049	0.977
	8	0.100	1.000	0.048	0.977
	9	0.047	1.000	0.018	0.975
	10	0.035	1.000	0.010	0.972
	11	0.108	1.000	0.089	0.973
	12	0.421	1.000	0.423	0.975
Year	1966	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1967	0.467	0.571	0.701	0.499
	1968	0.401	0.484	0.172	0.094
	1969	0.629	0.813	0.988	0.163
	1970	0.620	0.209	0.930	0.731
	1971	0.208	0.750	0.939	0.938
	1974	0.004	0.266	< 0.001	0.110
	1979	0.006	0.932	0.002	0.428
	1980	0.001	0.104	< 0.001	0.031
	1981	< 0.001	0.039	< 0.001	0.010
	1982	0.075	0.131	0.250	0.166
	1983	0.160	0.412	0.195	0.925
	1984	< 0.001	0.110	< 0.001	0.119
	1990	0.015	0.018	0.013	0.004
	1991	0.055	0.132	0.015	0.061
	1992	0.020	0.024	0.039	0.006
	1993	0.636	0.381	0.432	0.165
	1994	0.372	0.203	0.153	0.043
	1995	0.084	0.418	0.358	0.100
	1996	0.006	0.160	0.037	0.623
	1997	0.122	0.781	0.444	0.529
	1998	0.134	0.599	0.482	0.806
	1999	0.024	0.808	0.120	0.270
	2000	0.027	0.485	0.158	0.656
	2001	0.327	0.736	0.936	0.556
	2002	0.949	0.708	0.457	0.335
	2003	0.447	0.156	0.444	0.114
2004	0.517	0.035	0.412	0.017	
2005	0.037	0.011	0.021	0.003	
2006	0.940	0.106	0.936	0.045	
2007	0.658	0.081	0.465	0.008	
$R^2$		0.402	0.531	0.324	0.485
Composite $R^2$		0.050		0.049	



Table A19. Maryland coastal bay survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
1972	3	6.333	4.667	4.604
1973	1	3.000	3.000	5.698
1975	17	29.412	8.299	52.877
1976	14	17.143	9.650	86.563
1977	7	5.571	3.854	4.564
1978	22	54.955	11.514	29.689
1979	9	6.222	4.662	11.244
1980	1	12.000	12.000	22.791
1981	16	53.750	18.054	104.490
1982	12	18.667	11.014	39.662
1984	6	6.167	3.060	5.391
1985	10	6.100	3.632	7.583
1986	4	5.250	4.244	50.215
1987	4	31.000	6.310	156.013
1989	21	4.095	3.203	9.765
1990	39	13.744	7.782	15.357
1991	36	16.583	7.896	25.501
1992	31	44.516	14.478	51.628
1993	28	8.036	4.414	31.418
1994	48	20.125	7.944	21.295
1995	48	77.417	19.122	16.630
1996	49	24.286	8.204	16.672
1997	44	33.932	11.881	6.487
1998	45	29.444	8.599	4.512
1999	40	109.600	14.689	9.783
2000	38	43.526	11.685	18.591
2001	37	47.919	16.818	11.708
2002	17	15.176	6.814	21.899
2003	57	43.158	14.328	9.294
2004	49	22.959	9.039	5.881
2005	56	31.964	12.071	8.068
2006	29	23.828	11.264	5.760
2007	41	20.098	8.355	14.340

Table A20. Maryland coastal bay survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
4	3	1.000	1.000	6.690
5	8	1.250	1.181	2.249
6	26	3.308	2.018	8.068
7	242	71.789	19.689	20.410
8	310	30.397	12.085	13.280
9	200	12.410	6.482	27.263
10	84	5.476	3.255	29.250
11	6	6.833	3.769	25.253

Table A21. Significance (*p*-values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the Maryland coastal bay survey CPUE. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last line of the table is the  $R^2$  of the model.

Variable		GLM
		Positive catch
Site	T001	n/a
	T002	0.237
	T003	0.431
	T004	0.335
	T005	0.011
	T006	0.014
	T007	< 0.001
	T008	< 0.001
	T009	< 0.001
	T010	< 0.001
	T011	< 0.001
	T012	< 0.001
	T013	< 0.001
	T014	< 0.001
	T015	< 0.001
	T016	< 0.001
	T017	< 0.001
	T018	< 0.001
	T019	< 0.001
	T020	< 0.001
Month	4	n/a
	5	0.745
	6	0.424
	7	< 0.001
	8	< 0.001
	9	0.003
	10	0.051
11	0.075	
Year	1972	n/a
	1973	0.056
	1975	0.642
	1976	0.835
	1977	0.230
	1978	0.477
	1979	0.194
	1980	0.472
	1981	0.645
	1982	0.407
	1984	0.272
	1985	0.552
	1986	0.696
	1987	0.688
	1989	0.066
1990	0.913	
1991	0.595	
1992	0.639	

	1993	0.228
	1994	0.446
	1995	0.336
	1996	0.924
	1997	0.799
	1998	0.855
	1999	0.842
	2000	0.951
	2001	0.524
	2002	0.493
	2003	0.437
	2004	0.909
	2005	0.659
	2006	0.934
	2007	0.756
$R^2$		0.517

Table A22. North Carolina gillnet survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
2001	230	1.661	1.008	2.678	1.873
2002	306	1.529	0.658	1.342	1.468
2003	316	1.241	0.596	1.018	1.420
2004	317	1.366	0.576	1.058	1.163
2005	297	1.300	0.639	1.167	1.292
2006	317	1.082	0.490	0.891	0.905
2007	314	0.481	0.284	0.506	0.539

Table A23. North Carolina gillnet survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
2	94	0.096	0.062	0.187	0.249
3	188	0.559	0.290	0.632	0.845
4	185	3.341	1.459	3.166	2.756
5	221	2.330	1.022	1.883	1.783
6	220	0.664	0.339	0.666	0.640
7	222	0.563	0.286	0.569	0.670
8	222	0.671	0.414	0.774	0.828
9	206	1.015	0.648	1.243	1.162
10	216	1.639	0.944	1.777	1.602
11	213	1.080	0.628	1.173	1.217
12	110	0.864	0.381	0.748	1.068

Table A24. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the North Carolina gillnet survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that bottom temperature was not included as a variable in GLM. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		0.001	< 0.001	0.902	0.009
Latitude		0.207	< 0.001	0.004	< 0.001
Depth		0.079	< 0.001	0.883	0.003
Bottom temperature		0.716	< 0.001		
Bottom salinity		0.073	0.006	0.156	0.007
Surface DO		0.316	0.018	0.051	< 0.001
Surface salinity		0.055	< 0.001	0.280	< 0.001
Month	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3	0.202	0.018	0.248	0.003
	4	0.001	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001
	5	0.019	< 0.001	0.016	< 0.001
	6	0.525	0.100	0.473	0.026
	7	0.762	0.048	0.730	0.046
	8	0.677	0.013	0.621	0.005
	9	0.373	0.001	0.333	< 0.001
	10	0.071	< 0.001	0.053	< 0.001
	11	0.156	< 0.001	0.194	< 0.001
	12	0.074	0.017	0.083	0.006
	Year	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002		0.680	0.026	0.335	< 0.001
2003		0.454	0.002	0.825	< 0.001
2004		0.624	< 0.001	0.367	< 0.001
2005		0.619	0.002	0.515	< 0.001
2006		0.206	< 0.001	0.151	< 0.001
2007		0.004	< 0.001	0.004	< 0.001
$R^2$		0.176	0.176	0.127	0.118
Composite $R^2$		0.155		0.096	

Table A25. Connecticut trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1989	155	1.143	0.295	1.348	0.609
1990	60	0.270	0.205	0.628	0.554
1992	155	0.624	0.397	0.982	0.585
1993	239	0.625	0.395	0.836	0.652
1994	240	2.065	0.611	1.125	1.240
1995	200	0.367	0.270	0.377	0.460
1996	200	0.639	0.402	0.760	0.883
1997	155	0.679	0.535	1.755	1.198
1998	133	0.277	0.181	0.283	0.914
1999	26	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
2000	199	2.394	0.761	1.678	1.672
2001	199	1.449	0.618	1.552	1.407
2002	199	1.258	0.571	1.316	0.986
2003	200	1.100	0.553	0.845	2.001
2004	199	1.310	0.569	1.181	1.298
2005	200	1.094	0.519	1.114	1.020
2006	120	0.376	0.240	0.335	0.440
2007	200	2.002	0.684	1.530	1.541
2008	119	0.034	0.024	0.060	0.337

Table A26. Connecticut trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
4	501	0.004	0.003	0.006	0.521
5	709	0.061	0.043	0.138	0.606
6	672	0.213	0.150	0.256	0.342
7	43	0.122	0.087	0.137	0.086
8	52	0.181	0.133	0.126	0.131
9	596	2.527	1.409	3.285	1.193
10	534	3.031	1.414	2.000	1.818
11	86	1.703	1.320	1.771	1.703
12	5	1.000	0.741	1.122	2.311

Table A27. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the CT trawl survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate where bottom salinity was not included in GAM or positive catch GLM, and positive catches were not recorded in 1988 or 1999. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.040	< 0.001
Latitude		0.024	< 0.001	0.028	
Depth		0.004	< 0.001	0.036	0.096
Duration		< 0.001	0.101	< 0.001	0.095
Bottom temperature		0.001	< 0.001		< 0.001
Bottom salinity					0.066
Month	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	5	0.799	0.995	0.947	0.169
	6	0.766	0.401	0.956	0.294
	7	0.420	0.173	0.292	0.738
	8	0.862	0.119	0.854	0.414
	9	0.357	0.703	0.344	0.327
	10	0.301	0.227	0.374	0.002
	11	0.673	0.009	0.821	< 0.001
	12	0.522	< 0.001	0.702	< 0.001
Year	1988		n/a		
	1989	n/a	1.000	n/a	n/a
	1990	< 0.001	1.000	0.005	0.131
	1992	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	0.001
	1993	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1994	0.007	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1995	< 0.001	1.000	0.006	< 0.001
	1996	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1997	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1998	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1999		1.000		0.976
	2000	0.180	1.000	0.212	< 0.001
	2001	< 0.001	1.000	0.004	< 0.001
	2002	< 0.001	1.000	0.001	< 0.001
	2003	0.015	1.000	0.012	< 0.001
	2004	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001
2005	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	< 0.001	
2006	< 0.001	1.000	< 0.001	0.044	
2007	0.016	1.000	0.030	< 0.001	
2008	0.046	1.000	0.053	0.240	
$R^2$		0.268	0.533	0.229	0.488
Composite $R^2$		0.196		0.174	

Table A28. New York juvenile trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
1987	354	0.862	0.328	3.904
1988	426	0.254	0.106	0.977
1989	420	3.274	0.574	0.152
1990	430	1.058	0.264	0.201
1991	398	25.894	4.440	28.780
1992	411	10.727	1.205	6.328
1993	414	2.056	0.428	1.432
1994	428	27.182	1.725	16.677
1995	376	3.005	0.914	6.622
1996	409	88.814	5.004	56.713
1997	379	29.900	2.745	1.705
1998	395	2.382	0.515	1.103
1999	400	17.235	2.221	51.880
2000	420	67.183	3.899	100.122
2001	414	46.498	3.249	42.470
2002	415	54.860	2.604	95.765
2003	392	23.862	1.363	47.478
2004	408	22.532	2.127	6.749
2005	182	66.349	2.714	10.111
2006	244	36.033	4.776	5.206
2007	377	59.488	3.470	105.074

Table A29. New York juvenile trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
4	8	0.000	0.000	0.000
5	1221	0.034	0.012	0.109
6	1351	10.495	0.453	11.642
7	1453	69.522	4.561	55.257
8	1391	55.884	6.055	74.277
9	1272	16.237	2.310	7.006
10	1339	3.370	0.683	7.304
11	57	0.053	0.032	0.000

Table A30. Significance (*p*-values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the New York juvenile survey CPUE. The blank space indicates that no positive catches were recorded in month 4 (April). “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last line of the table is the *R*<sup>2</sup> of the model.

Variable		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent
Station	1	n/a	n/a
	2	< 0.001	< 0.001
	3	0.001	< 0.001
	4	0.103	0.344
	5	0.364	0.054
	6	0.953	0.205
	7	0.651	0.014
	8	0.461	0.370
	9	< 0.001	< 0.001
	10	< 0.001	< 0.001
	11	0.528	0.383
	12	0.295	0.011
	13	0.085	0.003
	14	< 0.001	< 0.001
	15	< 0.001	< 0.001
	16	< 0.001	< 0.001
	17	< 0.001	< 0.001
	18	< 0.001	< 0.001
	19	< 0.001	0.016
	20	0.012	0.004
	21	0.018	0.124
	22	< 0.001	< 0.001
	23	< 0.001	< 0.001
	24	< 0.001	< 0.001
	25	0.388	0.028
	26	< 0.001	< 0.001
	27	< 0.001	< 0.001
	28	< 0.001	< 0.001
	29	< 0.001	< 0.001
	30	< 0.001	< 0.001
	31	< 0.001	< 0.001
	32	< 0.001	0.004
	33	0.165	0.607
	34	0.032	0.868
	35	0.114	0.332
	36	0.181	0.929
	37	0.073	0.516
	38	< 0.001	< 0.001
	39	< 0.001	< 0.001
	40	< 0.001	< 0.001
	41	0.031	0.330
	42	0.289	0.032
	43	< 0.001	< 0.001
	44	< 0.001	< 0.001



	45	< 0.001	< 0.001
	46	0.001	< 0.001
	47	0.160	0.314
	48	< 0.001	< 0.001
	49	< 0.001	< 0.001
	50	< 0.001	< 0.001
	51	0.035	0.725
	52	0.001	0.128
	53	< 0.001	< 0.001
	54	< 0.001	< 0.001
	55	< 0.001	< 0.001
	56	< 0.001	< 0.001
	57	0.178	0.992
	58	0.068	0.407
	59	0.017	0.019
	60	0.037	0.005
	61	0.003	< 0.001
	62	< 0.001	< 0.001
	63	< 0.001	< 0.001
	64	< 0.001	< 0.001
	65	< 0.001	< 0.001
	66	< 0.001	< 0.001
	67	< 0.001	< 0.001
	68	< 0.001	0.104
	69	0.013	0.028
	70	< 0.001	< 0.001
	71	0.146	0.876
	72	0.002	0.085
	73	< 0.001	< 0.001
	74	< 0.001	< 0.001
	75	< 0.001	0.007
	76	0.051	0.795
	77	0.078	0.429
Month	4		n/a
	5	n/a	0.969
	6	< 0.001	0.953
	7	< 0.001	0.939
	8	< 0.001	0.936
	9	< 0.001	0.941
	10	0.005	0.947
	11	0.838	0.961
Year	1987	n/a	n/a
	1988	0.339	< 0.001
	1989	< 0.001	0.004
	1990	0.272	0.269
	1991	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1992	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1993	0.019	0.545
	1994	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1995	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1996	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1997	< 0.001	< 0.001
1998	0.009	< 0.001	

	1999	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2002	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2003	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2004	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2005	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2006	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2007	< 0.001	< 0.001
	$R^2$	0.440	0.474
	Composite $R^2$	0.100	

Table A31. Delaware 16-ft. trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1980	193	12.843	3.919	12.116	9.889
1981	189	15.452	4.117	19.766	17.541
1982	229	18.811	5.788	24.776	24.957
1983	226	10.454	3.355	13.530	12.612
1984	185	30.351	5.544	18.437	28.226
1985	133	7.271	1.431	2.249	24.066
1986	203	30.722	6.404	28.425	27.733
1987	176	18.589	4.288	20.623	18.753
1988	165	21.540	3.393	18.167	22.226
1989	138	16.291	4.102	23.922	24.670
1990	193	32.026	8.739	25.242	23.848
1991	276	31.347	7.460	38.577	40.395
1992	275	31.640	7.591	40.047	43.430
1993	168	34.196	7.271	38.966	47.640
1994	267	51.864	10.188	54.135	61.629
1995	264	55.727	10.011	45.430	47.161
1996	279	50.838	6.302	36.791	38.679
1997	279	59.194	8.436	47.419	52.432
1998	317	26.097	5.472	32.846	37.557
1999	231	32.709	6.372	33.377	36.227
2000	257	43.371	10.074	63.135	50.196
2001	240	25.609	4.533	21.618	20.362
2002	275	26.344	3.526	20.555	18.364
2003	275	28.585	4.465	31.441	31.460
2004	253	26.292	3.639	26.766	29.277
2005	240	65.038	10.772	52.974	49.500
2006	273	14.326	3.298	17.794	17.814
2007	272	34.728	7.247	43.132	38.389

Table A32. Delaware 16-ft. trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
4	866	0.099	0.040	0.258	0.434
5	886	2.608	0.812	5.095	6.062
6	962	20.490	3.356	15.665	15.165
7	936	88.764	29.840	81.128	76.784
8	955	57.216	23.366	59.375	57.151
9	954	39.119	14.906	40.799	47.053
10	912	12.798	4.867	18.774	23.383

Table A33. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the Delaware 16-ft. trawl survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that depth and tow duration were not included as variables in the GAM. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		0.001	0.005	< 0.001	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Depth				0.010	0.788
Duration				0.017	0.775
Surface temperature		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002
Surface salinity		0.002	< 0.001	0.544	< 0.001
Month	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	5	0.003	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001
	6	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	7	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	8	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	9	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	10	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Year	1980	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1981	0.002	0.233	0.010	0.747
	1982	< 0.001	0.003	< 0.001	0.042
	1983	0.300	0.078	0.469	0.335
	1984	< 0.001	0.141	< 0.001	0.579
	1985	< 0.001	0.983	< 0.001	0.425
	1986	< 0.001	0.005	< 0.001	0.031
	1987	< 0.001	0.410	0.002	0.852
	1988	< 0.001	0.246	< 0.001	0.185
	1989	< 0.001	0.080	0.002	0.444
	1990	< 0.001	0.228	< 0.001	0.947
	1991	< 0.001	0.004	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1992	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001
	1993	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001
	1994	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1995	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1996	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.005
	1997	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001
	1998	< 0.001	0.002	< 0.001	0.076
	1999	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.022
2000	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	
2001	< 0.001	0.133	< 0.001	0.838	
2002	< 0.001	0.758	< 0.001	0.307	
2003	< 0.001	0.124	< 0.001	0.762	
2004	< 0.001	0.069	< 0.001	0.914	
2005	< 0.001	0.025	< 0.001	0.347	
2006	< 0.001	0.424	0.008	0.860	
2007	< 0.001	0.019	< 0.001	0.109	
$R^2$		0.322	0.499	0.297	0.471
Composite $R^2$		0.180		0.161	

Table A34. VIMS trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1988	710	21.259	1.704	14.276	17.422
1989	716	18.894	1.490	16.201	11.433
1990	709	16.422	1.445	14.377	8.567
1991	650	9.752	1.206	9.363	8.318
1992	658	15.895	1.965	15.450	21.378
1993	589	19.474	1.558	12.418	13.834
1994	662	9.956	1.544	12.342	13.859
1995	635	12.898	2.076	16.084	17.908
1996	1152	13.773	1.677	13.819	14.767
1997	1189	12.373	1.727	12.915	15.169
1998	1254	12.510	1.407	10.304	9.545
1999	1321	14.760	2.002	15.731	17.293
2000	1351	13.928	2.054	16.717	22.554
2001	1107	27.046	2.778	22.344	19.102
2002	1088	14.619	1.893	15.444	14.499
2003	1194	11.899	1.486	11.634	13.983
2004	1222	10.639	1.408	10.504	8.708
2005	1211	7.701	1.386	8.801	8.766
2006	1193	10.293	1.808	13.868	15.705
2007	1223	12.303	1.900	14.628	13.584

Table A35. VIMS trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1	1072	0.006	0.003	0.037	0.888
2	1562	0.002	0.001	0.013	0.499
3	1143	0.001	0.001	0.022	0.087
4	1661	0.337	0.109	0.798	1.840
5	1828	2.231	0.813	4.292	5.972
6	1850	3.518	1.047	4.757	3.885
7	1809	20.837	3.617	14.780	7.634
8	1754	37.365	7.987	31.658	16.285
9	1861	49.988	10.823	45.306	36.644
10	1869	27.544	5.995	30.718	40.378
11	1781	9.389	2.181	13.893	28.001
12	1644	1.207	0.251	1.916	10.311

Table A36. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the VIMS CPUE. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. Last two lines of the table are the  $R^2$  of each model, and the composite  $R^2$  resulting from multiplying the respective two components of the delta-lognormal method, i.e., positive catch  $\times$  presence/absence.

Variable		GAM		GLM	
		Positive catch	Present/Absent	Positive catch	Present/Absent
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.094	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.007	0.114
Depth		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
DO		< 0.001	< 0.001	0.009	0.279
Temperature		< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
River	AT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CL	0.260	0.289	0.444	0.970
	CP	0.668	0.084	0.576	0.096
	GW	0.754	0.102	0.736	0.536
	JA	0.053	0.165	0.234	0.816
	JE	0.796	0.570	0.297	0.301
	MB	0.363	0.003	0.624	0.125
	ME	0.174	0.013	0.363	0.119
	MN	0.102	0.003	0.423	0.018
	MS	0.906	0.027	0.483	0.144
	MW	0.500	0.185	0.881	0.406
	PK	0.111	0.070	0.476	0.326
	PM	0.545	0.106	0.574	0.637
	PO	0.132	0.449	0.200	0.213
RA	0.163	0.334	0.403	0.725	
YK	0.169	0.045	0.644	0.259	
Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	0.597	0.968	0.679	0.341
	3	0.942	0.047	0.913	0.119
	4	0.411	0.009	0.667	< 0.001
	5	0.491	< 0.001	0.787	< 0.001
	6	0.295	< 0.001	0.471	< 0.001
	7	0.735	< 0.001	0.986	< 0.001
	8	0.748	< 0.001	0.478	< 0.001
	9	0.315	< 0.001	0.180	< 0.001
	10	0.332	< 0.001	0.194	< 0.001
	11	0.542	< 0.001	0.295	< 0.001
	12	0.991	< 0.001	0.740	< 0.001
Year	1988	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1989	0.634	0.003	0.900	0.057
	1990	0.297	< 0.001	0.702	< 0.001
	1991	< 0.001	0.234	< 0.001	0.322
	1992	0.032	< 0.001	0.152	< 0.001
	1993	0.009	0.379	0.028	0.340
	1994	0.003	0.220	0.006	0.323
	1995	0.003	< 0.001	0.010	0.002
	1996	0.004	0.125	0.024	0.415
1997	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.001	

	1998	< 0.001	0.753	< 0.001	0.774
	1999	0.010	0.005	0.045	0.018
	2000	0.007	< 0.001	0.017	< 0.001
	2001	0.287	0.032	0.647	0.051
	2002	< 0.001	0.021	0.003	0.078
	2003	< 0.001	0.012	< 0.001	0.279
	2004	< 0.001	0.790	< 0.001	0.654
	2005	< 0.001	0.042	< 0.001	0.448
	2006	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.002
	2007	< 0.001	0.010	< 0.001	0.028
$R^2$		0.293	0.427	0.264	0.375
Composite $R^2$		0.158		0.118	

Table A37. North Carolina juvenile trawl survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1987	85	12.741	7.084	13.669	13.430
1988	120	17.042	9.110	17.277	16.481
1989	93	12.677	6.512	11.305	11.776
1990	69	19.768	13.095	17.817	15.807
1991	65	12.846	8.315	9.872	9.387
1992	72	18.472	14.603	19.690	18.275
1993	77	15.143	10.678	14.354	15.324
1994	86	20.547	14.831	18.676	19.551
1995	88	19.068	14.949	19.755	19.520
1996	83	23.373	17.938	23.117	23.806
1997	87	21.977	17.494	24.530	25.922
1998	71	22.676	18.398	28.397	27.731
1999	104	31.202	27.250	30.380	32.394
2000	101	22.455	19.541	26.094	26.742
2001	67	17.239	11.482	14.857	15.245
2002	63	13.127	9.260	12.362	11.846
2003	77	13.039	9.714	12.803	13.024
2004	67	17.836	13.352	18.064	17.821
2005	67	17.687	12.145	15.963	15.160
2006	78	21.462	16.400	22.869	23.041
2007	65	20.323	14.887	18.849	18.415

Table A38. North Carolina juvenile trawl survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM	GAM
1	1	1.000	1.000	3.320	1.763
3	35	1.629	1.458	2.487	2.688
6	701	16.693	11.894	16.589	17.348
7	53	37.604	32.360	31.234	30.614
9	785	21.146	15.519	22.472	23.907
10	50	21.680	19.257	24.307	23.615
12	60	5.767	3.456	5.110	5.584

Table A39. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GAMs and GLMs for the North Carolina juvenile survey CPUE. Blank spaces indicate that depth was not used as a variable in the GAM, and latitude was not used as a variable in the GLM. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. The last line of the table is the  $R^2$  of each model.

Variable		GAM	GLM
		Positive catch	Positive catch
Longitude		< 0.001	< 0.001
Latitude		< 0.001	
Depth			< 0.001
Bottom DO		0.002	0.005
Surface DO		< 0.001	0.005
Month	1	n/a	n/a
	3	0.674	0.843
	6	0.021	0.038
	7	0.005	0.009
	9	0.009	0.017
	10	0.010	0.017
	12	0.247	0.354
Year	1987	n/a	n/a
	1988	0.144	0.085
	1989	0.379	0.241
	1990	0.319	0.099
	1991	0.033	0.065
	1992	0.061	0.024
	1993	0.414	0.707
	1994	0.017	0.042
	1995	0.017	0.016
	1996	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1997	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1998	< 0.001	< 0.001
	1999	< 0.001	0.003
	2000	< 0.001	< 0.001
	2001	0.506	0.618
	2002	0.492	0.643
	2003	0.866	0.784
2004	0.111	0.106	
2005	0.519	0.377	
2006	0.002	0.003	
2007	0.086	0.061	
$R^2$		0.311	0.272



Table A40. Maryland Chesapeake “blue crab” survey yearly CPUE averages.

Year	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
1989	18	4.944	3.071	10.276
1990	37	19.108	5.189	14.574
1991	26	24.846	6.175	19.394
1992	53	26.736	10.259	30.694
1993	44	31.955	6.020	22.144
1994	36	29.694	9.110	23.681
1995	99	29.131	12.113	53.642
1996	65	68.062	14.857	46.622
1997	63	40.778	14.022	44.013
1998	58	68.362	20.506	38.454
1999	55	35.018	14.424	52.043
2000	84	57.190	14.369	56.037
2001	88	53.182	20.174	69.271
2002	69	39.971	9.418	32.382
2003	60	25.400	10.985	32.456
2004	60	7.167	3.587	15.945
2005	59	28.729	7.421	32.193
2006	71	13.563	3.973	7.629
2007	87	6.586	2.478	5.307
2008	58	4.690	1.928	8.355

Table A41. Maryland Chesapeake “blue crab” survey monthly CPUE averages.

Month	N	Arith. Mean	Geo. Mean	GLM
5	16	1.750	1.566	4.570
6	141	39.624	8.155	17.362
7	262	44.805	14.229	43.673
8	331	41.610	11.209	48.918
9	328	21.448	6.665	29.435
10	105	5.952	2.841	11.791
11	7	2.000	1.784	1.442

Table A42. Significance ( $p$ -values) of predictor variables used in the GLM for the Maryland “blue crab” survey CPUE. “n/a” entries indicate that a parameter was not reported for one category of a categorical variable, in order to avoid over-fitting the model. The last line of the table is the  $R^2$  of the model.

Variable		GLM
		Positive catch
Site	CHR	n/a
	CPR	0.110
	EBY	0.663
	FBY	0.535
	LCP	0.531
	NTK	0.933
	PAX	0.009
	POC	< 0.001
	TNG	< 0.001
Month	5	n/a
	6	< 0.001
	7	< 0.001
	8	< 0.001
	9	< 0.001
	10	0.008
	11	0.767
Year	1989	n/a
	1990	0.341
	1991	0.102
	1992	0.001
	1993	0.029
	1994	0.021
	1995	< 0.001
	1996	< 0.001
	1997	< 0.001
	1998	< 0.001
	1999	< 0.001
	2000	< 0.001
	2001	< 0.001
	2002	< 0.001
	2003	< 0.001
	2004	0.200
2005	< 0.001	
2006	0.014	
2007	0.136	
2008	0.339	
$R^2$		0.433

**Appendix C-5**

**Weakfish**

**ADAPT Output**

SAW/SARC 48  
June 1-4, 2009  
Woods Hole, MA

VPA Version 2.8.0

Model ID: Weakfish SASC preferred run

Input File: C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND  
RETRO\_00.DAT

Date of Run: 21-APR-2009

Time of Run: 14:12

Levenburg-Marquardt Algorithm Completed 16 Iterations  
Residual Sum of Squares = 446.968

Number of Residuals = 359  
Number of Parameters = 6  
Degrees of Freedom = 353  
Mean Squared Residual = 1.26620  
Standard Deviation = 1.12526

Number of Years = 26  
Number of Ages = 6  
First Year = 1982  
Youngest Age = 1  
Oldest True Age = 5

Number of Survey Indices Available = 38  
Number of Survey Indices Used in Estimate = 23

VPA Classic Method - Auto Estimated Q's

Stock Numbers Predicted in Terminal Year Plus One (2008)

Age	Stock Predicted	Std. Error	CV
1	16442.584	0.190205E+05	0.115679E+01
2	11406.889	0.683918E+04	0.599566E+00
3	3737.354	0.173831E+04	0.465117E+00
4	1060.126	0.480622E+03	0.453364E+00
5	200.106	0.953091E+02	0.476292E+00
6	4.679	0.537012E+01	0.114759E+01

Catchability Values for Each Survey Used in Estimate

INDEX	Catchability	Std. Error	CV
1	0.211918E-02	0.690956E-03	0.326049E+00
2	0.250557E-02	0.718644E-03	0.286818E+00
3	0.141990E-02	0.541978E-03	0.381702E+00
4	0.132513E-02	0.421512E-03	0.318091E+00
5	0.892300E-03	0.279400E-03	0.313123E+00
6	0.792329E-03	0.193343E-03	0.244019E+00
7	0.359433E-05	0.842737E-06	0.234463E+00
8	0.789323E-05	0.180624E-05	0.228835E+00
9	0.578221E-05	0.164373E-05	0.284273E+00
10	0.333437E-05	0.147753E-05	0.443120E+00
11	0.185515E-05	0.821036E-06	0.442572E+00
12	0.149946E-05	0.932948E-06	0.622190E+00
13	0.315053E-04	0.562930E-05	0.178678E+00
14	0.157929E-03	0.311494E-04	0.197237E+00

15	0.455255E-03	0.137916E-03	0.302942E+00
16	0.849967E-03	0.384431E-03	0.452289E+00
17	0.112275E-02	0.627731E-03	0.559104E+00
18	0.701428E-04	0.801330E-05	0.114243E+00
34	0.568621E-05	0.113335E-05	0.199316E+00
35	0.197591E-04	0.314498E-05	0.159167E+00
36	0.573293E-04	0.105223E-04	0.183542E+00
37	0.641095E-04	0.121778E-04	0.189953E+00
38	0.183228E-04	0.213521E-05	0.116533E+00

-- Non-Linear Least Squares Fit --

Default Tolerances Used

Scaled Gradient Tolerance = 6.055454E-06  
 Scaled Step Tolerance = 3.666853E-11  
 Relative Function Tolerance = 3.666853E-11  
 Absolute Function Tolerance = 4.930381E-32

VPA Method Options

- Catchability Values Estimated as an Analytic Function of N
- Catch Equation Used in Cohort Solution
- Plus Group Backward Calculation Method Used
- Arithmetic Average Used in F-Oldest Calculation
- F-Oldest Calculation in Years Prior to Terminal Year  
 Uses Fishing Mortality in Ages 4 to 4
- Calculation of Population of Age 1 In Year 2008  
 = Stock Estimate

Stock Estimates

Age 1  
 Age 2  
 Age 3  
 Age 4  
 Age 5  
 Age 6

Full F in Terminal Year = 0.5570

F in Oldest True Age in Terminal Year = 0.5570

Full F Calculated Using Average Method

Age	Input Partial Recruitment	Calc Partial Recruitment	Fishing Mortality	Used In Full F	Comments
1	0.120	0.083	0.0464	YES	Stock Estimate in T+1
2	0.280	0.428	0.2383	YES	Stock Estimate in T+1
3	0.570	0.627	0.3495	YES	Stock Estimate in T+1
4	1.000	0.831	0.4631	YES	Stock Estimate in T+1
5	1.000	1.000	0.5570		Input PR * Full F

Catch At Age - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	9914.2	8004.0	10444.2	14153.2	18610.7
2	12967.0	12869.1	14736.9	11262.3	15778.4
3	5473.0	5822.7	6521.1	3246.1	4942.4
4	2778.2	2780.0	3045.3	1171.0	1823.7
5	721.6	568.2	484.5	212.9	264.1
6	639.5	424.1	254.5	55.1	52.1
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	16256.3	8161.9	3705.0	9510.1	9795.9
2	14343.1	16140.8	5304.9	4890.1	5825.6
3	4347.1	10545.3	4333.5	2093.6	2750.0
4	1485.2	6092.0	2922.3	1204.8	1373.6
5	145.4	1050.5	626.2	591.4	463.4
6	11.0	70.7	84.6	89.1	57.3
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	5179.5	4974.8	3761.9	4336.3	2498.8
2	6046.0	6357.0	4347.4	3727.7	2689.5
3	2211.0	2179.8	3561.0	3566.7	5033.3
4	1255.0	1138.6	1563.5	1637.8	3174.2
5	527.8	401.1	204.1	198.1	1379.3
6	65.0	48.2	39.8	54.3	100.1
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	1716.4	1270.6	1412.6	1377.0	2420.7
2	2394.2	2138.3	1300.4	1727.1	2953.1
3	2913.2	3983.1	2256.6	1985.7	1474.1
4	5522.0	2019.2	3326.0	1663.7	1219.9
5	1523.1	2928.8	725.7	1528.2	658.7
6	410.2	909.5	1145.0	403.0	485.9
AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	2591.7	335.6	852.3	334.3	747.3
2	1070.5	949.9	1511.9	1771.5	637.3
3	2695.7	959.7	667.8	1255.2	959.2
4	823.9	718.4	115.8	191.5	252.9
5	388.2	209.5	49.7	10.2	15.5
6	231.5	254.2	38.4	27.1	11.9

Catch At Age - Input Data

AGE	2007
1	616.6
2	1148.0
3	507.6
4	135.2
5	25.2
6	5.8

Weight At Age - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.1420	0.1210	0.1590	0.1420	0.1890
2	0.2790	0.2540	0.2940	0.4480	0.4850
3	0.5210	0.4850	0.5670	1.1400	1.2830
4	0.8210	1.5040	1.1860	2.6890	2.7130
5	1.4110	2.3710	1.6670	2.5760	2.9550
6	3.0330	2.8620	2.5360	3.0550	3.1730

AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.1250	0.1290	0.1260	0.1000	0.1050
2	0.2940	0.2560	0.2670	0.2310	0.3630
3	0.5670	0.5390	0.5720	0.6210	0.7480
4	1.1860	1.1180	1.0970	1.1270	1.2050
5	1.6670	1.8810	1.7960	1.6740	1.6870
6	2.5360	3.0260	3.3480	2.2070	2.1570

AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.0850	0.0760	0.1180	0.1080	0.1040
2	0.3130	0.2040	0.2570	0.2050	0.2100
3	0.6660	0.3940	0.4460	0.3330	0.3510
4	1.0970	0.6350	0.6750	0.4860	0.5220
5	1.5590	0.9110	0.9320	0.6620	0.7170
6	2.0170	1.2080	1.2060	0.8530	0.9300

AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.1860	0.1200	0.1050	0.1050	0.2000
2	0.3000	0.2300	0.2410	0.2410	0.3800
3	0.4380	0.3740	0.4280	0.4280	0.4500
4	0.5960	0.5470	0.6570	0.6570	0.7200
5	0.7700	0.7420	0.9150	0.9150	1.0900
6	0.9560	0.9530	1.1910	1.1910	2.3900

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.2600	0.2200	0.2280	0.2790	0.2910
2	0.3200	0.3100	0.3440	0.3540	0.3310
3	0.5700	0.4000	0.4480	0.4420	0.4820
4	0.7200	0.6600	0.7850	0.5070	0.7250
5	0.9000	1.5300	1.6150	1.2320	0.9100
6	1.3900	2.5700	4.1650	3.7100	4.8610

Weight At Age - Input Data

AGE	2007
1	0.2150
2	0.3450
3	0.4680
4	0.8400
5	0.9700
6	3.8980

JAN-1 Weights at Age - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.1060	0.0780	0.0950	0.0770	0.1520
2	0.2120	0.1900	0.1890	0.2670	0.2620
3	0.3070	0.3680	0.3790	0.5790	0.7580
4	0.4830	0.8850	0.7580	1.2350	1.7590
5	1.0760	1.4000	1.5830	1.7500	2.8190
6	3.0330	2.8600	2.5360	3.0600	3.1730
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.0870	0.0900	0.1090	0.0600	0.0360
2	0.2360	0.1790	0.1860	0.1040	0.2150
3	0.5240	0.3980	0.3830	0.4070	0.5430
4	1.2340	0.7960	0.7690	0.8650	0.9710
5	2.1270	1.4940	1.4170	1.3990	1.4460
6	2.5360	3.0260	3.3480	1.9450	1.9250
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.0270	0.0360	0.0690	0.0710	0.0660
2	0.1810	0.1320	0.1810	0.1530	0.1520
3	0.4770	0.2920	0.3460	0.2650	0.2760
4	0.8750	0.5090	0.5560	0.4070	0.4330
5	1.3260	0.7690	0.8000	0.5720	0.6170
6	1.7900	1.0580	1.0670	0.7550	0.8220



AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.1390	0.0780	0.0590	0.0590	0.0430
2	0.2390	0.1700	0.1660	0.1660	0.1820
3	0.3660	0.2980	0.3290	0.3290	0.4250
4	0.5150	0.4570	0.5380	0.5380	0.7510
5	0.6810	0.6420	0.7830	0.7830	1.1340
6	0.8620	0.8460	1.0510	1.0510	1.5480

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.0920	0.0670	0.1160	0.1010	0.1330
2	0.2650	0.2490	0.2790	0.2370	0.2870
3	0.5200	0.5440	0.5120	0.4310	0.5000
4	0.8360	0.9240	0.8020	0.6740	0.7620
5	1.1910	1.3560	1.1340	0.9530	1.0640
6	1.5660	1.8090	1.4930	1.2570	1.3920

JAN-1 Weights at Age - Input Data

AGE	2007	2008
1	0.1740	0.1740
2	0.3880	0.3880
3	0.6750	0.6750
4	1.0150	1.0150
5	1.3880	1.3880
6	1.7760	1.7760

SSB Weight At Age - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.0950	0.0700	0.0860	0.0690	0.1370
2	0.2120	0.1900	0.1890	0.2670	0.2620
3	0.3070	0.3680	0.3790	0.5790	0.7580
4	0.4830	0.8850	0.7580	1.2350	1.7590
5	1.0760	1.3950	1.5830	1.7480	2.8190
6	3.0330	2.8620	2.5360	3.0550	3.1730

AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.0780	0.0810	0.0980	0.1000	0.1100
2	0.2360	0.1790	0.1860	0.1800	0.3100
3	0.5240	0.3980	0.3830	0.5400	0.6800
4	1.2340	0.7960	0.7690	1.0400	1.1200
5	2.1270	1.4940	1.4170	1.5800	1.6000
6	2.5360	3.0260	3.3480	2.3900	2.3300

AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.0900	0.0800	0.1200	0.1100	0.1000
2	0.2600	0.1800	0.2300	0.1900	0.1900
3	0.6000	0.3600	0.4100	0.3100	0.3200
4	1.0200	0.5900	0.6300	0.4600	0.4900
5	1.4800	0.8600	0.8900	0.6300	0.6800
6	2.1900	1.3300	1.3200	0.9400	1.0200
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.1900	0.1200	0.1100	0.1100	0.0860
2	0.2800	0.2100	0.2100	0.2100	0.2680
3	0.4100	0.3500	0.3900	0.3900	0.5470
4	0.5700	0.5200	0.6200	0.6200	0.8990
5	0.7400	0.7100	0.8700	0.8700	1.2970
6	1.0300	1.0400	1.3100	1.3100	1.7170
AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.1500	0.1250	0.1720	0.1480	0.1870
2	0.3580	0.3550	0.3640	0.3080	0.3660
3	0.6400	0.6880	0.6220	0.5230	0.6000
4	0.9740	1.0930	0.9310	0.7820	0.8790
5	1.3400	1.5360	1.2750	1.0720	1.1920
6	1.7190	1.9910	1.6410	1.3830	1.5290

SSB Weight At Age - Input Data

AGE	2007
1	0.2500
2	0.4950
3	0.8060
4	1.1610
5	1.5420
6	1.9330

Natural Mortality - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
4	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
5	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
6	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
4	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
5	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
6	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
4	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
5	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
6	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
4	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
5	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
6	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
2	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
3	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
4	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
5	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500
6	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500	0.2500

Natural Mortality - Input Data

AGE	2007
1	0.2500
2	0.2500
3	0.2500
4	0.2500
5	0.2500
6	0.2500
Proportion of Natural Mortality Before Spawning =	0.4000
Proportion of Fishing Mortality Before Spawning =	0.4000

Maturity - Input Data

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
2	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
2	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
2	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
2	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
2	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

Maturity - Input Data

AGE	2007
1	0.9000
2	1.0000
3	1.0000
4	1.0000
5	1.0000
6	1.0000

Input Partial Recruitment

AGE	
1	0.1200
2	0.2800
3	0.5700
4	1.0000
5	1.0000

Input F-Plus Ratio

YEAR

1982	1.0000
1983	1.0000
1984	1.0000
1985	1.0000
1986	1.0000
1987	1.0000
1988	1.0000
1989	1.0000
1990	1.0000
1991	1.0000
1992	1.0000
1993	1.0000
1994	1.0000
1995	1.0000
1996	1.0000
1997	1.0000
1998	1.0000
1999	1.0000
2000	1.0000
2001	1.0000
2002	1.0000
2003	1.0000
2004	1.0000
2005	1.0000
2006	1.0000
2007	1.0000

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	1	2	3	4	5
SURVEY TAG	DEDFW	DEDFW	DEDFW	DEDFW	DEDFW
AGE	1	2	3	4	5
TIME	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	4.7100	7.3300	3.0200	1.4500	0.2400
1983	5.3900	8.0000	3.3400	1.5700	0.2000
1984	2.9900	5.3200	2.4200	1.1500	0.1300
1985	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1986	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1987	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1988	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1989	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1990	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1991	27.1588	3.6382	0.6383	0.0000	0.0000
1992	21.1512	2.6081	0.0318	0.0318	0.0000
1993	50.2801	25.4220	3.9002	0.5169	0.0000
1994	113.4222	68.5360	23.6497	0.9653	0.0000
1995	75.2633	53.4866	15.7403	5.4251	0.0764
1996	44.0437	48.3017	111.1071	23.8182	6.3870
1997	33.4142	25.0014	13.5633	34.5991	2.9623
1998	23.3566	24.6266	20.3749	11.5955	20.7062
1999	42.0661	20.1604	17.0310	6.7402	2.5878
2000	97.8468	50.3831	23.6377	5.7446	0.6592
2001	13.1139	42.6313	18.7718	5.5263	0.5702
2002	89.3537	23.3228	27.9672	3.8367	0.4039
2003	50.1607	13.9835	1.2183	0.4237	0.0000
2004	26.3628	22.4048	0.1089	0.0000	0.0000
2005	12.0686	14.5354	2.3872	0.0000	0.0000
2006	58.3793	37.1285	10.0217	0.7848	0.0000
2007	23.4698	17.4276	2.0963	0.1644	0.0000
2008	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	6	7	8	9	10
SURVEY TAG	DEDFW	NJDEP	NJDEP	NJDEP	NJDEP
AGE	6	1	2	3	4
TIME	MEAN	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	0.3300	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1983	0.1800	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1984	0.0700	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1985	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1986	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1987	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1988	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1989	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1990	0.0000	0.0356	0.0260	0.0057	0.0024
1991	0.0000	0.0745	0.0523	0.0099	0.0023
1992	0.0000	0.0892	0.3206	0.0585	0.0007
1993	0.0000	0.0405	0.1103	0.0445	0.0181
1994	0.0000	0.2556	0.1489	0.0316	0.0000
1995	0.0000	0.0398	0.1607	0.0702	0.0082
1996	0.1331	0.0543	0.0434	0.1177	0.0273
1997	0.4740	0.1323	0.0342	0.0466	0.1339
1998	1.3252	0.0087	0.0440	0.0679	0.0350
1999	4.0331	0.0222	0.0396	0.0302	0.0053
2000	0.9418	0.0397	0.1255	0.1011	0.2153
2001	0.0877	0.0047	0.0788	0.1381	0.0582
2002	0.0000	0.1398	0.0546	0.0239	0.0029
2003	0.0000	0.0416	0.0407	0.0021	0.0003
2004	0.0000	0.0591	0.1735	0.0726	0.0129
2005	0.0000	0.0977	0.0934	0.0099	0.0008
2006	0.0000	0.0746	0.0747	0.0161	0.0000
2007	0.0000	0.0926	0.0122	0.0009	0.0001
2008	0.0000	0.0591	0.1735	0.0726	0.0129



SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	11	12	13	14	15
SURVEY TAG	NJDEP	NJDEP	NCGill	NCGill	NCGill
AGE	5	6	1	2	3
TIME	JAN-1	JAN-1	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1983	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1984	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1985	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1986	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1987	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1988	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1989	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1990	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1991	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1992	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1993	0.0014	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1994	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1995	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1996	0.0107	0.0009	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1997	0.0116	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1998	0.0821	0.0113	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1999	0.0015	0.0012	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2000	0.0112	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2001	0.0137	0.0029	0.1480	1.4886	0.3694
2002	0.0000	0.0000	0.1729	0.2674	1.0873
2003	0.0000	0.0000	0.1454	0.3669	0.3450
2004	0.0002	0.0000	0.2269	0.5946	0.5840
2005	0.0000	0.0000	0.1719	0.4862	0.6925
2006	0.0000	0.0000	0.1974	0.3766	0.5534
2007	0.0000	0.0000	0.1597	0.2564	0.1790
2008	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	16	17	18	19	20
SURVEY TAG	NCGill	NCGill	NCGill	SEAFALL	SEAFALL
AGE	4	5	6	1	2
TIME	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	JAN-1	JAN-1
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1983	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1984	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1985	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1986	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1987	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1988	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1989	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1990	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1991	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.1500	1.3200
1992	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.8500	5.6700
1993	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2000	0.6200
1994	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	15.2600	27.4000
1995	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	43.7800	7.0200
1996	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	3.6400	4.1600
1997	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	20.3400	1.1500
1998	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7100	4.0900
1999	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	4.5400	9.8700
2000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	24.5400	4.2100
2001	0.1459	0.1127	0.0000	8.9600	5.0100
2002	0.2423	0.0569	0.0089	5.6000	0.9300
2003	0.6802	0.0583	0.0000	44.3300	12.0000
2004	0.1885	0.0722	0.0000	22.2200	13.2200
2005	0.1747	0.0343	0.0009	10.8900	22.4300
2006	0.2130	0.0543	0.0008	238.5600	221.3300
2007	0.1140	0.0520	0.0008	2.6200	32.4200
2008	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.6600	1.9000

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	21	22	23	24	25
SURVEY TAG	SEAFALL	SEAFALL	SEAFALL	SEAFALL	RI
AGE	3	4	5	6	1
TIME	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	5.0400
1983	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	4.1100
1984	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7900
1985	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3800
1986	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	2.3700
1987	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7000
1988	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3300
1989	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.9000
1990	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.4200
1991	0.0500	0.0100	0.0000	0.0000	2.4500
1992	0.4200	0.0900	0.0100	0.0100	1.6600
1993	0.1100	0.0100	0.0100	0.0000	2.3500
1994	1.0300	0.0100	0.0100	0.0100	1.3000
1995	0.4800	0.1800	0.0300	0.0000	1.5700
1996	0.4500	0.0700	0.0000	0.0100	0.0900
1997	0.3100	0.0300	0.0000	0.0100	6.3400
1998	1.8400	0.7500	0.0800	0.0100	6.6900
1999	4.7200	0.9600	0.5900	0.0600	1.3900
2000	0.2700	0.0500	0.0100	0.0100	1.0000
2001	0.7400	0.0400	0.0100	0.0100	2.1000
2002	0.3300	0.0100	0.0100	0.0100	2.3900
2003	0.7700	1.4000	0.0100	0.0100	2.0700
2004	0.9100	0.1100	0.2200	0.0100	16.5400
2005	2.4400	0.0900	0.0000	0.0000	0.4000
2006	33.7400	0.7500	0.0000	0.0000	8.6400
2007	7.3000	1.7800	0.0000	0.0000	0.1600
2008	0.3900	0.1800	0.0000	0.0000	4.8300

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	26	27	28	29	30
SURVEY TAG	CT	NY	DEDFW	MDDNR1	MDDNR2
AGE	1	1	1	1	1
TIME	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	0.0000	0.0000	5.9800	0.2400	1.8500
1983	0.0000	0.0000	11.4900	0.2200	0.0000
1984	0.0000	0.0000	4.4700	1.3200	0.0000
1985	1.0000	0.0000	6.6700	0.1300	0.5200
1986	6.1900	0.0000	9.3500	1.6600	1.4000
1987	13.1600	0.0000	12.9400	0.4400	0.8500
1988	0.6300	0.6000	5.9800	0.3600	0.5600
1989	3.4900	0.1100	4.7300	0.2300	0.0000
1990	8.6900	1.3800	11.1100	0.4400	0.8700
1991	5.5600	0.5500	8.7300	0.9500	1.7200
1992	11.9500	20.6400	20.0700	0.7800	1.8900
1993	3.0500	3.2600	14.7200	3.2400	1.8100
1994	4.0800	1.0300	14.7900	1.5900	0.9100
1995	11.1900	8.3300	11.4700	2.3300	1.8400
1996	5.2200	1.6000	13.4900	5.9500	4.4400
1997	15.2300	24.4900	11.9300	6.4000	3.1800
1998	12.3800	18.7500	15.4000	4.2800	3.0600
1999	5.0200	1.0300	11.3500	5.8700	2.8000
2000	30.9300	8.4300	13.5100	3.2600	2.7600
2001	63.3100	15.8800	14.1600	6.5400	2.3400
2002	40.0900	16.1800	7.5700	8.1000	2.5600
2003	41.3500	12.1700	5.9600	3.9200	0.6100
2004	49.4100	7.0100	10.4400	4.8900	5.6400
2005	58.9800	5.5200	8.3900	1.6200	3.3900
2006	25.8600	31.9800	16.8400	3.5500	4.9800
2007	1.0500	8.7000	5.3500	2.4100	1.5000
2008	63.9300	12.0700	13.7000	1.6400	2.3200

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	31	32	33	34	35
SURVEY TAG	VIMS	NCDMF	NCDMF	MRFSS	MRFSS
AGE	1	1	2	3	4
TIME	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1	JAN-1
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1	1	1
1982	6.0200	0.0000	0.0000	0.1865	0.2176
1983	10.9500	0.0000	0.0000	0.0084	0.0588
1984	10.8500	0.0000	0.0000	0.1771	0.1631
1985	6.0500	0.0000	0.0000	0.1033	0.0919
1986	37.0400	0.0000	0.0000	0.0933	0.0758
1987	4.6200	0.0000	0.0000	0.3885	0.1329
1988	17.8500	12.1400	53.1400	0.2272	0.1262
1989	21.7200	101.5000	36.3800	0.1498	0.1915
1990	21.2700	14.2000	13.6400	0.0527	0.0527
1991	30.0100	50.2000	17.1800	0.0574	0.0309
1992	15.3200	36.9600	14.7400	0.0530	0.0485
1993	15.9100	42.7100	19.9200	0.0370	0.0328
1994	15.4200	8.7000	67.7100	0.0300	0.0258
1995	7.0400	68.0600	71.4300	0.0355	0.0659
1996	11.0000	38.2100	42.2800	0.0271	0.0588
1997	7.4200	72.3900	32.6200	0.0137	0.0504
1998	14.8200	32.7900	55.7000	0.0151	0.0605
1999	9.9500	70.4400	25.8100	0.0162	0.0647
2000	16.2500	99.9000	48.3600	0.0105	0.0264
2001	11.0900	62.9900	123.6600	0.0109	0.0274
2002	11.5200	30.3000	52.7500	0.0368	0.0263
2003	8.5900	22.0000	20.6400	0.0051	0.0462
2004	5.4200	23.9300	17.3900	0.0094	0.0047
2005	10.4700	28.7500	31.2400	0.0135	0.0058
2006	7.1000	28.7600	29.0000	0.0489	0.0384
2007	6.2000	39.0900	83.8200	0.0084	0.0196
2008	14.3700	56.7700	21.5300	0.0113	0.0054

SURVEY - INPUT DATA

INDEX	36	37	38		
SURVEY TAG	MRFSS	MRFSS	rec		
AGE	5	6	2 - 6	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
TIME	JAN-1	JAN-1	MEAN	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
TYPE	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS	NUMBERS
RETRO FLAG	1	1	1		

---

1982	0.2131	0.1066	0.2021
1983	0.0671	0.0630	0.5109
1984	0.1165	0.0326	0.3001
1985	0.0632	0.0172	0.2777
1986	0.0525	0.0175	0.7681
1987	0.0664	0.0102	0.5178
1988	0.0707	0.0101	0.5738
1989	0.1290	0.0291	0.1673
1990	0.0341	0.0093	0.1557
1991	0.0177	0.0044	0.1778
1992	0.0265	0.0088	0.1928
1993	0.0287	0.0082	0.1651
1994	0.0172	0.0043	0.3849
1995	0.0304	0.0000	0.5079
1996	0.0407	0.0045	0.6054
1997	0.1054	0.0321	0.5177
1998	0.0958	0.0302	0.5297
1999	0.1024	0.0323	0.4101
2000	0.0632	0.0474	0.4585
2001	0.0328	0.0711	0.2818
2002	0.0158	0.0158	0.2379
2003	0.0205	0.0154	0.1162
2004	0.0047	0.0047	0.1154
2005	0.0021	0.0020	0.2243
2006	0.0058	0.0001	0.1704
2007	0.0088	0.0009	0.0884
2008	0.0026	0.0003	0.0000

Additional Output Files

Population File C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Auxilliary File C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Covariance File C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Residuals File C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Log File C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R

Bootstrap Files

Bootstrap Stock Numbers C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Bootstrap Fishing Mortality C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Bootstrap Biomass C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R  
 Bootstrap Catchability C:\WEAKVPA\FINAL RUNS\UNLAGGED NJ\FINAL RUN\FINAL RUN BOOT AND R

Estimation Results

JAN-1 Population Numbers

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	45006.	41012.	44143.	63406.	70885.
2	28860.	26376.	24931.	25244.	36997.
3	10964.	11224.	9394.	6722.	9886.
4	4051.	3800.	3706.	1739.	2422.
5	1052.	777.	590.	316.	351.
6	932.	580.	310.	82.	69.
=====					
Total	90865.	83769.	83073.	97508.	120610.
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	54403.	26316.	20817.	26655.	29497.
2	38942.	28181.	13374.	12966.	12476.
3	15109.	17841.	8028.	5802.	5842.
4	3421.	7971.	4810.	2508.	2696.
5	335.	1374.	1031.	1231.	909.
6	25.	93.	139.	185.	112.
=====					
Total	112235.	81776.	48198.	49348.	51532.
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	35646.	36736.	49285.	23406.	29734.
2	14433.	23219.	24247.	35078.	14430.
3	4665.	5987.	12530.	15075.	24047.
4	2166.	1717.	2765.	6649.	8621.
5	911.	605.	361.	804.	3746.
6	112.	73.	70.	220.	272.
=====					
Total	57932.	68337.	89257.	81232.	80849.
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	16171.	11394.	9380.	12496.	6263.
2	20962.	11087.	7759.	6066.	8523.
3	8882.	14224.	6762.	4903.	3216.
4	14322.	4378.	7599.	3299.	2092.
5	3950.	6349.	1658.	3031.	1130.
6	1064.	1972.	2616.	799.	833.
=====					
Total	65352.	49404.	35774.	30594.	22057.

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	5969.	5630.	6107.	4480.	8662.
2	2772.	2398.	4090.	4009.	3196.
3	4065.	1227.	1042.	1869.	1584.
4	1226.	854.	142.	238.	380.
5	578.	249.	61.	13.	23.
6	345.	302.	47.	34.	18.
=====					
Total	14954.	10662.	11489.	10643.	13864.

JAN-1 Population Numbers

AGE	2007	2008
1	15343.	16443.
2	6090.	11407.
3	1931.	3737.
4	408.	1060.
5	79.	200.
6	15.	5.
=====		
Total	23866.	32852.

Fishing Mortality Calculated

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.2844	0.2477	0.3088	0.2887	0.3490
2	0.6944	0.7824	1.0608	0.6875	0.6456
3	0.8095	0.8582	1.4370	0.7706	0.8113
4	1.4015	1.6135	2.2116	1.3506	1.7287
5	1.4015	1.6135	2.2116	1.3506	1.7287
6	1.4015	1.6135	2.2116	1.3506	1.7287
=====					
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.4078	0.4269	0.2234	0.5092	0.4648
2	0.5306	1.0057	0.5851	0.5473	0.7337
3	0.3895	1.0608	0.9134	0.5166	0.7423
4	0.6618	1.7955	1.1127	0.7645	0.8351
5	0.6618	1.7955	1.1127	0.7645	0.8351
6	0.6618	1.7955	1.1127	0.7645	0.8351
=====					
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.1787	0.1655	0.0900	0.2337	0.0996
2	0.6299	0.3669	0.2253	0.1276	0.2352
3	0.7496	0.5227	0.3837	0.3088	0.2682
4	1.0256	1.3097	0.9848	0.3237	0.5304
5	1.0256	1.3097	0.9848	0.3237	0.5304
6	1.0256	1.3097	0.9848	0.3237	0.5304



AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.1274	0.1343	0.1858	0.1326	0.5652
2	0.1378	0.2445	0.2090	0.3845	0.4904
3	0.4576	0.3769	0.4676	0.6017	0.7142
4	0.5634	0.7208	0.6693	0.8219	1.0366
5	0.5634	0.7208	0.6693	0.8219	1.0366
6	0.5634	0.7208	0.6693	0.8219	1.0366

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.6618	0.0696	0.1710	0.0879	0.1024
2	0.5647	0.5839	0.5331	0.6783	0.2539
3	1.3097	1.9079	1.2269	1.3426	1.1059
4	1.3437	2.3915	2.1654	2.0733	1.3175
5	1.3437	2.3915	2.1654	2.0733	1.3175
6	1.3437	2.3915	2.1654	2.0733	1.3175

Fishing Mortality Calculated

AGE	2007
1	0.0464
2	0.2383
3	0.3495
4	0.4631
5	0.5570
6	0.5570

Average Fishing Mortality For Ages 4- 5

Year	Average F	N Weighted	Biomass Wtd	Catch Wtd
1982	1.4015	1.4015	1.4015	1.4015
1983	1.6135	1.6135	1.6135	1.6135
1984	2.2116	2.2116	2.2116	2.2116
1985	1.3506	1.3506	1.3506	1.3506
1986	1.7287	1.7287	1.7287	1.7287
1987	0.6618	0.6618	0.6618	0.6618
1988	1.7955	1.7955	1.7955	1.7955
1989	1.1127	1.1127	1.1127	1.1127
1990	0.7645	0.7645	0.7645	0.7645
1991	0.8351	0.8351	0.8351	0.8351
1992	1.0256	1.0256	1.0256	1.0256
1993	1.3097	1.3097	1.3097	1.3097
1994	0.9848	0.9848	0.9848	0.9848
1995	0.3237	0.3237	0.3237	0.3237
1996	0.5304	0.5304	0.5304	0.5304
1997	0.5634	0.5634	0.5634	0.5634
1998	0.7208	0.7208	0.7208	0.7208
1999	0.6693	0.6693	0.6693	0.6693
2000	0.8219	0.8219	0.8219	0.8219

2001	1.0366	1.0366	1.0366	1.0366
2002	1.3437	1.3437	1.3437	1.3437
2003	2.3915	2.3915	2.3915	2.3915
2004	2.1654	2.1654	2.1654	2.1654
2005	2.0733	2.0733	2.0733	2.0733
2006	1.3175	1.3175	1.3175	1.3175
2007	0.5101	0.4784	0.4828	0.4779

Average Fishing Mortality For Ages 1- 5

Year            Average F    N Weighted    Biomass Wtd    Catch Wtd

---

1982	0.9182	0.5433	0.7299	0.6642
1983	1.0231	0.5748	0.9195	0.7473
1984	1.4460	0.7622	1.2146	1.0228
1985	0.8896	0.4477	0.6967	0.5392
1986	1.0526	0.5097	0.7580	0.5867
1987	0.5303	0.4564	0.4913	0.4651
1988	1.2169	0.9216	1.2525	1.0414
1989	0.7895	0.5474	0.8092	0.7008
1990	0.6204	0.5395	0.6247	0.5453
1991	0.7222	0.5875	0.7466	0.6137
1992	0.7219	0.3824	0.7490	0.5401
1993	0.7349	0.3042	0.5366	0.4193
1994	0.5337	0.1994	0.3409	0.3293
1995	0.2635	0.2100	0.2348	0.2365
1996	0.3328	0.2403	0.3384	0.3145
1997	0.3699	0.3003	0.3954	0.4159
1998	0.4395	0.3655	0.5010	0.4669
1999	0.4402	0.3837	0.5308	0.4768
2000	0.5525	0.4075	0.6482	0.5633
2001	0.7686	0.6293	0.8023	0.6666
2002	1.0447	0.9078	1.1444	0.9880
2003	1.4689	0.6538	1.5688	1.4585
2004	1.2523	0.4319	0.6936	0.6660
2005	1.2511	0.5790	0.8919	0.9359
2006	0.8194	0.2876	0.5168	0.6327
2007	0.3309	0.1288	0.2034	0.2287

Back Calculated Partial Recruitment

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	0.2029	0.1535	0.1396	0.2138	0.2019
2	0.4954	0.4849	0.4797	0.5090	0.3735
3	0.5776	0.5319	0.6498	0.5705	0.4693
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	0.6162	0.2377	0.2008	0.6660	0.5566
2	0.8018	0.5601	0.5258	0.7158	0.8786
3	0.5885	0.5908	0.8208	0.6758	0.8889
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	0.1742	0.1264	0.0914	0.7218	0.1878
2	0.6142	0.2801	0.2287	0.3941	0.4435
3	0.7309	0.3991	0.3896	0.9540	0.5057
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	0.2262	0.1863	0.2776	0.1614	0.5453
2	0.2446	0.3391	0.3123	0.4678	0.4731
3	0.8122	0.5229	0.6988	0.7321	0.6890
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	0.4925	0.0291	0.0790	0.0424	0.0777
2	0.4202	0.2441	0.2462	0.3272	0.1927
3	0.9747	0.7978	0.5666	0.6475	0.8394
4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
5	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
6	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

Back Calculated Partial Recruitment

AGE	2007
1	0.0834
2	0.4277
3	0.6275
4	0.8314
5	1.0000
6	1.0000

JAN-1 Biomass

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	4771.	3199.	4194.	4882.	10774.
2	6118.	5011.	4712.	6740.	9693.
3	3366.	4131.	3560.	3892.	7494.
4	1956.	3363.	2809.	2147.	4261.
5	1132.	1087.	933.	553.	989.
6	2828.	1658.	785.	250.	220.
=====					
Total	20171.	18450.	16993.	18465.	33431.
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	4733.	2368.	2269.	1599.	1062.
2	9190.	5044.	2488.	1348.	2682.
3	7917.	7101.	3075.	2362.	3172.
4	4221.	6345.	3699.	2170.	2617.
5	712.	2054.	1461.	1722.	1315.
6	64.	280.	466.	361.	216.
=====					
Total	26838.	23192.	13457.	9562.	11065.
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	962.	1323.	3401.	1662.	1962.
2	2612.	3065.	4389.	5367.	2193.
3	2225.	1748.	4335.	3995.	6637.
4	1895.	874.	1537.	2706.	3733.
5	1208.	465.	289.	460.	2311.
6	201.	77.	75.	166.	223.
=====					
Total	9104.	7551.	14026.	14356.	17060.

AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	2248.	889.	553.	737.	269.
2	5010.	1885.	1288.	1007.	1551.
3	3251.	4239.	2225.	1613.	1367.
4	7376.	2001.	4088.	1775.	1571.
5	2690.	4076.	1298.	2373.	1281.
6	917.	1668.	2749.	840.	1290.
=====					
Total	21492.	14757.	12202.	8345.	7329.

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	549.	377.	708.	453.	1152.
2	735.	597.	1141.	950.	917.
3	2114.	668.	533.	806.	792.
4	1025.	789.	114.	160.	290.
5	688.	338.	69.	12.	25.
6	540.	547.	70.	42.	25.
=====					
Total	5650.	3316.	2636.	2423.	3201.

JAN-1 Biomass

AGE	2007	2008
1	2670.	2861.
2	2363.	4426.
3	1303.	2523.
4	414.	1076.
5	110.	278.
6	27.	8.
=====		
Total	6887.	11172.

Mean Biomass

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	4951.	3909.	5377.	6961.	10079.
2	5210.	4178.	4084.	7339.	11854.
3	3522.	3290.	2573.	4802.	7816.
4	1627.	2591.	1633.	2331.	2862.
5	726.	835.	365.	406.	451.
6	1384.	752.	292.	125.	96.
Total	17421.	15556.	14324.	21965.	33158.
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	4983.	2467.	2089.	1868.	2213.
2	7948.	4109.	2421.	2064.	2882.
3	6329.	5358.	2714.	2517.	2771.
4	2662.	3793.	2881.	1776.	1982.
5	366.	1100.	1011.	1295.	936.
6	42.	119.	255.	257.	148.
Total	22330.	16946.	11371.	9777.	10933.
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	2464.	2285.	4930.	2004.	2610.
2	3004.	3535.	4960.	5989.	2401.
3	1964.	1643.	4139.	3846.	6587.
4	1342.	552.	1072.	2459.	3124.
5	802.	279.	193.	405.	1865.
6	128.	44.	49.	143.	176.
Total	9705.	8338.	15342.	14846.	16762.
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	2505.	1135.	798.	1090.	857.
2	5213.	2012.	1499.	1083.	2288.
3	2789.	3952.	2065.	1412.	929.
4	5841.	1532.	3265.	1330.	847.
5	2082.	3015.	992.	1701.	693.
6	696.	1202.	2038.	584.	1120.
Total	19126.	12849.	10658.	7200.	6734.

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	1018.	1060.	1136.	1061.	2125.
2	607.	504.	976.	925.	831.
3	1173.	201.	244.	413.	418.
4	441.	198.	42.	47.	139.
5	260.	134.	37.	6.	11.
6	239.	273.	74.	48.	44.
Total	3739.	2371.	2509.	2500.	3567.

Mean Biomass

AGE	2007
1	2855.
2	1662.
3	680.
4	245.
5	53.
6	41.
Total	5535.

Spawning Stock Biomass

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	3107.	2117.	2732.	3174.	6878.
2	4194.	3316.	2789.	4633.	6775.
3	2203.	2651.	1813.	2587.	4902.
4	1011.	1596.	1049.	1132.	1931.
5	585.	514.	349.	291.	448.
6	1461.	787.	293.	132.	100.
Total	12560.	10982.	9026.	11949.	21033.

AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	2936.	1463.	1519.	1771.	2194.
2	6726.	3053.	1781.	1697.	2609.
3	6130.	4203.	1931.	2306.	2671.
4	2931.	2799.	2145.	1738.	1956.
5	495.	906.	847.	1296.	943.
6	45.	124.	270.	295.	170.
Total	19262.	12548.	8493.	9103.	10543.

AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	2432.	2240.	4646.	1910.	2327.
2	2639.	3266.	4611.	5731.	2258.
3	1877.	1582.	3987.	3737.	6254.
4	1326.	543.	1063.	2431.	3092.
5	809.	279.	196.	403.	1864.
6	147.	52.	57.	165.	203.
Total	9231.	7961.	14560.	14376.	15998.

AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	2378.	1055.	780.	1062.	350.
2	5026.	1911.	1356.	988.	1699.
3	2744.	3874.	1979.	1360.	1196.
4	5896.	1544.	3262.	1332.	1124.
5	2111.	3057.	999.	1717.	876.
6	791.	1391.	2373.	682.	855.
Total	18947.	12832.	10748.	7141.	6100.

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	560.	557.	799.	521.	1266.
2	716.	610.	1088.	852.	956.
3	1394.	356.	359.	517.	553.
4	631.	325.	50.	73.	179.
5	409.	133.	30.	5.	15.
6	313.	209.	29.	18.	15.
Total	4024.	2190.	2355.	1987.	2983.

Spawning Stock Biomass

AGE	2007
1	3066.
2	2480.
3	1224.
4	356.
5	89.
6	21.
Total	7236.



Catch Biomass

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	1408.	968.	1661.	2010.	3517.
2	3618.	3269.	4333.	5046.	7653.
3	2851.	2824.	3697.	3701.	6341.
4	2281.	4181.	3612.	3149.	4948.
5	1018.	1347.	808.	548.	780.
6	1940.	1214.	645.	168.	165.
Total	13116.	13803.	14756.	14621.	23404.
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	2032.	1053.	467.	951.	1029.
2	4217.	4132.	1416.	1130.	2115.
3	2465.	5684.	2479.	1300.	2057.
4	1761.	6811.	3206.	1358.	1655.
5	242.	1976.	1125.	990.	782.
6	28.	214.	283.	197.	124.
Total	10745.	19870.	8976.	5925.	7761.
AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	440.	378.	444.	468.	260.
2	1892.	1297.	1117.	764.	565.
3	1473.	859.	1588.	1188.	1767.
4	1377.	723.	1055.	796.	1657.
5	823.	365.	190.	131.	989.
6	131.	58.	48.	46.	93.
Total	6136.	3680.	4443.	3394.	5330.
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	319.	152.	148.	145.	484.
2	718.	492.	313.	416.	1122.
3	1276.	1490.	966.	850.	663.
4	3291.	1105.	2185.	1093.	878.
5	1173.	2173.	664.	1398.	718.
6	392.	867.	1364.	480.	1161.
Total	7170.	6278.	5640.	4382.	5027.

AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	674.	74.	194.	93.	217.
2	343.	294.	520.	627.	211.
3	1537.	384.	299.	555.	462.
4	593.	474.	91.	97.	183.
5	349.	321.	80.	13.	14.
6	322.	653.	160.	101.	58.
Total	3817.	2200.	1345.	1485.	1146.

Catch Biomass

AGE	2007
1	133.
2	396.
3	238.
4	114.
5	24.
6	23.
Total	927.

Catch Numbers

AGE	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
1	9914.2	8004.0	10444.2	14153.2	18610.7
2	12967.0	12869.1	14736.9	11262.3	15778.4
3	5473.0	5822.7	6521.1	3246.1	4942.4
4	2778.2	2780.0	3045.3	1171.0	1823.7
5	721.6	568.2	484.5	212.9	264.1
6	639.5	424.1	254.5	55.1	52.1
Total	32493.5	30468.1	35486.5	30100.6	41471.4
AGE	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	16256.3	8161.9	3705.0	9510.1	9795.9
2	14343.1	16140.8	5304.9	4890.1	5825.6
3	4347.1	10545.3	4333.5	2093.6	2750.0
4	1485.2	6092.0	2922.3	1204.8	1373.6
5	145.4	1050.5	626.2	591.4	463.4
6	11.0	70.7	84.6	89.1	57.3
Total	36588.1	42061.2	16976.5	18379.1	20265.8

AGE	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
1	5179.5	4974.8	3761.9	4336.3	2498.8
2	6046.0	6357.0	4347.4	3727.7	2689.5
3	2211.0	2179.8	3561.0	3566.7	5033.3
4	1255.0	1138.6	1563.5	1637.8	3174.2
5	527.8	401.1	204.1	198.1	1379.3
6	65.0	48.2	39.8	54.3	100.1
=====					
Total	15284.3	15099.5	13477.7	13520.9	14875.2
AGE	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1	1716.4	1270.6	1412.6	1377.0	2420.7
2	2394.2	2138.3	1300.4	1727.1	2953.1
3	2913.2	3983.1	2256.6	1985.7	1474.1
4	5522.0	2019.2	3326.0	1663.7	1219.9
5	1523.1	2928.8	725.7	1528.2	658.7
6	410.2	909.5	1145.0	403.0	485.9
=====					
Total	14479.1	13249.5	10166.3	8684.7	9212.4
AGE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
1	2591.7	335.6	852.3	334.3	747.3
2	1070.5	949.9	1511.9	1771.5	637.3
3	2695.7	959.7	667.8	1255.2	959.2
4	823.9	718.4	115.8	191.5	252.9
5	388.2	209.5	49.7	10.2	15.5
6	231.5	254.2	38.4	27.1	11.9
=====					
Total	7801.5	3427.3	3235.9	3589.8	2624.1

Catch Numbers

AGE	2007
1	616.6
2	1148.0
3	507.6
4	135.2
5	25.2
6	5.8
=====	
Total	2438.4

Surplus Production

Average Adjustment Factor (Delta) = 1.0000

Year	Biomass	Delta Biomass	Catch Biomass	Surplus Production
1982	20171.083	-1721.376	13115.726	11394.350
1983	18449.707	-1456.223	13803.341	12347.118
1984	16993.483	1471.296	14755.539	16226.835
1985	18464.779	14965.989	14621.399	29587.388
1986	33430.768	-6592.756	23404.472	16811.716
1987	26838.012	-3646.337	10745.440	7099.103
1988	23191.675	-9734.783	19869.631	10134.849
1989	13456.893	-3894.793	8975.659	5080.867
1990	9562.100	1503.181	5925.206	7428.387
1991	11065.281	-1961.751	7760.802	5799.051
1992	9103.530	-1552.084	6135.862	4583.777
1993	7551.446	6474.078	3680.393	10154.471
1994	14025.524	330.412	4442.975	4773.387
1995	14355.936	2704.246	3393.641	6097.887
1996	17060.182	4431.459	5330.342	9761.801
1997	21491.641	-6734.272	7169.542	435.270
1998	14757.369	-2555.289	6278.386	3723.097
1999	12202.080	-3856.852	5640.437	1783.585
2000	8345.228	-1015.922	4382.023	3366.100
2001	7329.306	-1679.011	5027.275	3348.264
2002	5650.295	-2334.027	3817.324	1483.297
2003	3316.268	-680.319	2200.154	1519.835
2004	2635.949	-213.040	1344.697	1131.657
2005	2422.910	777.898	1485.377	2263.275
2006	3200.807	3686.450	1146.048	4832.498
2007	6887.257	4284.426	926.806	5211.232
2008	11171.683			

Summary of Survey Indices Used in the Estimate

INDEX	Survey Tag	Age	Time	Type	Catchability	Std. Error	CV
1	DEDFW	1	MEAN	NUMBER	0.2119E-02	0.6910E-03	0.3260E+00
2	DEDFW	2	MEAN	NUMBER	0.2506E-02	0.7186E-03	0.2868E+00
3	DEDFW	3	MEAN	NUMBER	0.1420E-02	0.5420E-03	0.3817E+00
4	DEDFW	4	MEAN	NUMBER	0.1325E-02	0.4215E-03	0.3181E+00
5	DEDFW	5	MEAN	NUMBER	0.8923E-03	0.2794E-03	0.3131E+00
6	DEDFW	6	MEAN	NUMBER	0.7923E-03	0.1933E-03	0.2440E+00
7	NJDEP	1	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.3594E-05	0.8427E-06	0.2345E+00
8	NJDEP	2	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.7893E-05	0.1806E-05	0.2288E+00
9	NJDEP	3	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.5782E-05	0.1644E-05	0.2843E+00
10	NJDEP	4	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.3334E-05	0.1478E-05	0.4431E+00
11	NJDEP	5	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.1855E-05	0.8210E-06	0.4426E+00
12	NJDEP	6	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.1499E-05	0.9329E-06	0.6222E+00
13	NCGill	1	MEAN	NUMBER	0.3151E-04	0.5629E-05	0.1787E+00
14	NCGill	2	MEAN	NUMBER	0.1579E-03	0.3115E-04	0.1972E+00
15	NCGill	3	MEAN	NUMBER	0.4553E-03	0.1379E-03	0.3029E+00
16	NCGill	4	MEAN	NUMBER	0.8500E-03	0.3844E-03	0.4523E+00
17	NCGill	5	MEAN	NUMBER	0.1123E-02	0.6277E-03	0.5591E+00
18	NCGill	6	MEAN	NUMBER	0.7014E-04	0.8013E-05	0.1142E+00
34	MRFSS	3	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.5686E-05	0.1133E-05	0.1993E+00
35	MRFSS	4	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.1976E-04	0.3145E-05	0.1592E+00
36	MRFSS	5	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.5733E-04	0.1052E-04	0.1835E+00
37	MRFSS	6	JAN-1	NUMBER	0.6411E-04	0.1218E-04	0.1900E+00
38	rec	2 - 6	MEAN	NUMBER	0.1832E-04	0.2135E-05	0.1165E+00

Survey Index: 1 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 1  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.211918E-02 % Variance Contribution = 9.0380  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.471000E+01	0.738853E+02	-0.275283E+01
1983	0.539000E+01	0.684657E+02	-0.254179E+01
1984	0.299000E+01	0.716663E+02	-0.317675E+01
1985	N/A	0.103885E+03	N/A
1986	N/A	0.113012E+03	N/A
1987	N/A	0.844810E+02	N/A
1988	N/A	0.405200E+02	N/A
1989	N/A	0.351415E+02	N/A
1990	N/A	0.395799E+02	N/A
1991	0.271588E+02	0.446618E+02	-0.497418E+00
1992	0.211512E+02	0.614345E+02	-0.106627E+01
1993	0.502801E+02	0.637032E+02	-0.236626E+00
1994	0.113422E+03	0.885392E+02	0.247672E+00
1995	0.752633E+02	0.393266E+02	0.649090E+00
1996	0.440437E+02	0.531771E+02	-0.188446E+00
1997	0.334142E+02	0.285450E+02	0.157499E+00
1998	0.233566E+02	0.200478E+02	0.152759E+00
1999	0.420661E+02	0.161125E+02	0.959645E+00
2000	0.978468E+02	0.220036E+02	0.149220E+01
2001	0.131139E+02	0.907614E+01	0.368024E+00
2002	0.893537E+02	0.829898E+01	0.237647E+01
2003	0.501607E+02	0.102129E+02	0.159158E+01
2004	0.263628E+02	0.105631E+02	0.914585E+00
2005	0.120686E+02	0.805700E+01	0.404066E+00
2006	0.583793E+02	0.154717E+02	0.132795E+01
2007	0.234698E+02	0.281381E+02	-0.181410E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 2 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 2  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.250557E-02 % Variance Contribution = 6.9939  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.733000E+01	0.467906E+02	-0.185371E+01
1983	0.800000E+01	0.412148E+02	-0.163935E+01
1984	0.532000E+01	0.348077E+02	-0.187836E+01
1985	N/A	0.410478E+02	N/A
1986	N/A	0.612378E+02	N/A
1987	N/A	0.677316E+02	N/A
1988	N/A	0.402116E+02	N/A
1989	N/A	0.227189E+02	N/A
1990	N/A	0.223886E+02	N/A
1991	0.363820E+01	0.198952E+02	-0.169899E+01
1992	0.260810E+01	0.240493E+02	-0.222148E+01
1993	0.254220E+02	0.434173E+02	-0.535244E+00
1994	0.685360E+02	0.483542E+02	0.348806E+00
1995	0.534866E+02	0.732032E+02	-0.313808E+00
1996	0.483017E+02	0.286455E+02	0.522469E+00
1997	0.250014E+02	0.435367E+02	-0.554673E+00
1998	0.246266E+02	0.219172E+02	0.116556E+00

1999	0.201604E+02	0.155890E+02	0.257153E+00
2000	0.503831E+02	0.112544E+02	0.149890E+01
2001	0.426313E+02	0.150866E+02	0.103878E+01
2002	0.233228E+02	0.475010E+01	0.159127E+01
2003	0.139835E+02	0.407628E+01	0.123269E+01
2004	0.224048E+02	0.710606E+01	0.114833E+01
2005	0.145354E+02	0.654358E+01	0.798103E+00
2006	0.371285E+02	0.628982E+01	0.177545E+01
2007	0.174276E+02	0.120726E+02	0.367117E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 3 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 3  
Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.141990E-02 % Variance Contribution = 12.3867  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.302000E+01	0.959993E+01	-0.115650E+01
1983	0.334000E+01	0.963323E+01	-0.105925E+01
1984	0.242000E+01	0.644333E+01	-0.979278E+00
1985	N/A	0.598131E+01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.865021E+01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.158488E+02	N/A
1988	N/A	0.141154E+02	N/A
1989	N/A	0.673682E+01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.575404E+01	N/A
1991	0.638300E+00	0.526027E+01	-0.210913E+01
1992	0.318000E-01	0.418784E+01	-0.488047E+01
1993	0.390020E+01	0.592142E+01	-0.417548E+00
1994	0.236497E+02	0.131776E+02	0.584832E+00
1995	0.157403E+02	0.163978E+02	-0.409246E-01
1996	0.111107E+03	0.266459E+02	0.142786E+01
1997	0.135633E+02	0.903976E+01	0.405735E+00
1998	0.203749E+02	0.150050E+02	0.305919E+00
1999	0.170310E+02	0.685167E+01	0.910544E+00
2000	0.236377E+02	0.468592E+01	0.161828E+01
2001	0.187718E+02	0.293052E+01	0.185718E+01
2002	0.279672E+02	0.292249E+01	0.225860E+01
2003	0.121830E+01	0.714240E+00	0.533992E+00
2004	0.108900E+00	0.772872E+00	-0.195968E+01
2005	0.238720E+01	0.132749E+01	0.586831E+00
2006	0.100217E+02	0.123151E+01	0.209652E+01
2007	0.209630E+01	0.206199E+01	0.165018E-01
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 4 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 4  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.132513E-02 % Variance Contribution = 6.1574  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.145000E+01	0.262682E+01	-0.594210E+00
1983	0.157000E+01	0.228320E+01	-0.374501E+00
1984	0.115000E+01	0.182466E+01	-0.461634E+00
1985	N/A	0.114891E+01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.139797E+01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.297395E+01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.449595E+01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.348012E+01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.208826E+01	N/A
1991	N/A	0.217973E+01	N/A
1992	0.318000E-01	0.162151E+01	-0.393165E+01
1993	0.516900E+00	0.115204E+01	-0.801444E+00
1994	0.965300E+00	0.210378E+01	-0.779051E+00
1995	0.542510E+01	0.670420E+01	-0.211698E+00
1996	0.238182E+02	0.793064E+01	0.109972E+01
1997	0.345991E+02	0.129877E+02	0.979823E+00
1998	0.115955E+02	0.371187E+01	0.113908E+01
1999	0.674020E+01	0.658549E+01	0.232210E-01
2000	0.574460E+01	0.268239E+01	0.761552E+00
2001	0.552630E+01	0.155948E+01	0.126517E+01
2002	0.383670E+01	0.812500E+00	0.155225E+01
2003	0.423700E+00	0.398061E+00	0.624205E-01
2004	N/A	0.708650E-01	N/A
2005	N/A	0.122394E+00	N/A
2006	0.784800E+00	0.254361E+00	0.112667E+01
2007	0.164400E+00	0.386844E+00	-0.855720E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 5 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 5  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.892300E-03 % Variance Contribution = 2.4129  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.240000E+00	0.459426E+00	-0.649339E+00
1983	0.200000E+00	0.314233E+00	-0.451818E+00
1984	0.130000E+00	0.195478E+00	-0.407916E+00
1985	N/A	0.140655E+00	N/A
1986	N/A	0.136321E+00	N/A
1987	N/A	0.196049E+00	N/A
1988	N/A	0.522047E+00	N/A
1989	N/A	0.502152E+00	N/A
1990	N/A	0.690244E+00	N/A
1991	N/A	0.495165E+00	N/A
1992	N/A	0.459195E+00	N/A
1993	N/A	0.273277E+00	N/A
1994	N/A	0.184926E+00	N/A
1995	0.764000E-01	0.546038E+00	-0.196671E+01
1996	0.638700E+01	0.232052E+01	0.101247E+01
1997	0.296230E+01	0.241222E+01	0.205417E+00
1998	0.207062E+02	0.362540E+01	0.174247E+01



1999	0.258780E+01	0.967554E+00	0.983792E+00
2000	0.659200E+00	0.165913E+01	-0.923019E+00
2001	0.570200E+00	0.567015E+00	0.560103E-02
2002	0.403900E+00	0.257785E+00	0.449043E+00
2003	N/A	0.781663E-01	N/A
2004	N/A	0.204801E-01	N/A
2005	N/A	0.438978E-02	N/A
2006	N/A	0.104975E-01	N/A
2007	N/A	0.485526E-01	N/A
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 6 Tag: DEDFW AGE = 6  
Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.792329E-03 % Variance Contribution = 0.9592  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.330000E+00	0.361538E+00	-0.912754E-01
1983	0.180000E+00	0.208264E+00	-0.145849E+00
1984	0.700000E-01	0.911775E-01	-0.264313E+00
1985	N/A	0.323241E-01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.238797E-01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.131701E-01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.311981E-01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.602403E-01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.923408E-01	N/A
1991	N/A	0.543680E-01	N/A
1992	N/A	0.502153E-01	N/A
1993	N/A	0.291603E-01	N/A
1994	N/A	0.320208E-01	N/A
1995	N/A	0.132902E+00	N/A
1996	0.133100E+00	0.149539E+00	-0.116458E+00
1997	0.474000E+00	0.576872E+00	-0.196413E+00
1998	0.132520E+01	0.999686E+00	0.281878E+00
1999	0.403310E+01	0.135556E+01	0.109032E+01
2000	0.941800E+00	0.388507E+00	0.885482E+00
2001	0.877000E-01	0.371406E+00	-0.144337E+01
2002	N/A	0.136505E+00	N/A
2003	N/A	0.842182E-01	N/A
2004	N/A	0.140508E-01	N/A
2005	N/A	0.103564E-01	N/A
2006	N/A	0.715643E-02	N/A
2007	N/A	0.824995E-02	N/A
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 7 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 1  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.359433E-05 % Variance Contribution = 4.2063  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.161766E+00	N/A
1983	N/A	0.147412E+00	N/A
1984	N/A	0.158664E+00	N/A
1985	N/A	0.227900E+00	N/A
1986	N/A	0.254782E+00	N/A
1987	N/A	0.195543E+00	N/A
1988	N/A	0.945887E-01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.748213E-01	N/A
1990	0.356000E-01	0.958075E-01	-0.989996E+00
1991	0.745000E-01	0.106023E+00	-0.352853E+00
1992	0.892000E-01	0.128123E+00	-0.362106E+00
1993	0.405000E-01	0.132043E+00	-0.118182E+01
1994	0.255600E+00	0.177147E+00	0.366634E+00
1995	0.398000E-01	0.841277E-01	-0.748469E+00
1996	0.543000E-01	0.106875E+00	-0.677135E+00
1997	0.132300E+00	0.581249E-01	0.822478E+00
1998	0.870000E-02	0.409543E-01	-0.154913E+01
1999	0.222000E-01	0.337142E-01	-0.417827E+00
2000	0.397000E-01	0.449140E-01	-0.123398E+00
2001	0.470000E-02	0.225119E-01	-0.156648E+01
2002	0.139800E+00	0.214550E-01	0.187426E+01
2003	0.416000E-01	0.202377E-01	0.720554E+00
2004	0.591000E-01	0.219511E-01	0.990414E+00
2005	0.977000E-01	0.161042E-01	0.180282E+01
2006	0.746000E-01	0.311356E-01	0.873789E+00
2007	0.926000E-01	0.551475E-01	0.518277E+00
2008	0.591000E-01	0.591000E-01	-0.412020E-10

Survey Index: 8 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 2  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.789323E-05 % Variance Contribution = 4.0068  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.227799E+00	N/A
1983	N/A	0.208188E+00	N/A
1984	N/A	0.196790E+00	N/A
1985	N/A	0.199258E+00	N/A
1986	N/A	0.292026E+00	N/A
1987	N/A	0.307377E+00	N/A
1988	N/A	0.222438E+00	N/A
1989	N/A	0.105565E+00	N/A
1990	0.260000E-01	0.102342E+00	-0.137023E+01
1991	0.523000E-01	0.984749E-01	-0.632805E+00
1992	0.320600E+00	0.113919E+00	0.103470E+01
1993	0.110300E+00	0.183272E+00	-0.507765E+00
1994	0.148900E+00	0.191384E+00	-0.251006E+00
1995	0.160700E+00	0.276881E+00	-0.544049E+00
1996	0.434000E-01	0.113899E+00	-0.964856E+00
1997	0.342000E-01	0.165460E+00	-0.157650E+01
1998	0.440000E-01	0.875156E-01	-0.687628E+00

1999	0.396000E-01	0.612397E-01	-0.435966E+00
2000	0.125500E+00	0.478838E-01	0.963528E+00
2001	0.788000E-01	0.672743E-01	0.158135E+00
2002	0.546000E-01	0.218780E-01	0.914550E+00
2003	0.407000E-01	0.189310E-01	0.765425E+00
2004	0.173500E+00	0.322836E-01	0.168162E+01
2005	0.934000E-01	0.316417E-01	0.108241E+01
2006	0.747000E-01	0.252241E-01	0.108568E+01
2007	0.122000E-01	0.480692E-01	-0.137121E+01
2008	0.173500E+00	0.900372E-01	0.655955E+00

Survey Index: 9 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 3  
Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.578221E-05 % Variance Contribution = 6.1833  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.633936E-01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.649021E-01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.543188E-01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.388655E-01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.571641E-01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.873606E-01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.103158E+00	N/A
1989	N/A	0.464186E-01	N/A
1990	0.570000E-02	0.335504E-01	-0.177258E+01
1991	0.990000E-02	0.337790E-01	-0.122731E+01
1992	0.585000E-01	0.269751E-01	0.774113E+00
1993	0.445000E-01	0.346179E-01	0.251119E+00
1994	0.316000E-01	0.724498E-01	-0.829737E+00
1995	0.702000E-01	0.871642E-01	-0.216445E+00
1996	0.117700E+00	0.139042E+00	-0.166640E+00
1997	0.466000E-01	0.513596E-01	-0.972513E-01
1998	0.679000E-01	0.822465E-01	-0.191685E+00
1999	0.302000E-01	0.391010E-01	-0.258307E+00
2000	0.101100E+00	0.283483E-01	0.127154E+01
2001	0.138100E+00	0.185980E-01	0.200492E+01
2002	0.239000E-01	0.235026E-01	0.167678E-01
2003	0.210000E-02	0.709649E-02	-0.121766E+01
2004	0.726000E-01	0.602374E-02	0.248926E+01
2005	0.990000E-02	0.108076E-01	-0.877138E-01
2006	0.161000E-01	0.916087E-02	0.563878E+00
2007	0.900000E-03	0.111642E-01	-0.251807E+01
2008	0.726000E-01	0.216102E-01	0.121180E+01

Survey Index: 10 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 4  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.333437E-05 % Variance Contribution = 11.9491  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.135059E-01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.126716E-01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.123559E-01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.579695E-02	N/A
1986	N/A	0.807695E-02	N/A
1987	N/A	0.114061E-01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.265780E-01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.160385E-01	N/A
1990	0.240000E-02	0.836319E-02	-0.124837E+01
1991	0.230000E-02	0.898825E-02	-0.136301E+01
1992	0.700000E-03	0.722129E-02	-0.233371E+01
1993	0.181000E-01	0.572456E-02	0.115115E+01
1994	N/A	0.921814E-02	N/A
1995	0.820000E-02	0.221689E-01	-0.994556E+00
1996	0.273000E-01	0.287445E-01	-0.515612E-01
1997	0.133900E+00	0.477540E-01	0.103103E+01
1998	0.350000E-01	0.145963E-01	0.874583E+00
1999	0.530000E-02	0.253380E-01	-0.156460E+01
2000	0.215300E+00	0.110012E-01	0.297403E+01
2001	0.582000E-01	0.697527E-02	0.212151E+01
2002	0.290000E-02	0.408907E-02	-0.343607E+00
2003	0.300000E-03	0.284880E-02	-0.225087E+01
2004	0.129000E-01	0.472948E-03	0.330600E+01
2005	0.800000E-03	0.793219E-03	0.851259E-02
2006	N/A	0.126766E-02	N/A
2007	0.100000E-03	0.136139E-02	-0.261109E+01
2008	0.129000E-01	0.353485E-02	0.129456E+01

Survey Index: 11 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 5  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.185515E-05 % Variance Contribution = 4.8204  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.195174E-02	N/A
1983	N/A	0.144096E-02	N/A
1984	N/A	0.109371E-02	N/A
1985	N/A	0.586385E-03	N/A
1986	N/A	0.650769E-03	N/A
1987	N/A	0.621271E-03	N/A
1988	N/A	0.254990E-02	N/A
1989	N/A	0.191212E-02	N/A
1990	0.300000E-03	0.228403E-02	-0.202992E+01
1991	0.100000E-03	0.168708E-02	-0.282558E+01
1992	N/A	0.168968E-02	N/A
1993	0.140000E-02	0.112199E-02	0.221371E+00
1994	N/A	0.669503E-03	N/A
1995	N/A	0.149187E-02	N/A
1996	0.107000E-01	0.694935E-02	0.431596E+00
1997	0.116000E-01	0.732835E-02	0.459255E+00
1998	0.821000E-01	0.117792E-01	0.194160E+01

1999	0.150000E-02	0.307589E-02	-0.718130E+00
2000	0.112000E-01	0.562222E-02	0.689186E+00
2001	0.137000E-01	0.209550E-02	0.187760E+01
2002	N/A	0.107194E-02	N/A
2003	N/A	0.462215E-03	N/A
2004	0.200000E-03	0.112934E-03	0.571511E+00
2005	N/A	0.235065E-04	N/A
2006	N/A	0.432264E-04	N/A
2007	N/A	0.147097E-03	N/A
2008	0.200000E-03	0.371226E-03	-0.618494E+00

Survey Index: 12 Tag: NJDEP AGE = 6  
Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.149946E-05 % Variance Contribution = 1.7322  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.139805E-02	N/A
1983	N/A	0.869313E-03	N/A
1984	N/A	0.464359E-03	N/A
1985	N/A	0.122663E-03	N/A
1986	N/A	0.103765E-03	N/A
1987	N/A	0.379897E-04	N/A
1988	N/A	0.138708E-03	N/A
1989	N/A	0.208799E-03	N/A
1990	N/A	0.278135E-03	N/A
1991	N/A	0.168612E-03	N/A
1992	N/A	0.168192E-03	N/A
1993	N/A	0.108978E-03	N/A
1994	N/A	0.105523E-03	N/A
1995	N/A	0.330524E-03	N/A
1996	0.900000E-03	0.407639E-03	0.792013E+00
1997	N/A	0.159525E-02	N/A
1998	0.113000E-01	0.295655E-02	0.134078E+01
1999	0.120000E-02	0.392262E-02	-0.118444E+01
2000	0.200000E-03	0.119837E-02	-0.179040E+01
2001	0.290000E-02	0.124941E-02	0.842041E+00
2002	N/A	0.516680E-03	N/A
2003	N/A	0.453306E-03	N/A
2004	N/A	0.705272E-04	N/A
2005	N/A	0.504794E-04	N/A
2006	N/A	0.268238E-04	N/A
2007	N/A	0.227511E-04	N/A
2008	N/A	0.701670E-05	N/A

Survey Index: 13 Tag: NCGill AGE = 1  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.315053E-04 % Variance Contribution = 0.3000  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.109843E+01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.101786E+01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.106544E+01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.154444E+01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.168012E+01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.125596E+01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.602400E+00	N/A
1989	N/A	0.522440E+00	N/A
1990	N/A	0.588423E+00	N/A
1991	N/A	0.663976E+00	N/A
1992	N/A	0.913330E+00	N/A
1993	N/A	0.947059E+00	N/A
1994	N/A	0.131629E+01	N/A
1995	N/A	0.584659E+00	N/A
1996	N/A	0.790570E+00	N/A
1997	N/A	0.424371E+00	N/A
1998	N/A	0.298046E+00	N/A
1999	N/A	0.239541E+00	N/A
2000	N/A	0.327121E+00	N/A
2001	0.148000E+00	0.134933E+00	0.924368E-01
2002	0.172900E+00	0.123379E+00	0.337455E+00
2003	0.145400E+00	0.151833E+00	-0.432916E-01
2004	0.226900E+00	0.157039E+00	0.368014E+00
2005	0.171900E+00	0.119781E+00	0.361246E+00
2006	0.197400E+00	0.230014E+00	-0.152906E+00
2007	0.159700E+00	0.418322E+00	-0.962953E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 14 Tag: NCGill AGE = 2  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.157929E-03 % Variance Contribution = 0.3656  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.294926E+01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.259781E+01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.219397E+01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.258729E+01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.385989E+01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.426920E+01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.253458E+01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.143200E+01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.141118E+01	N/A
1991	N/A	0.125401E+01	N/A
1992	N/A	0.151585E+01	N/A
1993	N/A	0.273664E+01	N/A
1994	N/A	0.304782E+01	N/A
1995	N/A	0.461408E+01	N/A
1996	N/A	0.180556E+01	N/A
1997	N/A	0.274417E+01	N/A
1998	N/A	0.138146E+01	N/A

1999	N/A	0.982593E+00	N/A
2000	N/A	0.709375E+00	N/A
2001	0.148860E+01	0.950925E+00	0.448156E+00
2002	0.267400E+00	0.299404E+00	-0.113048E+00
2003	0.366900E+00	0.256932E+00	0.356276E+00
2004	0.594600E+00	0.447902E+00	0.283313E+00
2005	0.486200E+00	0.412449E+00	0.164508E+00
2006	0.376600E+00	0.396454E+00	-0.513775E-01
2007	0.256400E+00	0.760949E+00	-0.108783E+01
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 15 Tag: NCGill AGE = 3  
Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.455255E-03 % Variance Contribution = 0.8624  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.307798E+01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.308866E+01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.206590E+01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.191776E+01	N/A
1986	N/A	0.277348E+01	N/A
1987	N/A	0.508153E+01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.452576E+01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.216000E+01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.184489E+01	N/A
1991	N/A	0.168658E+01	N/A
1992	N/A	0.134273E+01	N/A
1993	N/A	0.189856E+01	N/A
1994	N/A	0.422507E+01	N/A
1995	N/A	0.525756E+01	N/A
1996	N/A	0.854335E+01	N/A
1997	N/A	0.289838E+01	N/A
1998	N/A	0.481099E+01	N/A
1999	N/A	0.219682E+01	N/A
2000	N/A	0.150243E+01	N/A
2001	0.369400E+00	0.939598E+00	-0.933572E+00
2002	0.108730E+01	0.937026E+00	0.148742E+00
2003	0.345000E+00	0.229004E+00	0.409806E+00
2004	0.584000E+00	0.247803E+00	0.857269E+00
2005	0.692500E+00	0.425627E+00	0.486744E+00
2006	0.553400E+00	0.394852E+00	0.337570E+00
2007	0.179000E+00	0.661127E+00	-0.130656E+01
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 16 Tag: NCGill AGE = 4  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.849967E-03 % Variance Contribution = 1.9222  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.168490E+01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.146449E+01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.117038E+01	N/A
1985	N/A	0.736933E+00	N/A
1986	N/A	0.896685E+00	N/A
1987	N/A	0.190755E+01	N/A
1988	N/A	0.288380E+01	N/A
1989	N/A	0.223222E+01	N/A
1990	N/A	0.133945E+01	N/A
1991	N/A	0.139812E+01	N/A
1992	N/A	0.104007E+01	N/A
1993	N/A	0.738946E+00	N/A
1994	N/A	0.134941E+01	N/A
1995	N/A	0.430022E+01	N/A
1996	N/A	0.508688E+01	N/A
1997	N/A	0.833060E+01	N/A
1998	N/A	0.238087E+01	N/A
1999	N/A	0.422407E+01	N/A
2000	N/A	0.172054E+01	N/A
2001	0.145900E+00	0.100028E+01	-0.192512E+01
2002	0.242300E+00	0.521155E+00	-0.765871E+00
2003	0.680200E+00	0.255325E+00	0.979851E+00
2004	0.188500E+00	0.454543E-01	0.142239E+01
2005	0.174700E+00	0.785060E-01	0.799895E+00
2006	0.213000E+00	0.163153E+00	0.266605E+00
2007	0.114000E+00	0.248130E+00	-0.777755E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 17 Tag: NCGill AGE = 5  
 Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.112275E-02 % Variance Contribution = 2.9374  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.578078E+00	N/A
1983	N/A	0.395387E+00	N/A
1984	N/A	0.245963E+00	N/A
1985	N/A	0.176981E+00	N/A
1986	N/A	0.171528E+00	N/A
1987	N/A	0.246681E+00	N/A
1988	N/A	0.656871E+00	N/A
1989	N/A	0.631838E+00	N/A
1990	N/A	0.868507E+00	N/A
1991	N/A	0.623047E+00	N/A
1992	N/A	0.577788E+00	N/A
1993	N/A	0.343854E+00	N/A
1994	N/A	0.232685E+00	N/A
1995	N/A	0.687058E+00	N/A
1996	N/A	0.291982E+01	N/A
1997	N/A	0.303520E+01	N/A
1998	N/A	0.456170E+01	N/A



1999	N/A	0.121744E+01	N/A
2000	N/A	0.208761E+01	N/A
2001	0.112700E+00	0.713453E+00	-0.184539E+01
2002	0.569000E-01	0.324360E+00	-0.174056E+01
2003	0.583000E-01	0.983536E-01	-0.522967E+00
2004	0.722000E-01	0.257693E-01	0.103026E+01
2005	0.343000E-01	0.552349E-02	0.182614E+01
2006	0.543000E-01	0.132086E-01	0.141366E+01
2007	0.520000E-01	0.610918E-01	-0.161134E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 18 Tag: NCGill AGE = 6  
Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.701428E-04 % Variance Contribution = 0.0350  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	N/A	0.320060E-01	N/A
1983	N/A	0.184371E-01	N/A
1984	N/A	0.807171E-02	N/A
1985	N/A	0.286157E-02	N/A
1986	N/A	0.211400E-02	N/A
1987	N/A	0.116591E-02	N/A
1988	N/A	0.276188E-02	N/A
1989	N/A	0.533291E-02	N/A
1990	N/A	0.817469E-02	N/A
1991	N/A	0.481306E-02	N/A
1992	N/A	0.444543E-02	N/A
1993	N/A	0.258149E-02	N/A
1994	N/A	0.283472E-02	N/A
1995	N/A	0.117655E-01	N/A
1996	N/A	0.132383E-01	N/A
1997	N/A	0.510690E-01	N/A
1998	N/A	0.884996E-01	N/A
1999	N/A	0.120004E+00	N/A
2000	N/A	0.343935E-01	N/A
2001	N/A	0.328796E-01	N/A
2002	0.890000E-02	0.120844E-01	-0.305863E+00
2003	N/A	0.745561E-02	N/A
2004	N/A	0.124388E-02	N/A
2005	0.900000E-03	0.916821E-03	-0.185177E-01
2006	0.800000E-03	0.633540E-03	0.233288E+00
2007	0.800000E-03	0.730347E-03	0.910925E-01
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Survey Index: 34 Tag: MRFSS AGE = 3  
Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.568621E-05 % Variance Contribution = 6.2394  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
------	----------	-----------	----------

1982	0.186500E+00	0.623411E-01	0.109581E+01
1983	0.840000E-02	0.638246E-01	-0.202791E+01
1984	0.177100E+00	0.534169E-01	0.119859E+01
1985	0.103300E+00	0.382202E-01	0.994273E+00
1986	0.933000E-01	0.562150E-01	0.506636E+00
1987	0.388500E+00	0.859102E-01	0.150899E+01
1988	0.227200E+00	0.101446E+00	0.806307E+00
1989	0.149800E+00	0.456479E-01	0.118834E+01
1990	0.527000E-01	0.329934E-01	0.468309E+00
1991	0.574000E-01	0.332182E-01	0.546947E+00
1992	0.530000E-01	0.265272E-01	0.692120E+00
1993	0.370000E-01	0.340431E-01	0.832897E-01
1994	0.300000E-01	0.712470E-01	-0.864955E+00
1995	0.355000E-01	0.857170E-01	-0.881519E+00
1996	0.271000E-01	0.136734E+00	-0.161850E+01
1997	0.137000E-01	0.505069E-01	-0.130471E+01
1998	0.151000E-01	0.808810E-01	-0.167828E+01
1999	0.162000E-01	0.384518E-01	-0.864395E+00
2000	0.105000E-01	0.278777E-01	-0.976451E+00
2001	0.109000E-01	0.182892E-01	-0.517548E+00
2002	0.368000E-01	0.231124E-01	0.465129E+00
2003	0.510000E-02	0.697867E-02	-0.313617E+00
2004	0.940000E-02	0.592373E-02	0.461743E+00
2005	0.135000E-01	0.106282E-01	0.239183E+00
2006	0.489000E-01	0.900877E-02	0.169158E+01
2007	0.840000E-02	0.109788E-01	-0.267736E+00
2008	0.113000E-01	0.212514E-01	-0.631620E+00

Survey Index: 35 Tag: MRFSS AGE = 4  
Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.197591E-04 % Variance Contribution = 3.9789  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.217600E+00	0.800344E-01	0.100020E+01
1983	0.588000E-01	0.750905E-01	-0.244552E+00
1984	0.163100E+00	0.732198E-01	0.800898E+00
1985	0.919000E-01	0.343520E-01	0.984040E+00
1986	0.758000E-01	0.478630E-01	0.459755E+00
1987	0.132900E+00	0.675912E-01	0.676120E+00
1988	0.126200E+00	0.157498E+00	-0.221545E+00
1989	0.191500E+00	0.950421E-01	0.700568E+00
1990	0.527000E-01	0.495592E-01	0.614469E-01
1991	0.309000E-01	0.532633E-01	-0.544491E+00
1992	0.485000E-01	0.427925E-01	0.125202E+00
1993	0.328000E-01	0.339231E-01	-0.336667E-01
1994	0.258000E-01	0.546256E-01	-0.750127E+00
1995	0.659000E-01	0.131370E+00	-0.689881E+00
1996	0.588000E-01	0.170337E+00	-0.106364E+01
1997	0.504000E-01	0.282985E+00	-0.172540E+01
1998	0.605000E-01	0.864957E-01	-0.357451E+00
1999	0.647000E-01	0.150150E+00	-0.841873E+00
2000	0.264000E-01	0.651916E-01	-0.903967E+00
2001	0.274000E-01	0.413346E-01	-0.411157E+00
2002	0.263000E-01	0.242313E-01	0.819223E-01
2003	0.462000E-01	0.168816E-01	0.100675E+01
2004	0.470000E-02	0.280263E-02	0.517003E+00
2005	0.580000E-02	0.470052E-02	0.210185E+00
2006	0.384000E-01	0.751199E-02	0.163156E+01

2007 0.196000E-01 0.806740E-02 0.887698E+00  
 2008 0.540000E-02 0.209471E-01 -0.135560E+01

Survey Index: 36 Tag: MRFSS AGE = 5  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.573293E-04 % Variance Contribution = 5.2909  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.213100E+00	0.603143E-01	0.126219E+01
1983	0.671000E-01	0.445299E-01	0.410023E+00
1984	0.116500E+00	0.337989E-01	0.123746E+01
1985	0.632000E-01	0.181210E-01	0.124923E+01
1986	0.525000E-01	0.201106E-01	0.959565E+00
1987	0.664000E-01	0.191991E-01	0.124084E+01
1988	0.707000E-01	0.787992E-01	-0.108457E+00
1989	0.129000E+00	0.590901E-01	0.780749E+00
1990	0.341000E-01	0.705832E-01	-0.727495E+00
1991	0.177000E-01	0.521355E-01	-0.108028E+01
1992	0.265000E-01	0.522160E-01	-0.678244E+00
1993	0.287000E-01	0.346726E-01	-0.189054E+00
1994	0.172000E-01	0.206896E-01	-0.184720E+00
1995	0.304000E-01	0.461032E-01	-0.416440E+00
1996	0.407000E-01	0.214755E+00	-0.166327E+01
1997	0.105400E+00	0.226467E+00	-0.764837E+00
1998	0.958000E-01	0.364012E+00	-0.133492E+01
1999	0.102400E+00	0.950540E-01	0.744420E-01
2000	0.632000E-01	0.173743E+00	-0.101127E+01
2001	0.328000E-01	0.647571E-01	-0.680216E+00
2002	0.158000E-01	0.331260E-01	-0.740308E+00
2003	0.205000E-01	0.142838E-01	0.361301E+00
2004	0.470000E-02	0.348999E-02	0.297662E+00
2005	0.210000E-02	0.726420E-03	0.106156E+01
2006	0.580000E-02	0.133582E-02	0.146831E+01
2007	0.880000E-02	0.454571E-02	0.660568E+00
2008	0.260000E-02	0.114720E-01	-0.148439E+01

Survey Index: 37 Tag: MRFSS AGE = 6  
 Time = JAN-1 Type = NUMBER  
 Catchability = 0.641095E-04 % Variance Contribution = 5.2472  
 Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.106600E+00	0.597736E-01	0.578519E+00
1983	0.630000E-01	0.371676E-01	0.527698E+00
1984	0.326000E-01	0.198537E-01	0.495921E+00
1985	0.172000E-01	0.524448E-02	0.118773E+01
1986	0.175000E-01	0.443650E-02	0.137234E+01
1987	0.102000E-01	0.162425E-02	0.183734E+01
1988	0.101000E-01	0.593049E-02	0.532429E+00
1989	0.291000E-01	0.892724E-02	0.118163E+01
1990	0.930000E-02	0.118917E-01	-0.245824E+00
1991	0.440000E-02	0.720905E-02	-0.493732E+00
1992	0.880000E-02	0.719106E-02	0.201914E+00
1993	0.820000E-02	0.465936E-02	0.565255E+00
1994	0.430000E-02	0.451166E-02	-0.480511E-01

1995	N/A	0.141316E-01	N/A
1996	0.450000E-02	0.174286E-01	-0.135404E+01
1997	0.321000E-01	0.682052E-01	-0.753665E+00
1998	0.302000E-01	0.126408E+00	-0.143167E+01
1999	0.323000E-01	0.167712E+00	-0.164718E+01
2000	0.474000E-01	0.512363E-01	-0.778251E-01
2001	0.711000E-01	0.534186E-01	0.285929E+00
2002	0.158000E-01	0.220907E-01	-0.335147E+00
2003	0.154000E-01	0.193812E-01	-0.229934E+00
2004	0.470000E-02	0.301540E-02	0.443830E+00
2005	0.200000E-02	0.215825E-02	-0.761511E-01
2006	0.100000E-03	0.114686E-02	-0.243961E+01
2007	0.900000E-03	0.972727E-03	-0.777085E-01
2008	0.300000E-03	0.300000E-03	-0.601915E-07

Survey Index: 38 Tag: rec AGE = 2 - 6  
Time = MEAN Type = NUMBER  
Catchability = 0.183228E-04 % Variance Contribution = 1.9749  
Residual = LN(Observed) - LN(Predicted)

Year	Observed	Predicted	Residual
1982	0.202100E+00	0.520167E+00	-0.945387E+00
1983	0.510900E+00	0.468545E+00	0.865428E-01
1984	0.300100E+00	0.369041E+00	-0.206792E+00
1985	0.277700E+00	0.396881E+00	-0.357096E+00
1986	0.768100E+00	0.582127E+00	0.277232E+00
1987	0.517800E+00	0.745277E+00	-0.364167E+00
1988	0.573800E+00	0.549817E+00	0.426957E-01
1989	0.167300E+00	0.312897E+00	-0.626086E+00
1990	0.155700E+00	0.283159E+00	-0.598077E+00
1991	0.177800E+00	0.254934E+00	-0.360346E+00
1992	0.192800E+00	0.262921E+00	-0.310198E+00
1993	0.165100E+00	0.416130E+00	-0.924446E+00
1994	0.384900E+00	0.557280E+00	-0.370084E+00
1995	0.507900E+00	0.853909E+00	-0.519540E+00
1996	0.605400E+00	0.714092E+00	-0.165123E+00
1997	0.517700E+00	0.677484E+00	-0.268991E+00
1998	0.529700E+00	0.502793E+00	0.521319E-01
1999	0.410100E+00	0.344690E+00	0.173756E+00
2000	0.458500E+00	0.222913E+00	0.721180E+00
2001	0.281800E+00	0.189937E+00	0.394505E+00
2002	0.237900E+00	0.921340E-01	0.948606E+00
2003	0.116200E+00	0.480825E-01	0.882394E+00
2004	0.115400E+00	0.636639E-01	0.594786E+00
2005	0.224300E+00	0.670042E-01	0.120823E+01
2006	0.170400E+00	0.657861E-01	0.951740E+00
2007	0.884000E-01	0.121430E+00	-0.317465E+00
2008	N/A	0.000000E+00	N/A

Bootstrap Summary Report

Number of Bootstrap Repetitions Requested = 500  
Number of Bootstrap Repetitions Completed = 500  
Bootstrap Output Variable: Stock Estimates (2008)

	NLLS Estimate	Bootstrap Mean	Bootstrap Std Error	C.V. For NLLS Soln.
N 1	16443.	25024.	22636.	0.9046
N 2	11407.	12666.	7057.	0.5572
N 3	3737.	4081.	1660.	0.4068
N 4	1060.	1164.	585.	0.5025
N 5	200.	212.	112.	0.5300
N 6	5.	7.	6.	0.9056

	Bias Estimate	Bias Std. Error	Per Cent Bias	NLLS Estimate Corrected For Bias	C.V. For Corrected Estimate
N 1	8581.	1083.	52.1885	7861.	2.8794
N 2	1259.	321.	11.0380	10148.	0.6954
N 3	344.	76.	9.1983	3394.	0.4892
N 4	104.	27.	9.7640	957.	0.6113
N 5	12.	5.	6.0242	188.	0.5979
N 6	2.	0.	40.6860	3.	2.1480

	LOWER 80. % CI	UPPER 80. % CI
N 1	3841.	59080.
N 2	5384.	22460.
N 3	2138.	6142.
N 4	499.	1998.
N 5	89.	356.
N 6	1.	14.

Bootstrap Output Variable: Catchability Estimates

	NLLS Estimate	Bootstrap Mean	Bootstrap Std Error	C.V. For NLLS Soln.
Q 1	0.211918E-02	0.227085E-02	0.680531E-03	0.2997
Q 2	0.250557E-02	0.258029E-02	0.657196E-03	0.2547
Q 3	0.141990E-02	0.150457E-02	0.548043E-03	0.3643
Q 4	0.132513E-02	0.141311E-02	0.406719E-03	0.2878
Q 5	0.892300E-03	0.970657E-03	0.310111E-03	0.3195
Q 6	0.792329E-03	0.820719E-03	0.196189E-03	0.2390
Q 7	0.359433E-05	0.377379E-05	0.918097E-06	0.2433
Q 8	0.789323E-05	0.816576E-05	0.175158E-05	0.2145
Q 9	0.578221E-05	0.596933E-05	0.167484E-05	0.2806
Q 10	0.333437E-05	0.372262E-05	0.155389E-05	0.4174
Q 11	0.185515E-05	0.203206E-05	0.895587E-06	0.4407
Q 12	0.149946E-05	0.177698E-05	0.114970E-05	0.6470
Q 13	0.315053E-04	0.320050E-04	0.597824E-05	0.1868
Q 14	0.157929E-03	0.161713E-03	0.331682E-04	0.2051
Q 15	0.455255E-03	0.475327E-03	0.145131E-03	0.3053
Q 16	0.849967E-03	0.924423E-03	0.418767E-03	0.4530
Q 17	0.112275E-02	0.131778E-02	0.739879E-03	0.5615
Q 18	0.701428E-04	0.720016E-04	0.110620E-04	0.1536
Q 34	0.568621E-05	0.575464E-05	0.111705E-05	0.1941
Q 35	0.197591E-04	0.196796E-04	0.322614E-05	0.1639
Q 36	0.573293E-04	0.575328E-04	0.104855E-04	0.1823
Q 37	0.641095E-04	0.664651E-04	0.127805E-04	0.1923
Q 38	0.183228E-04	0.183956E-04	0.225698E-05	0.1227

	Bias Estimate	Bias Std. Error	Per Cent Bias	NLLS Estimate Corrected For Bias	C.V. For Corrected Estimate
Q 1	0.1517E-03	0.3118E-04	7.1569	0.1968E-02	0.3459
Q 2	0.7472E-04	0.2958E-04	2.9820	0.2431E-02	0.2704
Q 3	0.8468E-04	0.2480E-04	5.9635	0.1335E-02	0.4105
Q 4	0.8798E-04	0.1861E-04	6.6391	0.1237E-02	0.3288
Q 5	0.7836E-04	0.1431E-04	8.7815	0.8139E-03	0.3810
Q 6	0.2839E-04	0.8865E-05	3.5831	0.7639E-03	0.2568
Q 7	0.1795E-06	0.4184E-07	4.9931	0.3415E-05	0.2689
Q 8	0.2725E-06	0.7928E-07	3.4527	0.7621E-05	0.2298
Q 9	0.1871E-06	0.7537E-07	3.2361	0.5595E-05	0.2993
Q 10	0.3882E-06	0.7163E-07	11.6438	0.2946E-05	0.5274
Q 11	0.1769E-06	0.4083E-07	9.5362	0.1678E-05	0.5336
Q 12	0.2775E-06	0.5290E-07	18.5079	0.1222E-05	0.9409
Q 13	0.4997E-06	0.2683E-06	1.5861	0.3101E-04	0.1928
Q 14	0.3784E-05	0.1493E-05	2.3959	0.1541E-03	0.2152
Q 15	0.2007E-04	0.6552E-05	4.4090	0.4352E-03	0.3335
Q 16	0.7446E-04	0.1902E-04	8.7599	0.7755E-03	0.5400
Q 17	0.1950E-03	0.3422E-04	17.3716	0.9277E-03	0.7975
Q 18	0.1859E-05	0.5017E-06	2.6500	0.6828E-04	0.1620
Q 34	0.6843E-07	0.5005E-07	1.2034	0.5618E-05	0.1988
Q 35	-0.7948E-07	0.1443E-06	-0.4023	0.1984E-04	0.1626
Q 36	0.2034E-06	0.4690E-06	0.3548	0.5713E-04	0.1836
Q 37	0.2356E-05	0.5812E-06	3.6744	0.6175E-04	0.2070
Q 38	0.7283E-07	0.1010E-06	0.3975	0.1825E-04	0.1237

	LOWER 80. % CI	UPPER 80. % CI
Q 1	0.145102E-02	0.315938E-02
Q 2	0.177309E-02	0.350300E-02
Q 3	0.861406E-03	0.226706E-02
Q 4	0.941045E-03	0.197397E-02
Q 5	0.603069E-03	0.134357E-02
Q 6	0.588875E-03	0.106866E-02
Q 7	0.267697E-05	0.495628E-05
Q 8	0.591968E-05	0.104718E-04
Q 9	0.411532E-05	0.810935E-05
Q 10	0.197659E-05	0.583408E-05
Q 11	0.108615E-05	0.330985E-05
Q 12	0.656648E-06	0.334615E-05
Q 13	0.249530E-04	0.394452E-04
Q 14	0.121522E-03	0.205019E-03
Q 15	0.299199E-03	0.658288E-03
Q 16	0.472049E-03	0.149022E-02
Q 17	0.587057E-03	0.213450E-02
Q 18	0.585721E-04	0.876035E-04
Q 34	0.439891E-05	0.722621E-05
Q 35	0.160044E-04	0.238337E-04
Q 36	0.451248E-04	0.715270E-04
Q 37	0.506761E-04	0.827805E-04
Q 38	0.153827E-04	0.214638E-04

Bootstrap Output Variable: Fishing Mortality (2007)

	NLLS Estimate	Bootstrap Mean	Bootstrap Std Error	C.V. For NLLS Soln.
AGE 1	0.0464	0.0557	0.032226	0.5785
AGE 2	0.2383	0.2501	0.093221	0.3727
AGE 3	0.3495	0.3949	0.201140	0.5093
AGE 4	0.4631	0.5229	0.219453	0.4197
AGE 5	0.5570	0.6212	0.163984	0.2640
AGE 6	0.5570	0.6212	0.163984	0.2640

	Bias Estimate	Bias Std. Error	Per Cent Bias	NLLS Estimate Corrected For Bias	C.V. For Corrected Estimate
AGE 1	0.009267	0.001500	19.9549	0.0372	0.8670
AGE 2	0.011890	0.004203	4.9903	0.2264	0.4118
AGE 3	0.045404	0.009222	12.9899	0.3041	0.6614
AGE 4	0.059782	0.010173	12.9083	0.4033	0.5441
AGE 5	0.064133	0.007876	11.5133	0.4929	0.3327
AGE 6	0.064133	0.007876	11.5133	0.4929	0.3327

	LOWER 80. % CI	UPPER 80. % CI
AGE 1	0.023788	0.094236
AGE 2	0.148484	0.382338
AGE 3	0.199230	0.626814
AGE 4	0.285896	0.831382
AGE 5	0.440975	0.841022
AGE 6	0.440975	0.841022



Bootstrap Output Variable: Average F (2007) AGES 4 - 5

	NLLS Estimate	Bootstrap Mean	Bootstrap Std Error	C.V. For NLLS Soln.
AVG F	0.5101	0.5720	0.177343	0.3100
N WTD	0.4784	0.5403	0.203690	0.3770
B WTD	0.4828	0.5453	0.199536	0.3659
C WTD	0.4779	0.5383	0.203961	0.3789

	Bias Estimate	Bias Std. Error	Per Cent Bias	NLLS Estimate Corrected For Bias	C.V. For Corrected Estimate
AVG F	0.061958	0.008402	12.1466	0.4481	0.3957
N WTD	0.061952	0.009522	12.9498	0.4164	0.4891
B WTD	0.062470	0.009351	12.9382	0.4204	0.4747
C WTD	0.060465	0.009515	12.6529	0.4174	0.4886

	LOWER 80. % CI	UPPER 80. % CI
AVG F	0.377615	0.824861
N WTD	0.323682	0.817200
B WTD	0.334919	0.818263
C WTD	0.321282	0.814314

Bootstrap Output Variable: Biomass

JAN-1 Biomass (2008) Mean Biomass & SSB (2007)

	NLLS Estimate	Bootstrap Mean	Bootstrap Std Error	C.V. For NLLS Soln.
JAN-1	11172.	13511.	5152.	0.3813
MEAN	5535.	6042.	1915.	0.3169
SSB	7236.	7875.	2216.	0.2814

	Bias Estimate	Bias Std. Error	Per Cent Bias	NLLS Estimate Corrected For Bias	C.V. For Corrected Estimate
JAN-1	2339.	253.	20.9357	8833.	0.5833
MEAN	507.	89.	9.1632	5028.	0.3809
SSB	638.	103.	8.8192	6598.	0.3359

	LOWER 80. % CI	UPPER 80. % CI
JAN-1	7985.	20256.
MEAN	3873.	8677.
SSB	5300.	10733.

Plus Group Diagnostic Report

Calculation Method Selected = Backward

Year	Population Backward	Population Forward	F Forward	F Backward	Ratio
1982	932.	932.	1.401488	1.401496	1.000005
1983	580.	545.	1.886933	1.613466	0.855073
1984	310.	327.	1.886933	2.211595	1.172058
1985	82.	71.	1.886933	1.350613	0.715771
1986	69.	64.	2.130353	1.728682	0.811454
1987	25.	54.	0.257708	0.661775	2.567921
1988	93.	167.	0.637377	1.795549	2.817093
1989	139.	247.	0.484230	1.112728	2.297934
1990	185.	382.	0.303597	0.764521	2.518214
1991	112.	666.	0.102052	0.835058	8.182700
1992	112.	776.	0.099279	1.025611	10.330604
1993	73.	801.	0.070292	1.309665	18.631764
1994	70.	709.	0.065466	0.984819	15.043320
1995	220.	622.	0.103631	0.323722	3.123799
1996	272.	890.	0.135564	0.530377	3.912380
1997	1064.	2322.	0.221603	0.563406	2.542413
1998	1972.	3200.	0.383713	0.720849	1.878615
1999	2616.	4103.	0.375361	0.669256	1.782965
2000	799.	2857.	0.173012	0.821885	4.750451
2001	833.	2909.	0.208224	1.036577	4.978188
2002	345.	2152.	0.129287	1.343702	10.393179
2003	302.	1590.	0.198410	2.391292	12.052273
2004	47.	1033.	0.042879	2.163593	50.458683
2005	34.	776.	0.040222	2.060598	51.230496
2006	18.	582.	0.023370	1.280009	54.771862
2007	15.	448.	0.014739	0.551376	37.408845
2008	9.	381.	N/A	N/A	