



Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

1050 N. Highland Street • Suite 200A-N • Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0740 • 703.842.0741 (fax) • www.asmfc.org

MEMORANDUM

Shad & River Herring Stock Assessment Subcommittee Call Summary

February 23, 2017

Subcommittee Members: Mike Bailey, Mike Brown, Kevin Sullivan, Ed Hale, Ben Gahagan

ASMFC Staff: Jeff Kipp, Ashton Harp

Public: Diane Borggaard

The Stock Assessment Subcommittee met to discuss preliminary results of trend analyses and emerging issues. SAS members agreed with a April 7th deadline for circulating preliminary results of all trend analyses to the full SAS. If any decision points arise while developing preliminary results, these will be noted by the analysis lead and discussed by the SAS on the next call. The next call and webinar was tentatively planned for April 14th to review the finished analyses. There was a request for a mid-May, in-person meeting to review the final analyses and reports.

Data Inventory

Jeff reviewed the data inventory excel and highlighted cells for discussion, described below.

Cells with Questions

Select data was not included in the benchmark assessment description section or the figures. Also, no updated data were provided. How should the SAS proceed?

Agreement: There was general agreement to not include data in the update that was not described as an input in the benchmark assessment. These data sets include age-based Z estimates and mean lengths for the Gilbert-Stuart and Nonquit Rivers in RI and mean lengths for the Rappahannock River in VA.

When reviewing the R code for cluster analyses, Kevin noted that an entire data set is automatically excluded if there is 1 or more data gaps. There can be significant changes in the results when adding a new data set to an existing cluster analyses, how should the SAS proceed?

Agreement: There was a general agreement for new data sets to be analyzed individually, they should not be included in cluster analyses.

Cells with continuous data but TC member recommends not using this data set in the update due to issues with data collection

The Connecticut TC member recommended the Farmington and Naugatuck data sets not be included in the update assessment. Farmington was used in the benchmark, Naugatuck was not used due to data gaps. CT noted that there are 'known passage issues', which some SAS members confirmed. The fish passage was designed for salmon, not alosines, therefore it is not a good reflection of abundance. **Action:** The SAS agreed to not use Farmington in the update report, but CT will need to provide text to justify.

On the call, Kevin suggested dropping the Winnicut River (NH) because the fish counts range from 0-4. On further evaluation the group noted the Winnicut was not used in the benchmark due to a 2009 data gap.

The group discussed other fish ladders that were in the assessment that were lacking, but did not want to drop them from the assessment for two reasons: 1) it was not discussed at the data workshop and 2) it would reduce the amount of data available for the assessment. Some noted that if a fish ladder doesn't track population levels then why use it in the assessment.

Agreement: The SAS agreed to review any other TC requests to drop data, if it is approved then the TC member will need to provide adequate justification in the report.

Cells with data not submitted

Jeff received data from RI last week and will reach out to them again with questions. VA still needs to submit data.

Gary Nelson updated the catch-at-age model for the Monument River (MA) and will start working on Chowan (NC) soon. A SAS member noted that the Chowan was dropped from the cluster analyses because there are data gaps starting in 2003 (the terminal year of analysis is 2010).

There was a question regarding Table 1 in the excel (and assessment report), is it pulled directly from the coastwide trend analysis or state-specific reports? **Action:** Jeff will check with Katie Drew and Gary Nelson.

General Discussion

- After the January call, Jeff reached out to each TC member to let them know the SAS is accepting new data sets that meet the qualifying criteria. The TC members provided caveats to the data that were recorded in the 'new data set' word document.
- Ed mentioned that there is a slight change in how the results of the ARIMA will be presented in the update assessment report. This is consistent with the actual estimates provided in the benchmark, but the description of the results in the benchmark was not consistent with the results to be reported in tables. The bootstrapped mean probability of an index being below its 25th percentile is the estimate reported.
- Jeff mentioned that analysis leads can update the text from the benchmark assessment for their respective analysis, with a focus on the results since the benchmark. The draft

assessment sections have been uploaded to the FTP site. The link was included via email.