

*Science, Service, Stewardship*



## A brief summary of the Gulf of Maine cod assessment

Presented by Chris Legault (NEFSC)  
GOM Cod Stakeholder Meeting  
9 December 2011, Portsmouth, NH

**NOAA  
FISHERIES  
SERVICE**



## Disclaimer

Preliminary results

Peer review not complete

Do not expect large changes

Focus is on findings, not numbers or equations

Not here to review science, rather to explore options for moving forward



## Process

### Preparatory Meetings:

Industry-Science Meeting – August 16, 2011

Data Meeting – September 7-9, 2011

Model Meeting – October 17-21, 2011

Lead scientist: Michael Palmer

Chair of these meetings: Liz Brooks

Participants from NEFSC, NERO, Academia,  
Industry (including hired consultant)

Peer Review (SARC 53): November 29-December 2, 2011



## Changes from Last Assessment

Three more years of data (2008-2010)

Stock weights at age changed:

- Added recreational discards to catch

- Estimated commercial discards at age directly

- Discards include smaller fish, so weights and therefore biomass are lower than estimated in 2007

Different model (VPA to ASAP): both give similar results, but ASAP takes better account of uncertainties in data such as survey indices



Are the new data responsible for the change in status?

Yes

Surveys generally declined while catches increased from 2008 to 2010

The 2005 year class, which was thought to be strong in the previous assessment, entered the fishery and did not appear strong in either the catch or subsequent surveys

The old (VPA) and new (ASAP) models produce similar estimates of SSB and F over the entire time series



## How was the change of survey vessel to the Bigelow included?

One of the largest calibration experiments in the world was conducted in 2008 for Albatross and Bigelow

Bigelow caught more cod per tow than Albatross IV

Different ratio depending on length

Length specific calibration factors for cod estimated and peer reviewed through TRAC process

Only impacts 2009-2010 NEFSC surveys, but calibration allows these new observations to be related to previous observations



Did changing the stock weights result in the status change to overfished?

No

Both the assessment results and reference points would adjust to the change in stock weights, so status is not impacted

The new stock weights are more realistic than previous ones because they do not artificially increase when minimum size regulations increase



## Why did commercial discards change?

Previous assessment made assumption that discards were driven by trip limits, while this assessment uses observations of discarded fish size

When discards and landings have same size composition, can simply increase landings at age to account for discards – done in GARM III

When discards are smaller fish than landings, as due to minimum size regulations, better to estimate discards at age separately from landings at age – done in this assessment



## Why are all discarded cod assumed to die?

Working group examined a number of studies on discard mortality for a range of gears

These studies demonstrated that not all discarded fish survive, even under the best conditions

No single study tested every discard mortality factor

Could not quantify the discard mortality rate

Decision made to assume 100% mortality for modeling purposes

Sensitivity analysis resulted in lower SSB and F (amount varied by year) but no change to overall perception of stock or current status



## Result of Changes

Last assessment: not overfished, but overfishing

Strong 2005 year class

Stock expected to rebuild by 2014

This assessment: overfished and overfishing

SSB about one fifth  $SSB_{msy}$ ,  $F$  about 5 times  $F_{msy}$

2005 year class not strong

Cannot rebuild by 2014 even if  $F=0$

Results robust to wide range of sensitivity runs



Is the spring survey more than 100% efficient?

No

An artifact of the survey area greater than the catch area

Catchability estimate about half when smaller survey area used (SSB and F did not change)

When survey in Bigelow units and assumed 80% efficient, model estimates generally within confidence intervals

Historically, estimated biomass has been consistent through numerous assessments



## How can CPUE be increasing?

Concentration of population in western Gulf of Maine allows fishery catch rates to remain high even though population at low abundance

Fishery has also concentrated in western Gulf of Maine  
CPUE trends indicative of localized abundance where fleet is operating, not indicative of stock as a whole

Raw CPUE for gillnets and otter trawls has shown increasing trends over the past five years



## How can biomass increase in recent years when $F$ is so high?

The recent increase is just part of the variability at low stock size due to changes in recruitment and  $F$

SSB has fluctuated between 8,000 and 15,000 mt for the past decade

$F$  has been more than 3 times greater than the reference point during this entire period

Recruitment has ranged from 1.7 to 9.0 million age-1 fish during this period



## How can catch be almost the same as spawning stock biomass?

F is high

Population has not crashed because there remains a portion of the population that is not caught (due to selectivity of the gears) that can contribute to next year's catch and SSB

SSB is a measure of mature biomass, not total biomass

Total biomass is nearly double SSB

Reductions in F are expected to allow more fish to grow to older ages, eventually leading to an increase in catch and larger population abundance



Is poor stock status due only to high 2010 recreational catch?

No

Sensitivity run with reduced 2010 recreational catch did not change overall findings of stock assessment



## What are potential 2012 catches?

Cannot rebuild by 2014 even when  $F=0$

Assume 2011 catch = 2010 catch (11,392 mt)

Recruitment as suggested by Peer Review Panel

If fish at overfishing limit ( $F_{40\%} = 0.20$ )

2012 Catch = 1,313 mt

If fish at 75% $F_{40\%}$

2012 Catch = 1,001 mt

(These 2012 catch values were not reviewed during SARC  
– Preliminary and for demonstration purposes only)



## Summary

Preliminary results awaiting Peer Review report  
Bad news for Gulf of Maine cod and associated  
fisheries

Stock is much lower and  $F$  is much higher than targets

Cannot rebuild by 2014 even under  $F=0$

Large reduction in catch will be required to end  
overfishing