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## Catch reference point

Identifies possible change in stock stability, particularly growth overfishing

$$
\frac{\text { average catch for } 3 \text { most recent seasons }}{\text { average catch for } 10 \text { most recent seasons }} \leq 0.8
$$

## Data Source

Annual commercial landings recorded on CDFW landing receipts

## CPUE reference point

Identifies potential adverse changes in the fishery, mainly economic overfishing

$$
\frac{C P U E \text { for } 3 \text { most recent seasons }}{\text { CPUE for } 10 \text { most recent seasons }} \leq 0.8
$$

## Data Source

Total number of legal lobster caught per total trap pulls recorded on CDFW commercial fishing logs

## SPR reference point

Spawning Potential Ratio detects biological sustainability, particularly recruitment overfishing

## $S P R_{\text {current }} \leq S P R_{\text {Threshold (avg wt-2000/01-2009/10 seasons) }}$

## Data Source

Mean weight of lobsters landed based on total \# of individuals retained on CDFW commercial fishing logs and total commercial landings (lbs) from receipts
*Only data from landing receipts that can be matched to a specific fishing log are included

## Cable Model

- FMP process sought a model to calculate a biological reference point and incorporate Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)
- Developed by Dr. Richard Parrish through contract with the South Bay Cable Liaison Committee (provides estimate of SPR)
- Dr. Parrish aided CDFW with refinements to model and proposed new growth models
- CDFW has updated the model:

1) Addition of new growth model
2) Changes to initial time step (i.e. size, age, season)
3) Streamlining of model

## Model features

- Cohort analysis
- Equilibrium
- No stock-recruitment
- No set spatial scale
- No recreational component



## Overview

The Population Model

## Graphical Output



# Female Growth, Fecundity \& Maturity 

## Management Regime

Male Growth

Output

> Common Growth, Vulnerability \& Fishing Effort

## Unrecorded Fishing Mortality



Model structure \& use

## Model flow

| MODEL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Seasor | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male* | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male |  | MALE | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male |
| Age | Quarte | ength | vt gms | Vulner | F | var M | FNR | Sur in-in | Sur in | Sur oper | N in-in | N in | Nopen | cat in | Catoper | Nland | kgin-in | kg in 0.34 | kg open | TOT kg | land kg |
| 1.42 |  | 17.7 |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.3770 | 0.0000 | 0.6859 | 0.6859 | 0.685 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 427.0 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 3.96 | 4.64 | 0.00 |
| 1.67 |  | 25. | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.1600 | 0.0000 | 0.8521 | 0.8521 | 0.852 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 292.9 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 7.62 | 8.93 | 0.00 |
| 1.92 |  | 33.9 | 5. | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.0968 | 0.0000 | 0.9077 | 0.9077 | 0.907 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 249.6 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 13.73 | 16.08 | 0.00 |



## Females



Egg Production

## Growth


Quarterly growth

$$
S_{t+1}=0.25\left(f\left(S_{t}\right)\right)
$$

- Dr. Parrish identified von Bertalanffy model a poor fit
- CDFW developed growth models using raw tagrecapture data (Engle, Hovel, Kay)



## Size \& area-based mortality

- Vulnerability - gear selectivity
- Instantaneous fishing mortality (F)
- Natural mortality
- Unrecorded fishing mortality
- Survival



## Vulnerability



- Legal lobsters $84 \%$ vulnerable
- After CL reaches VulLT, vulnerability is dampened by a subtracting factor
- Vulnerability parameters adjusted to produce \% shorts in the catch from logs


## Instantaneous fishing mortality

- Iteratively found by adjusting until Mean Ibs is equal to log and landing receipt data
- Multiplied by
- Vulnerability
- Foct if in quarter 4
- Fjan if quarter 1
- If quarter $=2$ or $3, F=0$

| MODEL | Season | Male | Male | Male | Male | Male* | Male | Male |  | Male | Male N in-in | Male N in | Male Nopen | Male Cat in | Male Catopen | MALE <br> Nland | Male kgin-in | Male kg in | Male kg open | Male TOT kg | Male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | Quarter | length | wt gms | Vulner | F | var M | FNR | Sur in-in | Sur in | Sur open |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | and kg |
| 1.42 | 1 | 17.2 | 9 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.3770 | 0.0000 | 0.6859 | 0.6859 | 0.6859 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 427.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 3.96 | 4.64 | 0.00 |
| 1.67 | 2 | 25.5 | 26 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.1600 | 0.0000 | 0.8521 | 0.8521 | 0.8521 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 292.9 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 7.62 | 8.93 | 0.00 |
| 1.92 | 3 | 33.9 | 55 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -0.0968 | 0.0000 | 0.9077 | 0.9077 | 0.9077 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 249.6 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 13.73 | 16.08 | 0.00 |

Model structure \& use

## Survival ( Incorporating MPAs)

- Allows F to be applied differently relative to MPAs
- IN-IN: no F
- IN: 20\% F
- Open: full F



## Number of lobsters



- Initial state assumes even lobster density along the coastline
- Incorporates survival and movement rates in $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}+1}$
- $2 \%$ of lobster move 0.75 miles or more in 3 months (Lindberg 1955)



## Spawning potential ratio

- SPR = (current egg production) / (unfished egg production)
- Current

- F matched to average weight of lobster in catch
- 14.6\% habitat in MPAs
- Unfished
- $\mathrm{F}=0.0001$


Egg Production

## Spawning potential ratio



## Graphical output - 3d plots



Model structure \& use

# Graphical output - 3d plots 



## Graphical output - 2d (MPA)plots



Model structure \& use

## Challenges With Lobster Growth



## Growth

- Collected all available mark and recapture raw data (Engle, Hovel, Kay)
- Data treatment
- Only initial and most recent capture used
- Days at liberty > 150 days for individuals $<50 \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{CL}$
- Days at liberty > 200 for individuals >50 mm CL and span molting season
- Removed negative growth
- Removed extreme outliers
- Kept zero growth




## Growth model fitting

- Raw data (Engle, Hovel, Kay):
- Sub-legal males and females combined (0-82.5 mm)
- Legal males and females separate ( $>55 \mathrm{~mm}$ )
- Growth models presented in Rogers-Bennet et al., 2003 used as a template for invertebrates
- Models tested include: von Bertalanffy, Ricker, Logistic, Weibull, and Gaussian
- Fits tested


## Model fitting comparisons (sub-legals)

| Model | \# of <br> parameters | R-sq | Adj R-sq | SE | RSS | AIC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gaussian | 4 | $90 \%$ | $81 \%$ | 4.8 | 12284 | 1690 |
| Logistic | 4 | $79 \%$ | $79 \%$ | 5.0 | 13472 | 1741 |
| Weibull | 4 | $89 \%$ | $79 \%$ | 5.0 | 13565 | 1744 |
| Ricker | 2 | $88 \%$ | $78 \%$ | 5.2 | 14281 | 1767 |
| Logistic | 3 | $88 \%$ | $77 \%$ | 5.2 | 14700 | 1785 |
| von Bertalanffy | 2 | $83 \%$ | $69 \%$ | 6.1 | 20073 | 1950 |

## Male \& Female Gaussian 4-parameter



## Female Exponential Decay 2 parameter



## Male Gaussian 4-parameter



## All Growth Models



## Yield



## SPR



## Average weight



Average Weight of Lobster (lbs) in Landings
sq7 $4!$ Ұчб!əМ
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## 2-way table outputs

| OUTPUT TO | 2-WAY TABLES AND FIGURES |
| :--- | :--- |
| YieldT | $\underline{32.657}$ Yield per 1000 recruits (kgs) |
| Fect | $\underline{19.1}$ Millions of eggs |
| AveWt | $\underline{0.694}$ Mean weight in landings (kgs) |
| HR | $\frac{13.7 \%}{}$ Harvest rate of legals |
| Yield Ibs | $\underline{71.995}$ |
| SPR | $\underline{41 \%}$ |
| Mean lbs | $\underline{1.530}$ |

Fecundity: Total fecundity of the cohort over its lifetime in terms of millions of eggs and ratio over an unfished population

Average Weight: Average weight of a landed lobster in lbs and kgs

Harvest rate: Harvest rate of the legal-size individuals over a cohort's lifetime
Yield: Lifetime yield of a cohort in lbs and kgs

## Reference points

|  | CURRENT MODEL REFERENCE POINTS | This Rur Unfished $0.9100 \mathrm{~F}=0.00001$ |  | Percentage of Bun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fishing Mortality Rate (cell B5) F= |  |  |  |
|  | Size Limit in mm (cell B6) CL= | 82.5 | 82.5 |  |
|  | Total Biomass of Cohort (October lbs) | 1613 | 2152 | 75\% |
|  | Total Biomass legal males (October Ibs) | 92 | 379 | 24\% |
|  | Total Biomass legal females (October lbs) | 108 | 359 | 30\% |
| $\longrightarrow$ | Total Biomass legals (October Ibs) | 200 | 739 | 27\% |
|  | Total Fecundity (millions of eggs) | 19 | 46 | 41\% |
|  | Percentage Shorts | 74.1\% | 36.9\% |  |
|  | Average size in landings lbs | 1.53 | 2.08 | 74\% |
|  | Total Yield of Cohort lbs | 71.99 | 0.01 |  |
|  | Harvest Rate Yield/Age 1+ Biom | 4.5\% |  |  |
|  | Harvest Rate Yield/Legals Biom | 36.0\% |  |  |
|  | Males in landings | 21 |  |  |
|  | Females in Landings | 26 |  |  |
|  | Female sex ratio in landings | 55.8\% | 59.4\% |  |

Total Biomass of Cohort: Total cumulative biomass at the start of each fishing season (Season 4)
Total Biomass legal males: Cumulative biomass of male lobsters at the start of each season (Season 4) over the lifespan of the cohort (starting at row 87)
Total Biomass legal females: Cumulative biomass of female lobsters at the start of each season (Season 4) over the lifespan of the cohort (starting at row 87 as well)

Total Biomass legals: males + females
CDFW growth models produce slower juvenile growth, resulting in lower number of lobsters ultimately recruited into the fishery from each cohort

Males initially suffer higher natural mortality

## Modifications from Cable 6.0 to Cable-CDFW 1.0 Substantive Changes

1. New growth model
2. Iterative adjustment of aVul
3. Set handling and ghost fishing parameters to 0
4. Change the age at first time step from 1 to 1.42
5. Initial size at first time step changed to 17.2 mm

## Modifications from Cable 6.0 to Cable-CDFW 1.0 Removed Components

1. All notes and inputs associated with the Bertalanffy equations
2. Graphs, tables, and features that contain redundant or outdated information
3. All components related to the value-per-recruit outputs

## Sensitivity analyses

- Growth model
- Growth schedule


Sensitivity \& limitations

## Model limitation - discrete growth

- Annual growth - annual molt
- Quarterly growth - more continuous
- Discrete growth causes "knife edge" selection problem

| First fishing season at legal size (CL > 82.5mm) | Age | Quarter | length | wt lbs | length | wt lbs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11.92 | 3 | 80.3 | 1.17 | 80.3 | 1.29 |
|  | 12.17 | 4 | 81.1 | 1.20 | 81.1 | 1.32 |
|  | 12.42 | 1 | 81.9 | 1.23 | 81.9 | 1.36 |
| First fishing season after reaching legal size | 12.67 | 2 | 82.7 | 1.26 | 82.7 | 1.39 |
|  | 12.92 | 3 | 83.7 | 1.30 | 83.5 | 1.42 |
|  | 13.17 | 4 | 84.7 | 1.34 | 84.2 | 1.45 |

## Sensitivity analyses

| Growth Model | CDFW |  | von Bertalanffy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Growth Schedule | Quarterly | Annual | Quarterly |
| SPR Threshold | $40 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| SPR Current | $41 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Age to legal male | 12.7 | 12.7 | 6.4 |
| Age to legal female | 12.7 | 12.7 | 6.9 |
| \% survival to legal | $6.6 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ |

*CDFW currently employs quarterly growth model

## Model limitation - minimum weight



## Future work

- Data collection and/or parameterization
- Vulnerability
- Fecundity \& size at maturity
- Natural mortality
- Movement
- Average weight
- Sensitivity analyses
- Recreational



## Management implications

- Current SPR calculation of $41 \%$ shows that we are close to the SPR threshold of $40 \%$


Management implications

## Cable Model \& Future Management

- SPR provides a metric to measure the status of the stock in ways that catch and CPUE cannot
- Function of Cable Model provides ability to incorporate the effects of MPAs into SPR calculation
- Proposed regulation changes (e.g. trap limit) and maturing MPAs may effect all three FMP thresholds

