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#### Abstract

Summary The rebuilding analysis for canary rockfish was first conducted in 2000 based on the 1999 stock assessment then updated in 2002 on the basis of the first coastwide assessment. The 2005 stock assessment, as amended following SSC review in September 2005, included a base model and an alternative model based on a different configuration regarding male-female selectivity. The two models were considered equally plausible by the SSC and both are carried into the rebuilding analysis. By re-sampling from alternative input parameter sets, the rebuilding analysis result now integrates across the two alternate models, the probability profile of different spawner-recruitment steepness levels within each model, and the variability in future recruitments. As a result, this document dated Oct. 7, 2005 is a complete replacement for the preliminary rebuilding analysis presented to the SSC in September. The mean estimate of the $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ is $34,155 \mathrm{mt}$ of female spawning biomass and the stock is at $9.4 \%$ of this level at the beginning of 2005 when integrated across the steepness profiles for each model. The steepness of the spawner-recruitment relationship, which largely determines the rate of increase in recruitment as the stock rebuilds, is 0.32 in the base model, 0.45 in the alternate model, and has a mean estimate of 0.40 when integrated across the probability profiles for the two models. The estimated generation time increased from 19 years in the 2002 model to 23 years due to a decrease in the estimate of natural mortality for older females. The current OY of about 47 mt is not overfishing and the stock is expected to continue rebuilding at that level of harvest. The current rebuilding harvest rate would produce an OY of 43 mt in 2007 and has a $57.4 \%$ probability of rebuilding by the current $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ (2074) and a $58.5 \%$ probability of rebuilding by the current $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2076). Because this new analysis is now able to incorporate 3 sources of uncertainty, rather than just 1, it takes rather large changes in harvest rate (and short-term OY) to make large changes in the probability of rebuilding. The harvest rate that would produce a $50 \%$ probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}(2074)$ is twice the level that would produce a $60 \%$ probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2076).


## Introduction

The stock assessment for canary rockfish in 1999 documented that the stock had declined below the overfished level ( $25 \%$ of $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ ) in the northern area (Columbia and U.S. Vancouver INPFC areas; Crone et al., 1999) and in the southern area (Williams et al., 1999). Canary rockfish was determined to be in an "overfished" state on Jan. 1, 2000 and development of a rebuilding plan was initiated while preliminary rebuilding estimates were implemented through adjustments of annual management measures. The first rebuilding analysis (Methot, 2000) used results from the northern area assessment to project rates of potential stock recovery. The stock was found to have extremely low productivity. The initial rebuilding OY for 2001 and 2002 was set at 93 mt based upon a $50 \%$ probability of rebuilding by the year 2057 and maintaining a constant catch throughout the rebuilding period. The rebuilding analysis was updated in 2002 (Methot and Piner, 2002) to incorporate the coastwide assessment results and to switch to a constant exploitation rate, as in other west coast groundfish rebuilding plans. The results of the 2002 assessment and rebuilding analysis indicated that the spawning stock abundance, as a percentage of its unfished level, reached a low of $6.6 \%$ in 2000, the year of the overfished declaration. By 2002 it had increased to $7.9 \%$. The generation time was calculated to be 19 years. The rate of rebuilding was based on the estimated spawnerrecruitment relationship with steepness of 0.33 and sampling lognormally distributed random recruitment deviations around this relationship. The time to rebuild with no fishing, $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$, was estimated to be year 2057. The $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ was calculated to be the year 2076 (2057 plus 19 years for the generation time) and the $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ was set to 2074 on the basis of a rebuilding rate that would achieve a $60 \%$ probability of rebuilding by 2076. This rebuilding harvest rate produced an OY in 2003 of 41 mt . The rate of rebuilding was most sensitive to the steepness of the spawner-recruitment relationship. In addition, the 2002 analysis demonstrated the sensitivity of the OY to the commercial:recreational allocation because of the difference in selectivity between the two gear groups. Final rebuilding calculations were based upon a 50:50 commercial:recreational split in catch. The rebuilding plan that incorporated these results was completed as Amendment 16 to the groundfish fishery management plan in 2003.

This document presents an updated rebuilding analysis based upon the stock assessment in 2005 (Methot and Stewart, 2005).

## Assessment Summary

Methot and Stewart (2005) used data through 2004 and a revised assessment model to update the coastwide assessment of canary rockfish. Primary changes included:

- Addition of the 2004 trawl survey and catch data through 2004
- Recalculation of all historical fishery catch and size/age composition data
- Extend model time series back to 1916
- Include new calibration of ageing method
- Convert from age-based selectivity to size-based selectivity
- Implement the assessment in the ADMB-coded Stock Synthesis 2 using length-based selectivities

This update to the canary rockfish rebuilding analysis incorporates additional changes made as a result of the SSC review of the canary rockfish assessment, Sept. 27-30, 2005; Seattle, WA. After examining several issues that had not been specifically examined in the assessment (trawl survey catchability, recruitment variability, and juvenile recruitment survey) the SSC recommended no changes to the base model. However, the SSC concluded that the parametric variance around a single base model underestimated the overall uncertainty in the canary rockfish assessment. After re-examining some of the sensitivity analyses included in the assessment, the SSC concluded that an alternative configuration of the male-female selectivity parameters was as plausible as the base model. The two model scenarios are labeled here as Diff (base) and NoDiff (alternate).

NoDiff - The 2002 assessment model had been configured to allow for a difference in the age-selectivity for older females relative to males. Because females grow larger than males and because the model was being shifted to length-selectivity, this pre-STAR model configuration did not allow for a difference in length-selectivity between larger females and males.

Diff - Alternative model configurations considered during the STAR panel meeting disclosed that allowing for a differential selectivity for larger sized female canary rockfish provided a modestly significant improvement in the fit to the overall data set. This difference is allowed in the 3 trawl fisheries (northern Cal, Oregon, and Washington) and the trawl survey and required that 8 additional model parameters be estimated. Because of the improved statistical fit, this model was adopted as the postSTAR base model and used as the basis for the rebuilding analysis.

Another change that occurred at the STAR panel was the extent of re-weighting of data variance on the basis of the model's goodness-of-fit to the data in preliminary model runs. The post-STAR Diff model had re-weighted all data elements, which resulted in some down-weighting of the trawl survey biomass index. In order to assure consistent performance between the Diff and NoDiff models, the post-SSC configurations continued to allow re-weighting of the age and length composition data, but not the trawl survey biomass index.

After considerable deliberation, the SSC concluded that the Diff base model and the NoDiff alternate model should both be included in the rebuilding analysis as equally probable scenarios and that the uncertainty within each configuration should also be represented in the rebuilding analysis. The maximum likelihood estimates for the two models are shown in Table 1. Other quantities necessary for the rebuilding analysis are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

## Rebuilding Calculations

The rebuilding analysis was conducted using software developed by A. Punt (version 2.8a, April 2005). This software conducts stochastic simulations of future stock abundance and determines levels of future fishing mortality that are consistent with specified probabilities and time frames for rebuilding. The steps when conducting a rebuilding analysis are:

1. Estimation of the unfished level of abundance, $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ (and hence the rebuilding target, $0.4 \mathrm{~B}_{0}$ );
2. Selection of a method to generate future recruitment;
3. Specification of the mean generation time;
4. Calculation of the minimum rebuilding time, $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$;
5. Calculation of the maximum possible rebuilding time, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{max}}$;
6. Identification and analysis of alternative harvest strategies.

## Estimation of $\mathrm{B}_{0}$

The stock assessment was conducted using the Stock Synthesis 2 software (Methot, 2005). In this model, annual recruitments are defined as deviations from a long-term spawner-recruitment relationship. Thus, this relationship provides the required information about the central tendency of recruitments. A Beverton-Holt relationship was used in the assessment and trial model runs with a Ricker relationship produced nearly identical results. The modeled time series started in 1916, the year in which canary rockfish catch is first detected. This is earlier than the start year of 1941 used in the 2002 assessment. Although the cumulative catch prior to 1941 in the 2005 assessment is similar to the initial equilibrium catch level of 500 mt per annum used in the 2002 assessment, the difference in start year has an effect on the $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ estimate because of the low spawner-recruitment steepness. With the initial equilibrium catch approach, the $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ level of recruitment is applied, even though the initial equilibrium catch is reducing the spawning biomass. This is a satisfactory assumption as long as the catch is not too high and the spawner-recruitment steepness is not low. With the long time series approach, the initial equilibrium catch is zero, so no approximation is necessary, and the estimated level of recruitment declines from $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ as the annual catches reduce the spawning biomass. For canary rockfish, this contributes to a higher level for $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ in the 2005 assessment than in the 2002 assessment.

The uncertainty in the Diff model had been characterized both by the parametric estimate of variance for model outputs and by conducting a profile along a range of values for the spawner-recruitment steepness parameter. These alternative estimates of uncertainty were shown in the assessment document to be very similar, although low. The single maximum likelihood estimate from the Diff model (with an estimated steepness of 0.32) was used for the preliminary rebuilding analysis presented to the SSC in September 2005, and the upper $95 \%$ range (steepness $=0.38$ ) was used in a rebuilding run to characterize uncertainty. In order to much more fully characterize the uncertainty, the following procedure was used:

1. Conduct a profile on the steepness parameter for the Diff model and for the NoDiff model (Table 4). Steepness values ranged from 0.23 to 0.67 with a step of 0.02 to create these profiles covering the range over which there was more than negligible probability. The NoDiff model fits better at a higher steepness values and over a broader range. The best-fitting NoDiff model fits best at a steepness of 0.45 and produces an ending biomass level that is approximately twice as high as the ending biomass in the Diff model.


While this procedure captures much more of the uncertainty in the model results than has been possible in most other assessments, it still is not a complete solution. A fuller solution is beyond the realistic capacity of our computing systems. It might include a larger set of alternative plausible model configurations, each with an objectively assigned probability, and a full MCMC investigation of the uncertainty regarding all parameters within each model configuration.
2. Re-scale the Diff and NoDiff probability distributions into discrete frequency distributions with N equal to 500 for each (because they were equally weighted in the SSC's conclusion). Note that the "Both" distribution shown above is for illustration only and is not used subsequently.


Generation of future recruitment
The parametric, spawner-recruitment method for forecasting future recruitments has several desirable features and alternatives such as re-sampling from observed recruits per spawner were not considered. Use of the parametric approach:

- Reproduces current low recruitment levels while spawning biomass remains low, thus mimics a recruits per spawner approach;
- Smoothly increases mean recruitment (and decreases recruits per spawner) towards the unfished level as spawning biomass increases, thus is fully consistent with the $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ estimate;
- Parametric sampling from the lognormal distribution generates a smoother frequency distribution of future recruitments (in comparison to resampling from the model's time series of annual recruitment deviations) thus provides rebuilding calculations that are less sensitive to individual historical recruitment estimates.

The estimated spawner-recruitment relationship that tracks the central tendency of recruitment as the stock was fished down over the past few decades also provides a logical basis for estimating future recruitment levels as the stock rebuilds. The estimated steepness of the Beverton-Holt spawner-recruitment relationship was 0.329 in the base model and 0.45 in the alternate model (Table 4). The base model estimate indicates a
very un-resilient stock, but the value is nearly identical to the estimate in the 2002 assessment (0.33). Other fish species often have steepness levels near 0.7 (Myers, 1999) and Dorn's (2000) meta-analysis of rockfish found a level of approximately 0.67 , although canary was below the average. Some other west coast groundfish stocks (such as widow rockfish, bocaccio and yelloweye rockfish) have low estimated steepness levels.

These steepness estimates are conditioned upon the long-term trend in recruitment being due solely to changes in the abundance of spawners. If some of the recruitment downtrend for canary rockfish has been because of long-term shifts in the ocean climate, then it is possible that a future shift in the ocean climate will cause an upward shift in recruitment and future estimates of the spawner-recruitment steepness will be higher and representative of a longer-term environmental average. Until this happens, there is not sufficient contrast in the spawner-recruitment-climate data to separate the effects of longterm climate from the steepness of the spawner-recruitment relationship.

## Capturing Uncertainty

The uncertainty in model structure and the uncertainty in steepness were propagated into the rebuilding analysis by the following procedure:

Create 1000 input vectors for the rebuilding program according to the frequency distribution shown above. There are 500 vectors from the Diff model and 500 from the NoDiff model. Each input vector corresponds to an assessment model run with either the Diff or NoDiff configuration and with a steepness value fixed at a value between 0.23 and 0.67 , step 0.02 . There are 11 unique Diff vectors that get included from 1 to 140 times according to their probability. There are 18 unique NoDiff vectors that get included from 1 to 79 times. Overall, the 19 unique vectors differ in steepness value, numbers at age in the base year (2004) for the rebuilding analysis and, to a lesser degree, in the estimated selectivity patterns for the fisheries.

The year-to-year variability of recruitment is also important for the rebuilding analysis. The lognormal standard deviation of recruitment used in the assessment is 0.4 , and this level of variability is used in the forecasts of future recruitment. This is a lower level of recruitment variability than assumed for several other stocks, but the output level of recruitment variability in the canary assessment is lower still.

Run the rebuilding analysis program with 6000 iterations. During these 6000 iterations, the program will cycle through the 1000 input vectors 6 times. Run times were approximately 5 hours. This number of iterations was sufficient to produce smooth probability profiles in the final rebuilding output. More iterations probably would be needed where sigmaR is higher. In each iteration, the program simulates a random sequence of future recruitment deviations. The program accumulates and summarizes the results of the 6000 iterations, then produces estimates of $\mathrm{B}_{\text {zero }}, \mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$, and other rebuilding parameters that includes uncertainty due to model configuration, parameter variability within model configuration (to the extent this is captured by the steepness profile), and variability in future recruitment sequences. This is substantially more inclusive of
multiple sources of uncertainty than typical rebuilding analyses, including the preliminary canary rockfish rebuilding analysis which was based on a single Diff run (with steepness near 0.32 ) and included a steepness $=0.38$ run only as a sensitivity analysis. The new analysis also produces a single average result, but this average integrates across the 3 sources of uncertainty, thus includes the possibility that canary rockfish productivity is much greater or lesser than the current "best" estimate.

In order to better understand the effect of the use of a distribution of steepness values, the new model was run using only the 500 Diff input vectors and with the harvest rate set equal to the current rebuilding rate ( $\mathrm{SPR}=88.7 \%$ ). This is simply for illustration and does not represent an evaluation because it is only including half of the total possible input possibilities. The median result is similar to the results from the preliminary rebuilding analysis but, as expected, the distribution is much broader so there is a greater probability of rebuilding even with use of just the Diff scenario:

| Model | OY in 2007 | Median Year to <br> Rebuild | $\operatorname{Pr}($ rebuild by <br> $2076)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}($ rebuild by <br> 2076 with F=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}=0.32$ | 28.4 mt | 2119 | $0 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| Blend across h <br> distribution | 30.8 mt | 2098 | $18.7 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ |

## Generation Time

Generation time is calculated as the mean age of female spawners, weighted by agespecific spawn production in the absence of fishing mortality. The values used for these calculations are in Table 2. The updated estimate in the 2005 assessment is 23 years. This is 4 years longer than the estimate of 19 years in the 2002 assessment. The increased generation time is primarily due to a lower estimate of natural mortality for older female canary rockfish and partly due to improved estimates of weight-at-age.

## Rebuilding Scenarios

In order to project the effect of the fishery on the rate of rebuilding, it is necessary to quantify the fishery's pattern of selectivity and effect on the spawning potential of the stock. The assessment in 2005 stratified the fishery into 10 sectors based on gear (trawl, non-trawl, recreational) and section of the coast. For the purpose of conducting the rebuilding analysis, the latitudinal strata were combined to produce an estimate of gender-specific body weight and age-selectivity for each of the 3 major gear types due to program limitations on number of fishery types in the rebuilding software. The Oregon trawl, Oregon-Washington non-trawl, and Oregon-Washington recreational fisheries were selected to represent these 3 major gear types because they had the greatest catch level in 2004. The resulting selectivity and weight at age are in Table 3.

The relative F for the 3 gear groups was set to 0.112 for trawl, 0.021 for nontrawl and 0.867 for recreational in order to achieve a $50: 50$ split of catch biomass between recreational and commercial and to preserve the trawl vs.nontrawl proportion observed in 2004. The $50: 50$ commercial:recreational split is based on the Council's selection of this
allocation following the rebuilding analysis conducted in 2002. These proportions of F were obtained from the SS2 assessment model because the rebuilding software does not output the catch biomass for each gear type. It should be noted that future adjustments in the catch proportions may need to be made as the stock and OY rebuild to levels that are larger than the capacity of the recreational fishery.

In the assessment model (Methot and Stewart, 2005), it was determined that the fishery harvest rate for rebuilding corresponded to a SPR of $88.7 \%$.

Runs 1 and 3: These two runs determine the probability of rebuilding by the current $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ (2074) and $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2076) if the current harvest rate is continued. In the assessment model (Methot and Stewart, 2005), it was determined that the fishery exploitation rate for rebuilding corresponded to a SPR of $88.7 \%$. At this rate, the probability of rebuilding by the current $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ is $57.4 \%$ and the probability of rebuilding by the $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ is $58.5 \%$ as shown in the column labeled Current. These two probabilities were $50 \%$ and $60 \%$ respectively in the 2002 rebuilding analysis, so the probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ has increased while the probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ has decreased. The two probabilities move closer together in the current analysis because inclusion of more uncertainty causes the probability profile to flatten relative to the steep probability profile that occurred when the only uncertainty was in the future recruitment variability. Maintaining the current harvest rate would produce an average OY in 2007 of 43 mt , which is slightly lower than the current 47 mt OY. The OY in 2007 that would correspond to $\mathrm{SPR}=50 \%$ is 171 mt , so the current OY is less than a third of the overfishing level. However the harvest rate corresponding to $\mathrm{SPR}=50 \%$ has only a $17.8 \%$ chance of rebuilding by 2076 . Note that even if $\mathrm{F}=0$, there is only a $70 \%$ chance of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}$ because in the integrated analysis there is a small probability that the stock has very low productivity. Overall, changes in the SPR rate to achieve improvements in the probability of rebuilding above $50 \%$ would have a dramatic effect on the OY as shown in the Figure below:

Rebuilding runs conducted with the current $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}$ (2074).
RUN


Rebuilding runs conducted with the current $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2076).

| RUN | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $40-10$ | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $90 \%$ | Tmid | F=0 | Rule | Current |  |
| Fishing rate | 0.032 | 0.015 | $5 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 0 | 0 | 0.019 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPR RATE | $80.7 \%$ | $90.3 \%$ | $99.6 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $88.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ |  | $88.7 \%$ |  |
| OY in 2007 (mt) | 77.6 | 37 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 45.7 | 0 | 0 | 43.2 |  |
| Prob to rebuild by <br> $\mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}(2076)$ | $50.0 \%$ | $59.9 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $70.3 \%$ | $70.3 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ | $70.3 \%$ | $37.6 \%$ | $58.5 \%$ |  |
| Prob to rebuild by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ttarget (2074) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| Median year to <br> rebuild | 2076 | 2061 | 2053 | 2053 | 2053 | 2064 | 2053 | 2111 | 2063 |  |



Runs 2 and 4: Run 2 shows that increasing the harvest rate to a level that reduces SPR to $81.6 \%$ would create a probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}(2074)$ equal to $50 \%$ and would produce an OY equal to 73.4 mt in 2007. Run 4 shows that decreasing the harvest rate to increase SPR to $90.3 \%$ would reduce the 2007 OY to 37 mt and increase the probability
of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ back to $60 \%$. The movement of these two changes in opposite directions is caused by the shift from a low uncertainty rebuilding projection in 2002 that caused the $50 \%$ and $60 \%$ probabilities of rebuilding to occur close together in time (2074 and 2076), to an analysis that incorporates more of the uncertainty.

Runs 5 and 6: Recalculation of $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$ and generation time with the current model (integrating over two scenarios and probability of steepness) produces the following results:

| Model | $\mathrm{T}_{\min }$ | Generation Time | $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2002 | 2057 | 19 | 2076 |
| 2005 - integrated | 2048 | 23 | 2071 |

Run 5 - The current harvest rate would produce a $55.4 \%$ probability of rebuilding on or before the recalculated $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2071).

Run 6 - Reducing the harvest rate to produce a SPR of $93.5 \%$ would restore the $60 \%$ probability of rebuilding by $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ and would produce an OY of 24.1 mt in 2007. By interpolation from values in the table below, a harvest rate with SPR equal to $87.8 \%$ would produce an OY of 47 mt in 2007 and would result in a probability of rebuilding on or before 2071 of $54.5 \%$.

Rebuilding runs conducted with the recalculated $\mathrm{T}_{\max }$ (2071).

| RUN | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $50 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $90 \%$ | Tmid | F $=0$ | Current | ABC |  |
| Fishing rate | 0.0271 | 0.0097 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0152 | 0.000 |  |  |  |
| SPR RATE | $83.1 \%$ | $93.5 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $90.1 \%$ |  | $88.7 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| OY | 66.8 | 24.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.4 | 0 | 43.2 | 171.8 |  |
| Prob to rebuild by | 50.0 | 60.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 | 56.8 | 66.0 | 55.4 | 17.8 |  |
| Tmax |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median time to <br> rebuild | 64 | 51 | 45.9 | 45.9 | 45.9 | 54.4 | 45.9 | 56.2 | -1 |  |
| Prob overfished <br> after rebuild | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Median time to <br> rebuild (yrs) | 2071.0 | 2058.0 | 2052.9 | 2052.9 | 2052.9 | 2061.4 | 2052.9 | 2063.2 |  |  |
| Probability above <br> current spawning <br> outptut in 100 <br> years | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.7 |  |
| Probability above <br> current spawning <br> outptut in 200 <br> years | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.0 |  |
| Probability below <br> 0.01B0 in 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Probability below <br> 0.01B0 in 200 <br> years | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |
| Lower 5th <br> percentile, <br> spawning output / <br> target in Tmax <br> Median spawning <br> output / target in <br> Tmax | 0.999 | 1.267 | 1.445 | 1.445 | 1.445 | 1.180 | 1.445 | 1.143 | 0.514 |  |
| Upper 5th <br> percentile, <br> spawning output / <br> target in Tmax | 1.869 | 2.185 | 2.379 | 2.379 | 2.379 | 2.077 | 2.379 | 2.034 | 1.212 |  |

The table below summarizes the results of the rebuilding analyses requested by the SSC and GMT to evaluate the adequacy of progress in rebuilding and the degree of correction needed if any adjustment is considered necessary.

| Run \# | $\begin{gathered} \text { Prob } \\ \text { (recovery) } \end{gathered}$ | By | Based on | OY in 2007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \# 1 \\ \text { (default) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated: } \\ 57.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current } \\ \mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}(2074) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Current SPR } \\ (88.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 43.2 mt |
| $\# 2$ ( $\mathrm{T}_{\text {TARGET }}$ with $50 \%$ prob) | 50\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current } \\ \mathrm{T}_{\text {target }}(2074) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { SPR } \\ (81.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 73.4 mt |
| \#3 (\#1 based on $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MAX}}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated: } \\ 58.5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} {\text { Current } T_{\max }}^{(2076)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current SPR } \\ (88.7 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 43.2 mt |
| \#4 (\#2 based on $\mathrm{T}_{\text {MAX }}$ ) | $P_{0}(60 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current } T_{\max } \\ \text { (2076) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { SPR: } \\ 90.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | 37.0 mt |
| \#5 (\#3 with re-estimated $\mathrm{T}_{\text {MAX }}$ ) | Estimated: $55.4 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}: 2071 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current SPR } \\ (88.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 43.2 mt |
| $\# 6$ (\#4 with re-estimated $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{MAX}}$ ) | $P_{0}(60 \%)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}: 2071 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { SPR } \\ (93.5 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 24.1 mt |
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Table 1. Results of the stock assessment in 2005. These 2 configurations are the results of changes made during the September 2005 SSC review and are considered equally plausible.

| Year | Catch | Base Configuration ( Diff) |  |  |  |  | Alternate Configuration (No Diff) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sp |  | - | Age 3+ Bio | $\begin{gathered} \text { Catch } \\ 3+\mathrm{Bio} \end{gathered}$ | Spbio | Recruit | , | Age 3+ Bio | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Catch } \\ & 3+\mathrm{Bio} \end{aligned}$ |
| Vir |  | 34798 | 4728 | 93807 | 93315 |  | 33872 | 4357 | 88074 | 87621 | NA |
| Equ |  | 34798 | 4728 | 93807 | 93315 | 0.00 | 33872 | 4357 | 88074 | 87621 | 0.000 |
| 1916 | 74 | 34798 | 4728 | 93807 | 93315 | 0.00 | 33872 | 4357 | 88074 | 87621 | 0.005 |
| 1917 | 749 | 34574 | 4712 | 93307 | 92816 | 0.008 | 33634 | 4347 | 87583 | 87130 | 0.009 |
| 1918 | 794 | 34246 | 4689 | 92567 | 92077 | 0.00 | 33279 | 4333 | 86851 | 86399 | 0.009 |
| 1919 | 520 | 33909 | 4666 | 91817 | 91329 | 0.00 | 32917 | 4318 | 86108 | 85657 | 0.006 |
| 1920 | 543 | 33695 | 4650 | 91360 | 90874 | 0.00 | 32690 | 4309 | 85659 | 85209 | . 006 |
| 1921 | 459 | 33482 | 4635 | 90903 | 90419 | 0.00 | 32463 | 4299 | 85210 | 84762 | 0.005 |
| 1922 | 415 | 33312 | 4623 | 90546 | 90063 | 0.00 | 32285 | 4292 | 84862 | 84415 | 0.005 |
| 1923 | 491 | 33170 | 4613 | 90244 | 89763 | 0.0 | 32136 | 4286 | 84572 | 84125 | . 006 |
| 1924 | 457 | 33006 | 4601 | 89880 | 89401 | 0.00 | 31963 | 4278 | 84223 | 83777 | 0.005 |
| 1925 | 529 | 32864 | 4590 | 89560 | 89081 | 0.00 | 31816 | 4272 | 83920 | 83475 | 0.006 |
| 1926 | 726 | 32701 | 4578 | 89180 | 88703 | 0.008 | 31645 | 4265 | 83561 | 83117 | 0.009 |
| 1927 | 616 | 32466 | 4561 | 88624 | 88148 | 0.007 | 31396 | 4254 | 83029 | 82586 | 0.007 |
| 1928 | 627 | 32284 | 4548 | 88190 | 87715 | 0.007 | 31207 | 4246 | 82624 | 82181 | 0.008 |
| 1929 | 596 | 32105 | 4534 | 87758 | 87285 | 0.007 | 31023 | 4237 | 82224 | 81782 | 0.007 |
| 1930 | 709 | 31945 | 4522 | 87367 | 86895 | 0.008 | 30862 | 4230 | 81869 | 81428 | 0.009 |
| 1931 | 711 | 31745 | 4507 | 86879 | 86409 | 0.00 | 30659 | 4221 | 81420 | 80980 | 0.009 |
| 1932 | 547 | 31551 | 4493 | 86403 | 85934 | 0.00 | 30464 | 4212 | 80987 | 80548 | 0.007 |
| 1933 | 467 | 31429 | 4483 | 86096 | 85629 | 0.00 | 30350 | 4207 | 80726 | 80287 | 0.006 |
| 1934 | 450 | 31343 | 4477 | 85870 | 85404 | 0.005 | 30277 | 4204 | 80549 | 80111 | 0.006 |
| 1935 | 473 | 31265 | 4471 | 85661 | 85195 | 0.00 | 30214 | 4201 | 80392 | 79955 | 0.006 |
| 1936 | 460 | 31179 | 4464 | 85430 | 84965 | 0.0 | 30144 | 4198 | 80216 | 79779 | 0.006 |
| 1937 | 433 | 31099 | 4458 | 85211 | 84747 | 0.005 | 30082 | 4195 | 80056 | 79619 | 0.005 |
| 1938 | 370 | 31029 | 4453 | 85018 | 84554 | 0.00 | 30034 | 4193 | 79923 | 79487 | 0.005 |
| 1939 | 337 | 30984 | 4449 | 84884 | 84421 | 0.004 | 30013 | 4192 | 79852 | 79415 | 0.004 |
| 1940 | 422 | 30950 | 4447 | 84778 | 84315 | 0.00 | 30005 | 4191 | 79810 | 79374 | 0.005 |
| 1941 | 476 | 30882 | 4441 | 84587 | 84124 | 0.006 | 29961 | 4189 | 79685 | 79249 | 0.006 |
| 1942 | 413 | 30793 | 434 | 84345 | 83883 | 0.005 | 29895 | 4186 | 79510 | 79074 | 0.005 |
| 1943 | 1244 | 30737 | 4430 | 84162 | 83701 | 0.015 | 29863 | 4185 | 79395 | 78959 | 0.016 |
| 1944 | 1964 | 30382 | 4402 | 83185 | 82725 | 0.024 | 29495 | 4167 | 78484 | 78049 | 0.025 |
| 1945 | 4141 | 29762 | 4353 | 81563 | 81106 | 0.051 | 28828 | 4135 | 76928 | 76495 | 0.054 |
| 1946 | 2755 | 28396 | 4241 | 77924 | 77474 | 0.036 | 27327 | 4059 | 73350 | 72922 | 0.038 |
| 1947 | 1816 | 27571 | 4171 | 75773 | 75331 | 0.024 | 26431 | 4011 | 71260 | 70837 | 0.026 |
| 1948 | 1541 | 27127 | 4133 | 74622 | 74187 | 0.021 | 25960 | 3985 | 70171 | 69753 | 0.022 |
| 1949 | 1583 | 26828 | 4107 | 73787 | 73356 | 0.022 | 25649 | 3967 | 69400 | 68985 | 0.023 |
| 1950 | 1959 | 26541 | 4082 | 72942 | 72515 | 0.027 | 25352 | 3950 | 68623 | 68211 | 0.029 |
| 1951 | 1936 | 26134 | 4045 | 71754 | 71330 | 0.027 | 24925 | 3925 | 67512 | 67101 | 0.029 |
| 1952 | 1902 | 25738 | 3219 | 70586 | 70194 | 0.027 | 24516 | 3278 | 66435 | 66049 | 0.029 |
| 1953 | 1753 | 25367 | 3217 | 69472 | 69110 | 0.025 | 24137 | 3269 | 65421 | 65059 | 0.027 |
| 1954 | 1949 | 25041 | 3263 | 68527 | 68190 | 0.029 | 23816 | 3307 | 64583 | 64241 | 0.030 |


|  | 1961 | 24 | 3360 | 67391 | 67049 | 0.02 | 23427 | 3394 | 63565 | 63219 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 98 | 24251 | 3521 | 66206 | 5854 | 0.03 | 41 |  | 62520 | 62 | 0.032 |
|  | 2576 | 23833 | 3761 |  | 64574 | 0.040 |  |  |  | 61047 |  |
| 1958 | 2619 | 23 | 4059 | 6309 | 62699 |  | 001 |  | 59749 | 59354 |  |
| 59 | 52 | 22522 | 4354 | 61199 | 60775 | 0.040 | 346 | 333 | 053 | 5763 |  |
| 1960 | 2479 | 21903 | 4387 | 59 | 59 |  | 20760 | 348 | 56544 | 56101 | 0.04 |
| 1961 | 2160 | 21254 | 3901 | 760 | 7323 | . 03 | 20155 | 3883 | 55041 | 5460 |  |
|  | 2207 |  | 3238 |  | 56014 | 0.038 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 196 | 2071 | 20160 | 2734 | 55 | 54778 | 0.038 | 1919 | 276 | 52827 | 5248 |  |
|  | 1485 |  | 2496 | 54081 | 53789 |  |  |  |  | 51694 |  |
| 1965 | 1756 | 19438 | 2558 | 53 | 53 | 0.033 | 18629 | 259 | 51788 | 515 |  |
| 1966 | 3616 | 19 | 2969 | 53061 | 27 | 0.06 | 8442 | 298 | 51332 | 104 |  |
| 1967 | 1954 | 18 | 3559 | 50 | 5030 | 0.03 | 7558 | 3528 | 49062 | 48744 |  |
| 1968 | 2327 | 18081 | 3350 | 49 | 939 | 0.04 | 17395 | 3308 | 48342 | 80 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4839 | 48065 |  |  |  |  | 46831 |  |
| 1970 | 152 | 17686 | 2505 | 4772 | 4743 |  | 710 | 52 | 4664 | 635 |  |
| 1971 | 1521 | 17577 | 301 | 47085 | 680 | 0.0 | 706 | 302 | 46158 | 4587 |  |
| 1972 | 160 | 17 | 3868 | 4646 | 46135 | 0.03 | 1695 | 3809 | 4567 | 453 |  |
| 1973 | 248 |  | 3599 | 4571 | 535 | 0.0 |  |  | 4505 | 44689 |  |
| 1974 | 1863 |  | 3649 | 4410 | 43723 | 0.043 | 16 | 365 | 4356 | 431 |  |
|  |  | 16 | 3335 | 4310 | 42742 |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |
|  |  | 156 | 2347 | 42147 | 41826 |  | 15385 |  |  | 41490 |  |
|  | 20 | 15426 | 056 | 692 | 41390 |  | 15200 | 3102 |  | 1139 |  |
| 1978 |  | 150 | 2487 | 40729 | 40455 |  | 14797 |  | 40556 | 40279 |  |
| 1979 | 3461 | 14200 | 1244 | 3880 | 3857 | 0.090 | 1398 | 1303 |  | 84 |  |
|  |  | 1332 | 265 | 36 | 364 |  | 1306 |  | 36580 | 3635 |  |
|  |  | 12255 | 2526 | 33 | 335 | 0.10 | 11972 | 2670 | 33827 | 33592 |  |
|  |  | 11504 | 1273 | 31 | 14 |  | 112 |  |  | 31530 |  |
|  |  | 9993 | 2162 | 27 | 2747 |  | 965 |  |  | 275 |  |
|  | 239 | 8673 | 27 | 24 | 2403 | 0.1 | 83 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 8336 | 890 | 23 | 29 |  | 799 |  | 2333 | 2312 |  |
|  | 22 | 7848 |  | 2158 | 21 | 0.1 | 75 |  | 2189 | 17 |  |
|  |  | 7495 |  |  | 2037 |  | 210 |  |  | 2076 |  |
|  | 27 | 67 |  | 1855 | 1840 |  | 647 | 209 | 1908 | 1889 |  |
|  | 327 | 60 |  |  |  |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5 | 1129 |  | 14571 |  | 505 |  | 15 | 1532 |  |
|  |  | 4562 | 129 | 129 | 12869 |  | 4460 | 1941 | 13957 | 13776 |  |
|  | 282 | 3701 |  | 1086 | 10761 |  | 3675 | 104 | 1200 | 118 |  |
|  |  | 2975 | 897 | 9065 | 896 |  | 30 | 1562 | 1040 | 1025 |  |
|  | 1205 | 248 | 105 | 7853 | 7762 |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 240 |  | 7468 | 7382 |  | 265 | 104 | 9316 | 915 |  |
|  |  | 2318 |  | 000 |  | . | 266 | 74 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2060 | 366 | 6132 | 608 | . | 25 | 72 | 597 | 8510 |  |
| 1998 | 1513 | 17 | 824 | 5313 | 5258 | . 2 | 239 | 1737 | 16 | 805 |  |
| 199 | 85 | 1443 | 276 | 433 | 428 | 0.2 | 2212 | 605 | 7566 | 46 |  |
| 2000 | 181 | 1319 | 96 | 393 | 3889 | 0.04 | 225 | 462 | 7533 | 4 |  |
| 200 | 12 | 1442 | 327 | 414 | 4118 | 0.03 | 2544 | 799 | 8128 | 8063 |  |
| 2002 | 104 | 1580 | 380 | 4400 | 4368 | 0.02 | 2865 | 966 | 8773 | 8695 | 2 |
| 2003 | 48 | 1717 | 407 | 4640 | 4601 | 0.01 | 3187 | 1053 | 9387 | 9289 | 0.005 |


| 2004 | 38 | 1862 | 436 | 4890 | 4847 | 0.008 | 3518 | 1134 | 9985 | 9875 | 0.004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 N/A |  | 1995 | 466 | 5112 | 5066 |  | 3829 | 1182 | 10534 | 10417 |  |

Table 2. Age-specific natural mortality and female fecundity. Numbers at age (thousands) in 2000 are for the Tmin calculation and numbers at age in 2004 are the basis for projections. These values are from the base model reviewed by the STAR in September 2005. The integrated rebuilding analysis uses 38 ( 2 models and a range of steepness levels) unique init N vectors to represent alternative outcomes.

| Age | Females |  | Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fecundity M | Init N |  | Init N Tmin M | Init N |  | Init N (Tmin) |
|  | 0 | 0.00004 | 0.06 | 196.31 | 88.65 | 0.06 | 196.31 | 88.65 |
|  | 1 | 0.00004 | 0.06 | 172.86 | 120.26 | 0.06 | 172.86 | 120.26 |
|  | 2 | 0.00004 | 0.06 | 152.33 | 335.91 | 0.06 | 152.33 | 335.91 |
|  | 3 | 0.00016 | 0.06 | 123.56 | 140.12 | 0.06 | 123.56 | 140.12 |
|  | 4 | 0.00184 | 0.06 | 69.68 | 136.47 | 0.06 | 69.66 | 136.33 |
|  | 5 | 0.01202 | 0.06 | 93.96 | 184.11 | 0.06 | 93.82 | 183.10 |
|  | 6 | 0.05066 | 0.06 | 258.78 | 318.14 | 0.06 | 258.06 | 314.19 |
|  | 7 | 0.14742 | 0.064 | 105.08 | 230.15 | 0.06 | 105.02 | 226.13 |
|  | 8 | 0.31891 | 0.068 | 98.16 | 136.29 | 0.06 | 98.60 | 133.17 |
|  | 9 | 0.55367 | 0.072 | 127.00 | 203.28 | 0.06 | 128.65 | 196.47 |
|  | 10 | 0.82297 | 0.077 | 212.96 | 127.29 | 0.06 | 217.84 | 121.03 |
|  | 11 | 1.09879 | 0.081 | 150.98 | 103.58 | 0.06 | 155.90 | 96.17 |
|  | 12 | 1.36261 | 0.085 | 87.95 | 96.39 | 0.06 | 91.49 | 86.89 |
|  | 13 | 1.60522 | 0.089 | 129.37 | 57.86 | 0.06 | 134.80 | 50.71 |
|  | 14 | 1.82361 | 0.093 | 80.01 | 47.42 | 0.06 | 83.11 | 40.75 |
|  | 15 | 2.018 | 0.093 | 64.61 | 23.21 | 0.06 | 66.20 | 19.74 |
|  | 16 | 2.19001 | 0.093 | 59.89 | 56.85 | 0.06 | 59.98 | 48.43 |
|  | 17 | 2.34176 | 0.093 | 35.93 | 33.63 | 0.06 | 35.11 | 29.07 |
|  | 18 | 2.47539 | 0.093 | 29.54 | 14.41 | 0.06 | 28.29 | 12.78 |
|  | 19 | 2.59291 | 0.093 | 14.49 | 20.23 | 0.06 | 13.74 | 18.51 |
|  | 20 | 2.69616 | 0.093 | 35.57 | 14.85 | 0.06 | 33.77 | 14.01 |
|  | 21 | 2.78678 | 0.093 | 21.07 | 4.96 | 0.06 | 20.30 | 4.79 |
|  | 22 | 2.86625 | 0.093 | 9.04 | 7.16 | 0.06 | 8.94 | 7.04 |
|  | 23 | 2.93589 | 0.093 | 12.71 | 6.27 | 0.06 | 12.96 | 6.23 |
|  | 24 | 2.99684 | 0.093 | 9.33 | 3.46 | 0.06 | 9.82 | 3.45 |
|  | 25 | 3.05017 | 0.093 | 3.12 | 3.63 | 0.06 | 3.36 | 3.62 |
|  | 26 | 3.09678 | 0.093 | 4.51 | 2.98 | 0.06 | 4.94 | 2.96 |
|  | 27 | 3.1375 | 0.093 | 3.95 | 2.25 | 0.06 | 4.38 | 2.21 |
|  | 28 | 3.17306 | 0.093 | 2.18 | 1.87 | 0.06 | 2.43 | 1.81 |
|  | 29 | 3.20408 | 0.093 | 2.29 | 1.13 | 0.06 | 2.55 | 1.08 |
|  | 30 | 3.23114 | 0.093 | 1.88 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 2.08 | 0.70 |
|  | 31 | 3.25473 | 0.093 | 1.42 | 0.64 | 0.06 | 1.56 | 0.58 |
|  | 32 | 3.27529 | 0.093 | 1.18 | 0.67 | 0.06 | 1.27 | 0.59 |
|  | 33 | 3.2932 | 0.093 | 0.72 | 0.60 | 0.06 | 0.76 | 0.52 |
|  | 34 | 3.30881 | 0.093 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.06 | 0.49 | 0.36 |
|  | 35 | 3.32239 | 0.093 | 0.40 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.27 |
|  | 36 | 3.33422 | 0.093 | 0.42 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.22 |
|  | 37 | 3.34452 | 0.093 | 0.38 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.37 | 0.21 |
|  | 38 | 3.35348 | 0.093 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.22 |
|  | 39 | 3.36128 | 0.093 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.23 |
|  | 40 | 3.36806 | 0.093 | 2.25 | 2.43 | 0.06 | 2.06 | 2.03 |

Table 3. Age, gender, and fleet-specific body weight and selectivity. Fleet 1 is trawl, fleet 2 in non-trawl, and fleet 3 is recreational. These values are from the best-fitting Base model; steepness specific values are used in the blended rebuilding analysis and do not differ noticeably for these quantities.

|  | Fleet 1 (F) |  |  | Fleet 2 (F) |  | Fleet 3 (F) |  | Fleet 1 (M) |  | Fleet 2 (M) |  | Fleet 3 (M) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  | ight | Selectivity | Weight | Selectivity | Weight | Selectivity | Weight | Selectivity | Weight | Selectivity | Weight | Selectivity |
|  | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 00.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 00.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 00.037 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 0.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 | 0.037 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 0.053 | 0 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.062 | 0.001 | 10.059 | 0 | 0.056 | 0 | 0.068 | 0.001 |
|  | 3 | 0.166 | 0.001 | 10.155 | 0.002 | 20.176 | 0.041 | 10.182 | 0.001 | 10.169 | 0.002 | 0.189 | 0.057 |
|  | 4 | 0.353 | 0.005 | - 0.326 | 0.014 | 40.309 | 0.328 | 0.373 | 0.006 | - 0.344 | 0.017 | 70.322 | 0.394 |
|  | 5 | 0.577 | 0.025 | - 0.536 | 0.058 | - 0.437 | 0.78 | - 0.584 | 0.033 | - 0.544 | 0.065 | $5 \quad 0.45$ | 0.845 |
|  | 6 | 0.792 | 0.096 | - 0.748 | 0.159 | 0.572 | 0.972 | - 0.78 | 0.117 | . 0.737 | 0.166 | - 0.584 | 1 |
|  | 7 | 0.986 | 0.233 | - 0.947 | 0.321 | 0.714 | 0.879 | 0.953 | 0.276 | - 0.914 | 0.317 | $7 \quad 0.723$ | 0.893 |
|  | 8 | 1.166 | 0.405 | -1.137 | 0.505 | - 0.854 | 0.691 | 1.108 | 0.474 | 41.077 | 0.484 | 40.858 | 0.714 |
|  | 9 | 1.339 | 0.56 | - 1.321 | 0.67 | - 0.997 | 0.513 | 31.25 | 0.66 | -1.23 | 0.634 | 40.989 | 0.552 |
|  | 10 | 1.51 | 0.672 | 1.502 | 0.794 | 1.157 | 0.377 | 71.382 | 0.801 | 1.372 | 0.75 | 51.122 | 0.427 |
|  | 11 | 1.679 | 0.742 | 1.679 | 0.877 | 1.345 | 0.281 | 1.506 | 0.893 | -1.504 | 0.834 | 1.262 | 0.335 |
|  | 12 | 1.843 | 0.78 | 1.849 | 0.93 | 1.558 | 0.217 | 71.62 | 0.949 | 1.624 | 0.89 | 1.406 | 0.27 |
|  | 13 | 2.001 | 0.799 | 2.012 | 0.961 | 1.776 | 0.177 | 71.724 | 0.979 | 1.732 | 0.928 | 1.545 | 0.225 |
|  | 14 | 2.148 | 0.807 | 72.164 | 0.978 | -1.982 | 0.151 | 1.817 | 0.993 | 1.829 | 0.952 | 1.672 | 0.195 |
|  | 15 | 2.285 | 0.809 | 2.306 | 0.988 | 2.166 | 0.134 | 41.9 | 0.999 | 1.914 | 0.968 | -1.783 | 0.173 |
|  | 16 | 2.41 | 0.807 | 2.437 | 0.993 | 2.328 | 0.123 | 31.973 | 1 | 1.988 | 0.978 | 1.878 | 0.159 |
|  | 17 | 2.523 | 0.804 | 4.556 | 0.996 | - 2.469 | 0.116 | - 2.036 | 0.998 | 2.053 | 0.985 | 1.958 | 0.148 |
|  | 18 | 2.626 | 0.8 | - 2.663 | 0.998 | 2.593 | 0.111 | 12.091 | 0.996 | - 2.109 | 0.989 | 2.026 | 0.141 |
|  | 19 | 2.718 | 0.795 | 2.759 | 0.999 | 2.702 | 0.107 | 72.138 | 0.993 | 2.157 | 0.992 | 2.083 | 0.135 |
|  | 20 | 2.801 | 0.791 | 12.845 | 0.999 | 2.797 | 0.105 | 2.178 | 0.989 | 2.198 | 0.994 | 4.132 | 0.131 |
|  | 21 | 2.875 | 0.786 | - 2.921 | 1 | 12.88 | 0.103 | 2.212 | 0.986 | - 2.233 | 0.995 | - 2.172 | 0.127 |
|  | 22 | 2.941 | 0.782 | 2.988 | 1 | 12.953 | 0.102 | 2.241 | 0.983 | 2.263 | 0.996 | - 2.206 | 0.125 |
|  | 23 | 2.999 | 0.778 | 3.047 | 1 | 3.016 | - 0.101 | 12.266 | 0.981 | 2.288 | 0.997 | 72.235 | 0.123 |
|  | 24 | 3.051 | 0.775 | - 3.1 | 1 | 3.072 | - 0.1 | 12.287 | 0.979 | - 2.31 | 0.998 | - 2.259 | 0.121 |
|  | 25 | 3.097 | 0.772 | 2.146 | 1 | 1 3.121 | 0.099 | 2.305 | 0.977 | 2.328 | 0.998 | - 2.28 | 0.12 |


| 26 | 3.137 | 0.769 | 3.186 | 1 | 3.163 | 0.099 | 2.32 | 0.975 | 2.343 | 0.998 | 2.297 | 0.119 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 27 | 3.172 | 0.766 | 3.221 | 1 | 3.2 | 0.098 | 2.332 | 0.974 | 2.356 | 0.999 | 2.311 | 0.118 |
| 28 | 3.203 | 0.764 | 3.252 | 1 | 3.232 | 0.098 | 2.343 | 0.973 | 2.367 | 0.999 | 2.324 | 0.117 |
| 29 | 3.23 | 0.762 | 3.279 | 1 | 3.261 | 0.098 | 2.352 | 0.972 | 2.376 | 0.999 | 2.334 | 0.117 |
| 30 | 3.254 | 0.76 | 3.303 | 1 | 3.285 | 0.097 | 2.36 | 0.971 | 2.384 | 0.999 | 2.342 | 0.116 |
| 31 | 3.275 | 0.759 | 3.324 | 1 | 3.307 | 0.097 | 2.366 | 0.97 | 2.39 | 0.999 | 2.35 | 0.116 |
| 32 | 3.293 | 0.757 | 3.342 | 1 | 3.325 | 0.097 | 2.371 | 0.97 | 2.396 | 0.999 | 2.356 | 0.116 |
| 33 | 3.309 | 0.756 | 3.357 | 1 | 3.342 | 0.097 | 2.376 | 0.969 | 2.401 | 0.999 | 2.361 | 0.115 |
| 34 | 3.323 | 0.755 | 3.371 | 1 | 3.356 | 0.097 | 2.38 | 0.969 | 2.404 | 0.999 | 2.365 | 0.115 |
| 35 | 3.335 | 0.754 | 3.383 | 1 | 3.368 | 0.097 | 2.383 | 0.968 | 2.408 | 0.999 | 2.369 | 0.115 |
| 36 | 3.345 | 0.753 | 3.394 | 1 | 3.379 | 0.097 | 2.386 | 0.968 | 2.41 | 0.999 | 2.372 | 0.115 |
| 37 | 3.355 | 0.753 | 3.403 | 1 | 3.388 | 0.097 | 2.388 | 0.968 | 2.413 | 0.999 | 2.374 | 0.115 |
| 38 | 3.363 | 0.752 | 3.41 | 1 | 3.396 | 0.097 | 2.39 | 0.968 | 2.415 | 0.999 | 2.376 | 0.115 |
| 39 | 3.37 | 0.752 | 3.417 | 1 | 3.403 | 0.096 | 2.392 | 0.967 | 2.416 | 0.999 | 2.378 | 0.115 |
| 40 | 3.376 | 0.751 | 3.423 | 1 | 3.41 | 0.096 | 2.393 | 0.967 | 2.418 | 0.999 | 2.38 | 0.115 |

Table 4. Probability distributions based on steepness profiles for the base and alternate model configurations.

|  |  |  |  | B2005/ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Steepness | Prob | Bzero | B2005 | Bzero | Rzero |
| Diff | 0.23 | 0.000 | 38363 | 1075 | 0.028 | 5593 |
|  | 0.25 | 0.001 | 37429 | 1235 | 0.033 | 5357 |
|  | 0.27 | 0.007 | 36609 | 1406 | 0.038 | 5162 |
|  | 0.29 | 0.044 | 35913 | 1590 | 0.044 | 4994 |
|  | 0.31 | 0.110 | 35312 | 1788 | 0.051 | 4850 |
|  | 0.33 | 0.140 | 34784 | 2001 | 0.058 | 4725 |
|  | 0.35 | 0.090 | 34309 | 2238 | 0.065 | 4622 |
|  | 0.37 | 0.063 | 33894 | 2474 | 0.073 | 4519 |
|  | 0.39 | 0.029 | 33514 | 2734 | 0.082 | 4434 |
|  | 0.41 | 0.011 | 33169 | 3010 | 0.091 | 4359 |
|  | 0.43 | 0.004 | 32854 | 3302 | 0.101 | 4292 |
|  | 0.45 | 0.001 | 32564 | 3610 | 0.111 | 4232 |
|  | 0.47 | 0.000 | 32299 | 3933 | 0.122 | 4179 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NoDiff | 0.31 | 0.000 | 37551 | 1728 | 0.046 | 4988 |
|  | 0.33 | 0.001 | 36854 | 1975 | 0.054 | 4861 |
|  | 0.35 | 0.003 | 36231 | 2240 | 0.062 | 4749 |
|  | 0.37 | 0.013 | 35654 | 2527 | 0.071 | 4653 |
|  | 0.39 | 0.026 | 35160 | 2826 | 0.080 | 4563 |
|  | 0.41 | 0.055 | 34680 | 3151 | 0.091 | 4487 |
|  | 0.43 | 0.060 | 34268 | 3478 | 0.102 | 4416 |
|  | 0.45 | 0.079 | 33863 | 3839 | 0.113 | 4355 |
|  | 0.47 | 0.064 | 33496 | 4182 | 0.125 | 4303 |
|  | 0.49 | 0.061 | 33171 | 4582 | 0.138 | 4249 |
|  | 0.51 | 0.046 | 32866 | 4974 | 0.151 | 4203 |
|  | 0.53 | 0.033 | 32585 | 5376 | 0.165 | 4162 |
|  | 0.55 | 0.022 | 32324 | 5786 | 0.179 | 4124 |
|  | 0.57 | 0.014 | 32082 | 6203 | 0.193 | 4090 |
|  | 0.59 | 0.009 | 31857 | 6624 | 0.208 | 4059 |
|  | 0.61 | 0.006 | 31647 | 7046 | 0.223 | 4031 |
|  | 0.63 | 0.004 | 31451 | 7469 | 0.237 | 4005 |
| Diff | 0.65 | 0.003 | 31268 | 7889 | 0.252 | 3981 |
| NoDiff | 0.67 | 0.001 | 31097 | 8306 | 0.267 | 3959 |
| Both | 0.336 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.471 |  | 34703 | 2089 | 0.060 | 4710 |
| MPD | 0.403 |  | 33607 | 4263 | 0.128 | 4320 |
|  |  |  | 34155 | 3176 | 0.094 | 4515 |
| Diff | 0.329 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NoDiff | 0.451 |  | 34798 | 1995 | 0.057 | 4728 |
|  |  |  | 33826 | 3844 | 0.114 | 4355 |
|  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Projection Table. Note that decades of 2030-2060 are compressed.
Catch


| 2060 | 162.1 | 183.9 | 269.6 | 112.2 | 16096 | 13335 | 12913 | 11013 | 14246 | 0.567 | 0.490 | 0.477 | 0.412 | 0.515 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2061 | 165.2 | 187.4 | 274.0 | 114.4 | 16430 | 13583 | 13141 | 11187 | 14528 | 0.575 | 0.499 | 0.485 | 0.418 | 0.524 |
| 2062 | 167.8 | 190.3 | 278.5 | 116.2 | 16768 | 13826 | 13378 | 11387 | 14808 | 0.582 | 0.505 | 0.491 | 0.424 | 0.531 |
| 2063 | 170.2 | 192.8 | 281.7 | 117.8 | 17088 | 14113 | 13644 | 11556 | 15088 | 0.590 | 0.511 | 0.498 | 0.432 | 0.539 |
| 2064 | 173.5 | 196.6 | 287.1 | 120.3 | 17413 | 14329 | 13872 | 11737 | 15341 | 0.600 | 0.517 | 0.506 | 0.440 | 0.546 |
| 2065 | 176.5 | 199.9 | 291.4 | 122.5 | 17702 | 14581 | 14099 | 11935 | 15613 | 0.609 | 0.526 | 0.512 | 0.445 | 0.556 |
| 2066 | 179.5 | 203.8 | 297.0 | 124.6 | 18068 | 14861 | 14362 | 12156 | 15926 | 0.618 | 0.533 | 0.518 | 0.453 | 0.563 |
| 2067 | 182.5 | 206.8 | 301.4 | 126.4 | 18421 | 15170 | 14662 | 12385 | 16232 | 0.627 | 0.539 | 0.526 | 0.459 | 0.570 |
| 2068 | 185.3 | 210.0 | 305.9 | 128.5 | 18779 | 15397 | 14880 | 12554 | 16527 | 0.636 | 0.549 | 0.533 | 0.465 | 0.578 |
| 2069 | 187.6 | 212.7 | 309.1 | 130.3 | 19103 | 15611 | 15091 | 12744 | 16750 | 0.643 | 0.555 | 0.540 | 0.470 | 0.585 |
| 2070 | 190.1 | 215.4 | 313.2 | 132.0 | 19445 | 15945 | 15391 | 12929 | 17125 | 0.652 | 0.562 | 0.548 | 0.477 | 0.592 |
| 2071 | 192.5 | 218.1 | 315.8 | 133.6 | 19738 | 16190 | 15604 | 13106 | 17366 | 0.660 | 0.569 | 0.554 | 0.484 | 0.600 |
| 2072 | 194.9 | 221.1 | 320.8 | 135.4 | 20095 | 16425 | 15858 | 13342 | 17618 | 0.670 | 0.574 | 0.559 | 0.490 | 0.607 |
| 2073 | 197.7 | 224.2 | 324.5 | 137.3 | 20390 | 16633 | 16071 | 13503 | 17873 | 0.676 | 0.582 | 0.567 | 0.496 | 0.613 |
| 2074 | 200.3 | 227.1 | 328.9 | 139.1 | 20736 | 16897 | 16304 | 13655 | 18129 | 0.684 | 0.589 | 0.574 | 0.500 | 0.620 |
| 2075 | 203.5 | 230.2 | 332.2 | 141.2 | 20951 | 17133 | 16507 | 13832 | 18400 | 0.693 | 0.594 | 0.580 | 0.505 | 0.627 |
| 2076 | 205.2 | 232.9 | 337.5 | 142.6 | 21277 | 17331 | 16727 | 14019 | 18625 | 0.703 | 0.599 | 0.585 | 0.510 | 0.635 |
| 2077 | 207.9 | 235.6 | 341.1 | 144.5 | 21565 | 17553 | 16932 | 14233 | 18899 | 0.714 | 0.606 | 0.591 | 0.515 | 0.642 |
| 2078 | 210.7 | 238.4 | 345.6 | 146.4 | 21866 | 17805 | 17177 | 14384 | 19139 | 0.723 | 0.611 | 0.596 | 0.519 | 0.646 |
| 2079 | 213.8 | 242.1 | 349.9 | 148.5 | 22144 | 18038 | 17405 | 14558 | 19415 | 0.732 | 0.617 | 0.602 | 0.524 | 0.653 |
| 2080 | 216.3 | 244.9 | 353.8 | 150.4 | 22436 | 18270 | 17626 | 14742 | 19656 | 0.740 | 0.624 | 0.608 | 0.530 | 0.661 |

Table 6. Input file for the updated rebuilding analysis. Note that these inputs for fishery selectivity and weight-at-age, numbers-at-age in 2000 and 2004, and the steepness value are superceded by values read from the MCMC.prj file.

```
#Title
Canary
# Number of sexes
2
# Age range to consider (minimum age; maximum age)
0 40
# Number of fleets
3
# First year of projection
2004
# Year declared overfished
2000
# Is the maximum age a plus-group (1=Yes;2=No)
1
# Generate future recruitments using historical recruitments (1) historical
recruits/spawner (2) or a stock-recruitment (3)
3
# Constant fishing mortality (1) or constant Catch (2) projections
1
# Fishing mortality based on SPR (1) or actual rate (2)
1
# Pre-specify the year of recovery (or -1) to ignore
-1
# Fecundity-at-age
#
3.80E-05 3.80E-05 3.80E-05 0.000162861 0.00184254 0.0120233
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
0.0506613 & 0.147419 & 0.318907 & 0.553672 & 0.822968 \\
1.09879 & 1.36261 & 1.60522 & 1.82361 & 2.018 & 2.19001
\end{tabular}
    2.34176 2.47539 2.59291 2.69616 2.78678
    2.86625 2.93589 2.99684 3.05017 3.09678 3.1375
    3.17306 3.20408 3.23114 
    3.30881 3.32239 3.33422 3.34452 3.35348
    3.36128 3.36806
# Age specific information (Females then males) weight selectivity
# female wt and selex fleet 1=trawl
```



```
    1.843}22.001 2.148 2.285 2.41 2.523 2.626 2.718 2.801 2.875 2.941
    lllllllllllll
    3.323}30.335 3.345 3.355 3.363 3.37 3.376
0
    0.7803 0.7994 0.8073 0.809 0.8073 0.804 0.7998 0.7954 0.7909 0.78650.7824
```




| 7.03892 | 6.22943 | 3.45345 | 3.62153 | 2.95653 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2.21107 | 1.80929 | 1.0775 | 0.695287 | 0.579594 | 0.593405 |
| 0.51975 | 0.363393 | 0.266072 | 0.223315 | 0.212382 |  |
| 0.219973 | 0.23307 | 2.03463 |  |  |  |

\# Year for Tmin Age-structure 2000
\# Number of simulations
6000
\# recruitment and biomass
\# Number of historical assessment years
90
\# Historical data
\# year recruitment spawner in B0 in R project in R/S project

| 1915 | 4760 | 34921 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1916 | 4760 | 34921 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1917 | 4744 | 34698 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1918 | 4720 | 34370 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1919 | 4696 | 34034 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1920 | 4680 | 33820 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1921 | 4664 | 33606 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1922 | 4651 | 33437 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1923 | 4641 | 33294 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1924 | 4628 | 33130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1925 | 4617 | 32988 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1926 | 4605 | 32824 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1927 | 4587 | 32590 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1928 | 4573 | 32407 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1929 | 4559 | 32228 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1930 | 4547 | 32066 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1931 | 4531 | 31865 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1932 | 4516 | 31671 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1933 | 4506 | 31547 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1934 | 4499 | 31459 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1935 | 4493 | 31380 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1936 | 4486 | 31291 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1937 | 4479 | 31209 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1938 | 4473 | 31138 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1939 | 4469 | 31090 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1940 | 4467 | 31053 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1941 | 4461 | 30982 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1942 | 4454 | 30891 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1943 | 4449 | 30832 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1944 | 4420 | 30476 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1945 | 4369 | 29856 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1946 | 4253 | 28492 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1947 | 4181 | 27668 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| 1948 | 4142 | 27223 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1949 | 4115 | 26922 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1950 | 4088 | 26634 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1951 | 4051 | 26226 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1952 | 3213 | 25829 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1953 | 3211 | 25456 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1954 | 3259 | 25128 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1955 | 3356 | 24732 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1956 | 3519 | 24333 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1957 | 3760 | 23911 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1958 | 4061 | 23266 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1959 | 4359 | 22592 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1960 | 4393 | 21968 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1961 | 3904 | 21314 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1962 | 3237 | 20768 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1963 | 2732 | 20207 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1964 | 2493 | 19704 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1965 | 2556 | 19472 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1966 | 2969 | 19206 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1967 | 3563 | 18322 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1968 | 3353 | 18103 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1969 | 2642 | 17760 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1970 | 2503 | 17700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1971 | 3009 | 17587 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1972 | 3871 | 17401 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1973 | 3600 | 17113 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1974 | 3646 | 16446 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1975 | 3343 | 16046 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1976 | 2339 | 15655 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1977 | 3052 | 15420 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1978 | 2494 | 14993 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1979 | 1236 | 14192 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1980 | 2636 | 13313 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1981 | 2527 | 12248 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1982 | 1268 | 11498 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1983 | 2135 | 9989 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1984 | 2722 | 8670 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1985 | 876 | 8332 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1986 | 1426 | 7843 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1987 | 1350 | 7488 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1988 | 1667 | 6715 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1989 | 1276 | 6078 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1990 | 1097 | 5209 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1991 | 1245 | 4547 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1992 | 626 | 3684 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1993 | 846 | 2954 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



```
# Produce the risk-reward plots (1=Yes)
0
# Calculate coefficients of variation (1=Yes)
0
# Number of replicates to use
1
# Random number seed
-89102
# Conduct projections for multiple starting values ( }0=\textrm{No}\mathrm{ ;else yes)
1
# File with multiple parameter vectors
MCMC.PRJ
# Number of parameter vectors
1000
# User-specific projection (1=Yes); Output replaced (1->6)
1 9 0 0.5
# Catches and Fs (Year; 1/2/3 (F or C or SPR); value); Final row is -1
2007 3 . }88
-1 -1 -1
# Split of Fs (2004 0.27 0.05 2.1)
2004 . }112\mathrm{ . 021 . }86
-1
# Time varying weight-at-age (1=Yes;0=No)
0
# File with time series of weight-at-age data
HakWght.Csv
```



Figure 1. Estimated time series of spawning stock biomass from base model (Diff) and alternative model (NoDiff).


Figure 2. Estimated time series of recruitment from base model (Diff) and alternative model (NoDiff).


Figure 3. Spawner-recruitment relationship.


Figure 4. Alternative rebuilding scenarios.



Figure 5. Catch and spawning biomass for $\mathrm{F}=0$ and 4 alternative harvest strategies.

