Agenda Item F.2.a NMFS Report March 2017

A decade on: re-evaluating oceanographic drivers of California Current sablefish recruitment



Tolimieri N, Haltuch MA, Qi L, Jacox M, & Bograd S



US GLOBEC: The horizontal-advection bottom-up forcing paradigm

 Large-scale climate forcing drives regional changes in alongshore and cross-shelf ocean transport, directly impacting the transport of nutrients, water masses, and organisms.



US GLOBEC: The horizontal-advection bottom-up forcing paradigm

•Framework through which climate variability and change alter sea surface height (SSH), zooplankton community structure, and sablefish recruitment



Northern California Current System

SSH - Sablefish recruitment:

2011 Stock Assessment

- ~35-40% of the variance in recruitment explained
- Continuing validation
 - Bootstrap, jackknife, and removal of recent values (Schirripa and Colbert 2006, Schirripa 2007)
 - Randomization tests (Stewart et al., 2011)
- Modeled as a survey index of recruitment
 - ~ 1970 present
 - Uncertainty
 - Missing years of data



SSH - Sablefish recruitment:

2011 Stock Assessment

 ~35-40% of the variance in recruitment explained

Problem:

 Need to explain > 50% of the recruitment variability to potentially be useful in stock assessment (Basson et al 1999)

<u>Goal</u>

- To improve upon the existing sea levelrecruitment relationship
 - Index with higher r²



Oceanographic drivers of sablefish recruitment

Conceptual life-history Make hypotheses Fit a bunch of models (glms) Log(recruits) = Intercept + various predictors Model selection with AICc Model testing

Literature search

Oceanographic drivers of sablefish recruitment

Conceptual life-history Make hypotheses Fit a bunch of models (glms) Log(recruits) = Intercept + various predictors Model selection with AICc Model testing

Make stage specific & spatially specific hypotheses

- Do not use generalized climate indices like NOI or PDO
- Use ROMS output for oceanic drivers
- Include some biological drivers
 - Predator and prey density
- Include Sea surface height (SSH)
- Spawning stock biomass (SSB)
 MORE LATER...

Oceanographic drivers of sablefish recruitment

Conceptual life-history Make hypotheses Fit a bunch of models (glms) Log(recruits) = Intercept + various predictors Model selection with AICc Model testing

Models

Basic glms

- Identity link
- Normal distribution
- Min predictors = 0
- Max predictors = 5

Conceptual life-history model:

Preconditioning to benthic juveniles

Lat: 40-50 °N Years: 1980-2010

| Life-history stage | Time period | Depth | Sablefish location | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Preconditioning | Jun - Dec (Yr 0) | 50-1200m with highest occurrence between 150 - 400 m | Bottom | |
| Spawning | Dec (Yr 0)- Mar (Yr 1) | 300-500 m | Bottom | |
| Eggs | Jan-Apr | 300-825 m with highest occurrence between 240 and 480 m, may rise has high as 200-300 m | Open water | |
| Early Development | Feb-May | 1000-1200 m | Open water | |
| Larvae (start feeding) | Feb-May | Surface waters | Open water | |
| Pelagic juveniles | Apr-Nov | Surface waters | Open water | |
| Benthic Juvenile (Age-0) | Aug-Nov | 0 - 250 m | Bottom | |

Conceptual life-history model:

Preconditioning to benthic juveniles

| Life-history stage | Time period | Depth | Sablefish location |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Preconditioning | Jun - Dec (Yr 0) | 50-1200m with highest occurre between 150 - 400 | nce Bottom m |
| Spawning | Dec (Yr 0)- Mar (Yr 1) | 300-500 m | Bottom |
| Eggs | Look at | one stage | nce 0 m, Open water 0-300 |
| Early Development | | | Open water |
| Larvae (start feeding) | | | Open water |
| Pelagic juveniles | Apr-Nov | Surface waters | Open water |
| Benthic Juvenile (Age-0) | Aug-Nov | 0 - 250 m | Bottom |

| Cor Prece | Ceptual life-his Donditioning to benthic j | tory mod uveniles | el: | Lat: Years: | 40-50 °N 1980-2010 |
|--------------|--|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | Life-history stage | Time period | Depth | | Sablefish location |
| | Pelagic juveniles | Apr-Nov | Surface wa | ters | Open water |

| Hypothesis | Covariates | Depth extent | Longitudinal extent | Data source |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| (H16) Transport to settlement habitat affects recruitment | Net long-shore transport | Surface waters | 0-150 nautical nmi | ROMS |
| (H17) Transport to settlement habitat affects recruitment | Net cross-shelf transport | Surface waters | 0-150 nautical nmi | ROMS |
| (H18) Growth/Predation hypothesis: | | | | |
| Growth rate is faster in warm water leading to reduced time vulnerable to predators etc | Degree days | Surface waters | 0-150 nautical nmi | ROMS |

Models with $\Delta AICc < 6.0$

| Model | | | | | | | R ² | AICc | ΔAICc |
|---------|-----|--|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| Model 1 | SSB | CST_{egg} LST_{ed} | | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | | 0.63 | 77.38 | 0.00 |
| Model 2 | SSB | CST_{egg} LST_{ed} | | CST _{pjuv} LST _{bjuv} | | | 0.60 | 79.71 | 2.33 |
| Model 3 | SSB | | | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | | 0.53 | 81.33 | 3.94 |
| Model 4 | SSB | | | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | DD _{bjuv} | 0.57 | 82.07 | 4.69 |
| Model 5 | SSB | CST_{egg} LST_{ed} | | CST _{pjuv} | CST _{bjuv} | 7 | 0.57 | 82.15 | 4.76 |
| Model 6 | SSB | | DD _{larv} | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | | 0.56 | 82.95 | 5.56 |
| Model 7 | SSB | CST_{egg} LST_{ed} | | CST _{pjuv} | | | 0.50 | 83.11 | 5.72 |
| Model 8 | SSB | | | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | | 0.44 | 83.35 | 5.97 |

One best-fit model

| Model | | | | | R ² | AICc | ΔΑΙCc |
|---------|-----|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-------|
| Model 1 | SSB | CST_{egg} LST_{ed} | CST _{pjuv} | LST ² bjuv | 0.63 | 77.38 | 0.00 |

One model with $\triangle AICc < 2.0$ $r^2 = 0.63$

SSB

Cross-shelf transport – egg stage

500 m off shore to 170 nmi 300-825 m

Long-shelf transport – early development 1000 m off shore to 170 nmi 1000 – 1200 m

Cross-shelf transport – pelagic juvenile stage surface waters out to 150 nmi

Long-shore transport – benthic juveniles (^2)

bottom 0-250 m

Partial residual plots

 $\text{Residuals} + \hat{\beta}_i X_i \text{ versus } X_i$



LST - ben juv (m/s)

Multicolinearity among predictor variables?

| | SSB | | LST _{early dev} | CST _{pel juv} | VIF | VIF = variance inflation factor |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|------------------------|------|------------------------------------|
| SSB | | | | | 2.48 | < 1: low |
| CST _{egg} | -0.60 | | | | 1.92 | 1-5: moderate > 5: large |
| LST _{early} dev | -0.07 | -0.29 | | | 1.23 | |
| CST _{pel juv} | -0.11 | 0.14 | -0.11 | | 1.03 | |
| LST _{ben juv} | -0.69 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.64 | |

Ok, but a little high

Covariates in the best-fit model



SSB, CST_{egg} & LST_{bjuv} show long-term trends (to varying extents)

Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment SD by year from stock assessment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment SD by year from stock assessment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

5-covariates r² = 0.15 (95% CI: 0.03 – 0.38

Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment SD by year from stock assessment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

5-covariates r² = 0.15 95% CI: 0.03 – 0.38

Median $r^2 = 0.67$ 95% CI: 0.42 - 0.84

Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment SD by year from stock assessment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

5-covariates r² = 0.15 95% CI: 0.03 – 0.38

Median r² = 0.67 95% CI: 0.42 - 0.84

Median $r^2 = 0.63$ 95% CI = 0.59 - 0.70

Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment SD by year from stock assessment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)



Without 2007 data get different model

| Covariates | | | | | | R2 | AICc | ΔΑΙCc |
|------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----|------------------|------|-------|-------|
| SSB | | | CSTlarvae | SSH | | 0.56 | 71.35 | 0.00 |
| SSB | | | CSTlarvae | | SSH ² | 0.56 | 71.57 | 0.22 |
| SSB | | CST_{eggs} | CST _{larvae} | SSH | | 0.59 | 72.48 | 1.13 |
| SSB | | CST_{eggs} | CST _{larvae} | | SSH ² | 0.59 | 72.89 | 1.54 |
| SSB | MLD _{sd} | | CST _{larvae} | SSH | | 0.58 | 73.18 | 1.83 |

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time (n = 30)
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

Removing 2007 results in a different best-fit model

5 models with $\Delta AICc < 2.0$

$$CST_{larvae} \& SSH$$

replace
 $CST_{eggs}, LST_{edev},$
 CST_{pjuv}, LST_{bjuv}
 $r^2 = 0.56$

| Std Coefs | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| SSB | = 0.422 | | | |
| CST _{larvae} | = 0.476 | | | |
| SSH | = -0.358 | | | |

CST_{larvae} (Feb – May) overlaps CST_{pjuv} (Apr – Nov)

Perhaps CST in April-May CST is important?

SSH correlated with CST_{pjuv} (r = 0.56)

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)



Best-fit model

- Resample w/replacement individual recruitment values to estimate expected r² values for randomized data (1000 reps)
- (2) Bootstrapping to estimate bias and calculate standard error of the parameter estimates (1000 reps)
- (3) Jackknife resampling to determine effect of any single year
- (4) Resampled the recruitment values for each year (1000 reps)
 - a) Log-normal distribution
 - b) Mean = value for that year
 - c) Recruitment

<u>Whole model fitting process – do we get</u> the same model?

- (5) Rerun excluding one year each time
- (6) Re-sampled the sablefish recruitments with error (as in Step 4 above) and compared top models from each run (100 reps)

100 refits

- 93 out of 100 cases top model was the same
- In 7 cases, DD_{bjuv} replaced LST_{early dev}

Update with 2011 – 2014 data?

→ We used data for 1980 - 2010

→ 2011 – 2014 data are available from a different ROMS model

Refit best-fit model from 1980-2010 With 1980 - 2014

Update with 2011 – 2014 data?

→ We used data for 1980 – 2010

→ 2011 – 2014 data are available from a different ROMS model

Refit best-fit model from 1980-2010 With 1980 - 2014

 $r^2 = 0.49$

Update with 2011 – 2014 data?

- → We used data for 1980 2010
- → 2011 2014 data are available from a different ROMS model

Inconsistencies between the two models:

- Inputs from different products
 - Surface forcing (heat flux, wind)
 - Ocean boundary conditions
- For variables that are well observed confident that the two models are consistent
 - SST, SSH, MLD
- But not possible to validate many of our predictors between models
- New time series are short

So What's Next?

- What to do about physical time series
 - Single reconstruction as far back as possible and which can be updated into the future
- Short term forecasting applications for management advice.
 - Leading indicator dependent on forecasting important covariates: JSCOPE?
- Go back in time what could recruitment have looked like?
 - Recruitment hind-casting.
- MSE can be used to evaluate the robustness of control rules to potential long term trends in recruitment-climate relationships