

Preliminary for STAR Panel: Assessment of Pacific mackerel *(Scomber japonicus)* for 2023-24 and 2024-25

Peter T. Kuriyama, Juan P. Zwolinski, Caitlin Allen Akselrud, Kevin T. Hill

Southwest Fisheries Science Center Fisheries Resources Division 8901 La Jolla Shores Dr. La Jolla, CA 92037, USA

U.S. Department of Commerce | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | National Marine Fisheries Service

Stock structure

- Range from SE Alaska to Banderas Bay Mexico
- Three hypothesized spawning areas
 - Gulf of California
 - Cabo San Lucas, Mexico
 - Punta Abreojos, BCS
 - Extends north off southern California
 - Focus of US management





Distributions

- Seasonal movements
 - Northward in late spring/summer
 - Upwelling off OR and WA
 - Southward late fall/winter
 - Spawning in southern CA
 - Usually observed within 30 km off coast
 - Have been found up to 400 km offshore
 - School with other CPS





Biological characteristics

- Recruitment
 - Cyclical periods of abundance
 - Less frequent highs than other CPS
 - High biomass once every 60 years
 - MacCall et al. 1985
- Natural mortality (M)
 - Past assessments assume 0.5 yr⁻¹
 - Time-invariant, constant by age
 - 0.3-0.7 (Beverton 1963)



1978 CalCOFI larvae



Previous assessment

- Crone et al. (2019)
 - 2008-2019
 - One fishery, AT survey index and age compositions
- No AT survey age compositions
 - Used fishery age-length key to generate survey age comps.
- Fixed steepness, recruitment variability (sigmaR)
- Q estimated, time-invariant
- M estimated with prior
- Empirical weight-at-age



US Fishery Harvest limits and landings

- Fishing year
 - July 1-June 30
 - Model year
- Table 2 in assessment document

Model Year	OFL	ABC	ACL	HG	USA-TOT	PercHG
2008	NA	NA	40,000	NA	4,543	11%
2009	NA	NA	10,000	NA	$3,\!607$	36%
2010	NA	NA	11,000	NA	2,313	21%
2011	44,336	42,375	40,514	30,386	2,074	7%
2012	44,336	$42,\!375$	40,514	30,386	$5,\!608$	18%
2013	57,316	52,358	52,358	39,268	11,909	30%
2014	32,992	30,138	29,170	24,170	$5,\!593$	23%
2015	25,291	23,104	21,469	20,469	4,686	23%
2016	24,983	22,822	21,161	20,161	2,757	14%
2017	30,115	27,510	26,293	25,293	1,808	7%
2018	$27,\!662$	25,269	$23,\!840$	22,840	2,501	11%
2019	14,931	13,169	11,109	10,109	3,916	39%
2020	11,772	10,289	7,950	6,950	691	10%
2021	$12,\!145$	9,446	8,323	7,323	1,007	14%
2022	9,644	7,501	5,822	4,822	990	21%



Assessment configuration

- Annual time steps
 - Model year 2015
 - July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016
- Two fleets
 - Fishery
 - Mexico, California, Oregon, Washington
 - Acoustic-trawl (AT) survey
- 2008-2021 model period
 - Matches timeline of AT observations for AT survey data
 - 2022 AT survey value not finalized



Data in this assessment

- Catch
 - Fishery
- Age compositions (and weight-at-age data)
 - AT survey
 - Fishery
- Index of abundance
 - AT survey



Catch time series

- Mexico
 - Baja California (BC)
 - Baja California Sur (BCS)
- USA
 - California (CA)
 - California recreational (CA-REC)
 - Oregon (OR)
 - Washington (WA)
- Shown back to 1999





Catch time series



Age compositions

N adj.=35

6 8







Ageing error





Weight-at-age (by cohort)

- Filled values have white circle
- Sample sizes
 - Numbers of fish in bottom right of each panel



Biological characteristics

- Maturity
 - Age0 = 0.12
 - Age1 = 0.49
 - Age2 = 0.87
 - Age3 =0.98
 - Age4+ = 1
- From spring cruises in 2010 to 2021 (calendar year)



AT survey age compositions

1707

Length Comps -> Cruise-specific A-L Keys -> Age Comps



1607









Fork Length (mm)



Slight changes to index of abundance

- Prior AT survey biomass used S. African jack mackerel length-weight relationship
 - Due to unknown target strength of US P. mack.
- Recalculated with length-weight relationship from Palance et al. (2019)
 - CVs assumed to be the same
- Updated values (blue-2023 benchmark) slightly higher than 2019
- 2015 value dropped because of echogram reanalysis
- 2022 will not be usable



Index of abundance





Index of abundance



• Time-varying Q

• If Q constant

• 2012; ~100,000mt

Index

Log index of abundance



NOAA FISHERIES

Summer 2021 cruise (Stierhoff et al. 2023)







Summer 2021 catchability (Q)



- 2021 published values
 - US total biomass = 7,796mt
 - Core = 6,289mt; nearshore=1,507 mt
 - Mexico total biomass=14,202 mt
 - Total biomass =21,998mt
- Q in US waters = 7,796 / 21,998
 - 0.354
- 2021 updated values
 - Forthcoming



Model configuration details

<u>Time period</u>
Fisheries
Surveys
<u>Natural mortality (M)</u>
Growth
<u>Spawner-recruit relationship</u>
Equilbrium recruitment (R0)
Steepness (h)
Total Recruitment variability (sigmaR)
SR regime offset
Catchability
<u>Selectivity (age-based)</u>
<u>Fishery selectivity</u>
Form
Time-varying
AT survey selectivity
Form
Time-varying
Data weighting

2008-2021 1, AT Estimated (new Hamel prior) Fixed (WAA) **Beverton-Holt** Estimated Fixed (0.75)Fixed (0.75)Estimated Time-varying; fixed in 2021 Random walk (option 17) Yes; 2DAR option Asymptotic No

No

• Age-specific M (Lorenzen-age from 0-8+)

• 2021 Q value

- Most anchovy biomass in US waters from summer 2021 cruise
- Time-varying Q
 - 2008-2012
 - 2013-2015
 - 2016-2019
 - No survey 2020



Natural mortality (*M*)

- Hamel and Cope (2022)
- Assumed maximum age of 8 (plus group)
 - Data not used in this model have age-14 mackerel caught in 1998
- No recent estimates of growth from data not used in this assessment
- Lognormal prior with mean = 5.40 / 8 (assumed age) = 0.675
 - SD of 0.31



Forecast file catch settings

- Catch for model year 2022 is 16,000mt (actual value)
- 2023, 2024 used average of catch from 2019-2022
 - 20,366 mt



Model results

Parameter	NatM_Lorenzen_averageFem_GP_1	0.784							
	$SR_{LN(R0)}$	13.331							
SR_BH_steep SR_sigmaR SR_regime_BLK3repl_2007 LnQ_base_AT(2)		0.75	 2015 index value due to 						0
		0.75							-
		-0.305	reanalyzed echogram						
		-1.03							
	$LnQ_base_AT(2)_BLK4repl_2008$	-0.57							
•	$LnQ_base_AT(2)_BLK4repl_2013$	-2.765							
	$LnQ_base_AT(2)_BLK4repl_2016$	-0.698			Т				
Biomass (mt	2020 Age1+	54,025	ΙT						
	2021 Age1 +	40,024							
		Log index 9 10 I I							
		ω -	-		\bot	1 T			
		~ -	-			Ĭ			
		- O	<u> </u>	I	I		I		1
			2008	2010	2012	2014	2016	2018	2020

Year

Age-specific M (average estimate = 0.784)



AA

RIES

Time-varying Q





AA RIES

Age selectivities



IES

Population numbers at age





Fits to age compositions (fishery)



L S

Residuals from fishery age comp. fits





Page 31 Preliminary results presented to STAR panel



Age (yr)

Residuals from AT survey age comp. fits





SR relationship



Rec Devs





Spawning stock biomass time series





Recruitment time series



Age-0+ and age-1+ biomass





F time series



AA :RIES

Historical analysis





Likelihood profile for steepness (h)

- M estimated
- 2021 age-1+ biomass estimates (mt)
 - h=0.25; 39,539
 - h=0.5; 39,903
 - h=0.7; 39,986
 - h=1.0; 40,215



Likelihood profile for Q

- Profile over 2021 fixed Q value
- 2021 Q value
- 2021 biomass estimates (mt)
 - Q=0.1; 115,519
 - Q=0.3; 46,534
 - Q=0.6; 25,490
 - Q=1.0; 16,661



Likelihood profile for *M* (with estimated *h*)

- *M* is average value from age-specific curve
- 2021 age-1+ biomass estimates (mt)
 - M=0.3; 54,045
 - M=0.5; 49,542
 - M=0.8; 42,495
 - M=1.0; 42,044
- Steepness estimates at 1



Sensitivity to Francis reweighting

- 2021 age-1+ biomass estimates (mt)
 - Base; 40,024
 - Francis; 43,962



Sensitivity to downweighting

- lambda = 0.5
- 2021 age-1+ biomass estimates (mt)
 - Base; 40,024
 - Fishery down; 38,207
 - AT down; 41,439



Retrospective pattern

- Expected to have a strong retrospective pattern
- Time-varying Q
- Drop 2021 data
 - Q fixed for 2021, data unavailable to fix Q 2020



Model uncertainties

- Forecast for 2022 and 2023 model years
 - Catch and compositions available for 2022 but no AT index
- Movement and US/Mexico distributions
 - Q is fixed for 2021, year with data
- AT age compositions
 - Time-varying age-0 selectivity (as done in sardine and anchovy assessments) resulted in M estimates high (above 1)
 - Biologically, mackerel probably do not have M greater than anchovy
- Nearshore does not seem to be major uncertainty