# 2025 Re-evaluation of the recruits-per-spawner and CalCOFI SST relationship in Pacific sardine

Presentation for the PFMC SSC CPS subcommittee February 26, 2025

Caitlin I. Allen Akselrud, Alexander J. Jensen, and Kevin T. Hill NOAA - NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center



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

# Background: 2013 workshop

- Explored many model and data configurations and options
- Selected a GAM to assess the relationship between recruits-per-spawner and sea-surface temperature (SST)
- Spawners were represented by age 2+ biomass
- Spawner and recruit data were assembled from stock assessments 1984-2008
- The index of SST comes from CalCOFI quarterly survey estimates



# Context

- The purpose of this analysis is to assess the relationship between recruits-per-spawner and the CalCOFI SST
- Use the best selected models from the 2013 workshop and apply the same method with updated data sets for biomass, recruitment, and CalCOFI SST



# Data: biomass and recruits

- Recruits/spawner data for 1984-2004 were appended with the most recent stock assessment estimates of age 2+ biomass and recruits from 2005-2023 (Kuriyama et al, 2024)
- Two recruits/spawner time series:
  - one time series patching together the 1984-2023 data
  - one with only the most recent stock assessment data from 2005-2023.



# Data: sea-surface temperature (SST)

- Reported workshop values slightly different from [current] standard generation methods
- Replaced workshop SST with reported SST from recent stock assessments and values generated consistent with the current method (Ed Weber)



# GAM models

- Fitting to a log(recruits/spawner)
- Three GAM types:
  - Configuration L SST as a linear covariate:

 $\alpha + s(S_y, k = 3) + \beta T_y + \varepsilon_y$ 

- Configuration G (consistent with the model chosen in the 2013 workshop) – smoothed SST (non-linear covariate):  $\alpha + s(S_v, k = 3) + s(T_v, k=3) + \varepsilon_v$ .
- Configuration B no SST covariate:  $\alpha + s(S_y, k = 3) + \varepsilon_y$ .



### Results

Analysis	Time series	GAM type	GAM	Ν	Resid. DF	EDF of SST	AIC	R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	Squared Pearson corr. (R <sup>2</sup> )
New	1984-2023	В	no SST covariate	40	38	0	122.2	0.11	0.13
New	1984-2023	G	smooth SST covariate	40	35.5	1.89	106	0.44	0.49
New	1984-2023	L	linear SST covariate	40	36.69	1	112.7	0.32	0.36
New	2005-2023	В	no SST covariate	19	17	0	66.49	-0.04	0.02
New	2005-2023	G	smooth SST covariate	19	15.33	1.67	63.42	0.18	0.3
New	2005-2023	L	linear SST covariate	19	16	1	65.18	0.07	0.17
Workshop	1984-2008	G	smooth SST covariate	25	21.73	1.27	44.49	0.741	0.762
Workshop	1984-2008	L	linear SST covariate	25	22	0	44.68	0.731	0.762



#### Results Extended time series (1984-2023)



# GAM L, recruit/spawner

GAM G, recruit/spawner

s(biomass (mt))



#### Short time series (2005-2023)



GAM G, recruit/spawner



biomass (mt)

#### GAM G, recruit/spawner

400

biomass (mt)

600

800

200

GAM L, recruit/spawner



**NOAA** FISHERIES

# GAM G, recruit/spawner GAM

# Conclusion

The best fitting model is still the GAM with CalCOFI SST as a smoothed covariate (model G) for the extended time series (1984-2023).

The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> shows a decrease in the amount of variance explained in recruits/spawner by CalCOFI SST compared with the workshop findings.

The recent time series (2005-2023), which uses biomass and recruits generated in a consistent manner from the 2024 benchmark assessment, shows a much lower R<sup>2</sup> than the extended time series. However, AIC still suggests this is better than no SST covariate.



# Questions or discussion

