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#### Abstract

Two delta-lognormal indices were constructed for the SEDAR9 vermilion snapper data workshop (New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2005). One index used species composition to subset catch and effort data to exclude trips outside of vermilion snapper habitat. The second index was constructed using all offshore, charter boat and private boat hook and line trips that took place off Alabama and Florida. The indices were constructed using Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) data. The indices are quite similar. Both indicate declining catch rates during the 1990s. Catch rates remain at low levels from 1997-2004.


## INTRODUCTION

This document describes the construction of catch rate indices for the recreational fishery for vermilion snapper in the eastern U.S. Gulf of Mexico. These indices were constructed for the SEDAR9 vermilion snapper data workshop (New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2005). They are intended to be considered for use during formal assessment procedures.

## METHODS

## Data Sources

NOAA Fisheries initiated the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) in 1979 in order to obtain standardized estimates of participation, effort, and catch by recreational fishermen in U.S. marine waters. MRFSS data is collected using two approaches: a telephone survey of households in coastal counties, and dockside interviews of fishermen (intercept survey). MRFSS intercept data was used for the construction of catch rate indices.

MRFSS intercept survey sampling coverage has varied over the time series. Initially, the survey covered shore fishing, as well as charter boat (CB), headboat (HB) and private boat (PB) fishing modes in all Gulf States. During 1982-1984, MRFSS discontinued sampling boat modes in Texas. This program was turned over to the Texas Park and Wildlife Department (TPWD) which began sampling Texas boat modes in the summer of 1983. Headboat sampling gulf wide was transferred to the NOAA Fisheries Headboat Survey (HBS) program in 1986. TPWD
continued to survey bay headboats until July, 1991. Vermilion snapper are seldom reported in shore modes, or inshore areas, or before 1986. In addition, vermilion snapper are rarely reported on trips that fished off LA and TX. Therefore, trips used during index construction were restricted to private boats and head boats fishing with hook and line gear off AL and FL during 1986-2004.

Effort and catch are estimated by "leader" for each MRFSS fishing trip (there may be several leaders on a single trip). Inclusion of trips that did not fish within the habitat of the species of interest (vermilion snapper) can contaminate CPUE indices (Stephens and McCall, 2004). In the absence of direct information useful to infer targeting (e.g. depth of fishing, finescale fishing location, gear configuration), we used an objective approach recently developed by Stephens and McCall (2004) to subset leader records using species composition. A brief summary of the methodology follows:

First, the species composition from catch records was used to estimate the parameters of a logistic regression. For example, let $Y_{j}$ be a categorical variable describing the presence/absence of the non-target species for trip j . Similarly, let $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ describe the presence/absence of vermilion snapper.

$$
Y_{j}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if the target species is caught } \\ 0 & \text { if the target species is not caught }\end{cases}
$$

Then a logistic regression was applied to estimate the probability that vermilion snapper would have been encountered by a leader. Using the regression results, a score $\left(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)$ was assigned to each leader j as a function of the species encountered by that leader:

$$
S_{j}=\exp \sum_{i=0}^{k} x_{i j} \beta_{i}
$$

where the coefficients $\beta_{1}, \beta_{2}, \ldots \beta_{\mathrm{k}}$ quantify the predictive effect of each species and $\beta_{0}$ is the intercept of the logistic regression.

This score was then converted into the probability of observing vermilion snapper given the vector of presence/absence of the other species observed by the leader (j).
$\pi_{j}=\operatorname{Pr}\left\{Y_{j}=1\right\}=\frac{S_{j}}{1+S_{j}}$
Given the coefficients $\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{\mathrm{k}}$ and the presence/absence indicators $\mathrm{x}_{1 \mathrm{j}}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{kj}}$, the log-likelihood (excluding constants independent of the parameters) is the sum:

$$
L\left\{Y \mid \beta_{0}, \ldots, \beta_{k}, x_{1 j}, \ldots, x_{k j}\right\} \quad=\sum_{j \in j+} \log \left(\pi_{j}\right)+\sum_{j \in j-} \log \left(1-\pi_{j}\right)
$$

where $\mathrm{j}+$ indicates leaders that observed vermilion snapper, and j - indicates leaders that did not observe vermilion snapper. The log-likelihood was maximized using the statistical package R (Ihaka and Gentleman, 1996). The estimated $\beta$ coefficients reflect the association (positive or negative) between the non-target species and vermilion snapper, $\pi_{j}$ is intended to estimate the probability that the party led by leader $j$ fished in the habitat of vermilion snapper.

Leader records were selected for CPUE analysis using a critical value. The critical value was determined by examining the relationship between the critical value and the number of incorrect predictions. Both false positives (vermilion snapper predicted to occur when absent) and false negatives (vermilion snapper not expected to occur when present) were considered. The critical value that minimized the number of incorrect predictions was selected. Leader records were included in the CPUE analysis if $\pi$ (as calculated above) was above the critical value.

## Index Development

For each index, the following factors were considered as possible influences on the proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper (proportion positive), and the catch rates reported by leader that observed vermilion snapper. The factor REC_SEASON (OPEN/CLOSED) is defined in Table 1.

| FACTOR | LEVELS | VALUES |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | 19 | 1986-2004 |
|  | 4 | WIN = (Dec-Feb) SPR = (Mar-May) <br> SUM = (Jun-Aug) AUT = (Sep-Nov) |
| SEASON | 2 | Charter (CB) and Private (PB) |
|  |  | Closed and Open |
| MODE | 2 | FL, AL |
|  | 2 |  |
| REC_SEASON |  |  |
| STATE | 2 |  |

A delta-lognormal approach (Lo et al., 1992) was used to develop the standardized catch rate indices. This method combines separate generalized linear modeling (GLM) analyses of the proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper ${ }^{1}$ and the catch rates under leaders that observed vermilion snapper ${ }^{2}$ to construct a single standardized index of abundance.
Parameterization of each model was accomplished using a GLM procedure (GENMOD; Version 8.02 of the SAS System for Windows © 2000. SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC, USA). For the lognormal models, the response variable, $\ln ($ CPUE $)$, was calculated:

$$
\log (C P U E)=\log [(A+B 1+B 2) /(\text { anglers } * \text { hours fished })]
$$

[^0]where $\mathrm{A}=$ fish observed, $\mathrm{B} 1=$ dead fish not observed and $\mathrm{B} 2=$ fish released alive. B 1 and B 2 catch, as well as effort (angler hours) were corrected for non-interviewed fishermen. When necessary, catch was rounded to the nearest whole number.

A forward stepwise approach was used during the construction of each GLM. First, the GLM model was fit on year. These results reflect the distribution of the nominal data. Next each potential factor was added to the null model individually, and the resulting reduction (\%RED) in deviance per degree of freedom (DEV/DF) was examined. The factor that caused the greatest reduction in deviance per degree of freedom was added to the base model if the factor was significant based upon a Chi-Square test (PROB $>$ CHISQ), and the reduction in deviance per degree of freedom was $\geq 1 \%$. This model then became the base model, and the process was repeated, adding factors and two-way interaction terms individually until no factor or interaction met the criteria for incorporation into the final model. Higher order interaction terms were not examined.

The final delta-lognormal models were fitted using a SAS macro, GLIMMIX (glmm800MaOB.sas: Russ Wolfinger, SAS Institute). All factors were modeled as fixed effects except two-way interaction terms containing YEAR (e.g. YEAR*STATE). These were modeled as random effects. To facilitate visual comparison, a relative index and relative nominal CPUE series were calculated by dividing each value in the series by the mean value of the series.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## Species Associated with Red Snapper

Coefficients of the logistic regression reflect the association (positive or negative) between the non-target species and vermilion snapper (Table 2 ). The results are generally as expected. For example, red snapper, porgies, amberjack and gray triggerfish are positively correlated to vermilion snapper while snook, spotted seatrout, yellowtail snapper and bluestriped grunt are negatively correlated.

## Species Composition Approach

4,480 leaders were identified for inclusion by the species composition approach. Of these, 2,788 observed vermilion snapper. The final models for the binomial on proportion positive and the lognormal on CPUE were:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PPT = YEAR + MODE } \\
& \text { LN(CPUE)= YEAR + REC_SEASON }
\end{aligned}
$$

The linear regression statistics are summarized in Table 3.
Between $40 \%$ and $69 \%$ of the leaders reported vermilion snapper each year, and there was no obvious annual trend (Fig. 1). Annual nominal CPUE (made relative by dividing each value by the series mean) was highest during 1986, and 1990-1995, then decreased rapidly and
remained depressed through 2004 (Fig. 2). The delta-lognormal index is very similar to the nominal CPUE series (Fig. 3). Index statistics are summarized in Table 4.

## All Pertinent Data Included

When all offshore charter boat and private boat trips that fished off AL and FL using hook and line gear were included (118,725 leaders, of these 4,500 observed vermilion snapper), the final models for the binomial on proportion positive trips and the lognormal on CPUE were:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PPT }=\text { YEAR }+ \text { MODE }+ \text { STATE }+ \text { SEASON }+ \text { YEAR*SEASON }+ \text { SEASON*STATE }+ \text { YEAR*STATE } \\
& \text { LN(CPUE })=\text { YEAR + REC_SEASON }
\end{aligned}
$$

The linear regression statistics are summarized in Table 5.
Overall, the results were very similar to the species composition approach, although the proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper was quite small, between $2 \%$ and $6 \%$ annually (Fig. 1). Proportions below $20 \%$ may violate the assumptions of the binomial model. Again, there was no obvious trend in the proportion of leaders that reported vermilion snapper. Like the species composition approach, annual nominal CPUE was highest during 1986, and 1990-1995, then decreased rapidly and remained depressed through 2004 (Fig. 2). The deltalognormal index is very similar to the nominal CPUE series (Fig. 4). Index statistics are summarized in Table 6. The delta-lognormal index constructed using all pertinent data has higher variance than the species composition approach (Figs. 3 and 4). This is due to the YEAR*SEASON and YEAR*STATE interaction terms which were modeled as random effects. Models containing interaction terms modeled as random effects typically have higher variance than those containing only fixed effects.
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Table 1. Red snapper recreational open season definitions.

| Year | Rec Season Open | Season length (days) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Before | Always Open | 365 |
| 1997 | Jan 1 - Nov 26 | 330 |
| 1998 | Jan 1 - Sep 29 | 272 |
| 1999 | Jan 1 - Aug 28 | 240 |
| 2000 | Apr 21 - Oct 31 | 194 |
| 2001 | Apr 21 - Oct 31 | 194 |
| 2002 | Apr 21 - Oct 31 | 194 |
| 2003 | Apr 21 - Oct 31 | 194 |
| 2004 | Apr 21 - Oct 31 | 194 |

Table 2. Association coefficients by species. Positive numbers indicate a positive correlation between a given species and vermilion snapper.

| Coefficient | Common Name | Scientific Name |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2.159 | red snapper | Lutjanus campechanus |
| 1.931 | red porgy | Pagrus pagrus |
| 1.702 | gray triggerfish | Balistes capriscus |
| 1.211 | tomtate | Haemulon aurolineatum |
| 1.000 | lane snapper | Lutjanus synagris |
| 0.686 | almaco jack | Seriola rivoliana |
| 0.670 | greater amberjack | Seriola dumerili |
| 0.546 | sand perch | Diplectrum formosum |
| 0.366 | little tunny | Euthynnus alletteratus |
| 0.308 | blackfin tuna | Thunnus atlanticus |
| 0.281 | scamp | Mycteroperca phenax |
| 0.272 | round scad | Decapterus punctatus |
| 0.220 | red grouper | Epinephelus morio |
| 0.208 | bluefish | Pomatomus saltatrix |
| 0.147 | black grouper | Mycteroperca bonaci |
| 0.120 | atlantic croaker | Micropogonias undulatus |
| 0.110 | gray snapper | Lutjanus griseus |
| 0.046 | pigfish | Orthopristis chrysoptera |
| 0.024 | cobia | Rachycentron canadum |
| -0.028 | pinfish | Lagodon rhomboides |
| -0.087 | dolphin | Coryphaena hippurus |
| -0.088 | cero | Scomberomorus regalis |
| -0.140 | gulf flounder | Paralichthys albigutta |
| -0.142 | inshore lizardfish | Synodus foetens |
| -0.150 | king mackerel | Scomberomorus cavalla |
| -0.205 | gag | Mycteroperca microlepis |
| -0.247 | hardhead catfish | Arius felis |
| -0.321 | blue runner | Caranx crysos |
| -0.343 | white grunt | Haemulon plumieri |
| -0.348 | great barracuda | Sphyraena barracuda |
| -0.356 | mutton snapper | Lutjanus analis |
| -0.358 | blacktip shark | Carcharhinus limbatus |
| -0.386 | scaled sardine | Harengula jaguana |
| -0.415 | sand seatrout | Cynoscion arenarius |
| -0.445 | gafftopsail catfish | Bagre marinus |
| -0.518 | spanish mackerel | Scomberomorus maculatus |
| -0.581 | crevalle jack | Caranx hippos |
| -0.633 | southern puffer | Sphoeroides nephelus |
| -0.689 | red drum | Sciaenops ocellata |
| -0.889 | sailfish | Istiophorus platypterus |
| -1.051 | stingray genus | Dasyatis spp. |
| -1.168 | yellowtail snapper | Ocyurus chrysurus |
| -1.214 | black sea bass | Centropristis striata |
| -1.299 | ladyfish | Elops saurus |
| -1.841 | bluestriped grunt | Haemulon sciurus |
| -2.045 | bonnethead | Sphyrna tiburo |
| -2.167 | southern kingfish | Menticirrhus americanus |
| -2.364 | sheepshead | Archosargus probatocephalus |
| -3.360 | spotted seatrout | Cynoscion nebulosus |
| -12.454 | common snook | Centropomus undecimalis |
|  |  |  |

Table 3. Linear regression statistics for the final GLM models on (A) proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper and (B) catch rates under leaders that observed vermilion snapper (Species Composition approach).
A)

LR Statistics For Type 3 Analysis

|  |  | Chi- |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | DF | \%RED DEV $/ D F$ | Square | Pr $>$ ChiSq |
| year | 18 | 1.70 | 142.63 | $<.0001$ |
| MODE | 1 | 2.01 | 118.42 | $<.0001$ |

B)

LR Statistics For Type 3 Analysis

|  |  |  | Chi- |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | DF | \%RED DEV/DF | Square | Pr $>$ ChiSq |
| year | 18 | 11.32 | 429.88 | $<.0001$ |
| REC_SEASON | 1 | 2.95 | 84.63 | $<.0001$ |

Table 4. Nominal CPUE, proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper and index results (SPECIES COMPOSITION METHOD).

| YEAR | Nominal <br> CPUE | Proportion <br> Positive | Obs | Rel. <br> Index | LCI | UCI | CV <br> Index |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1986 | 1.477 | 0.695 | 187 | 2.015 | 1.498 | 2.709 | 0.149 |
| 1987 | 1.013 | 0.611 | 95 | 1.024 | 0.650 | 1.612 | 0.230 |
| 1988 | 0.834 | 0.591 | 110 | 0.882 | 0.564 | 1.380 | 0.226 |
| 1989 | 0.766 | 0.400 | 90 | 0.622 | 0.329 | 1.178 | 0.328 |
| 1990 | 1.844 | 0.678 | 59 | 2.422 | 1.489 | 3.939 | 0.247 |
| 1991 | 1.458 | 0.752 | 109 | 1.489 | 1.045 | 2.123 | 0.179 |
| 1992 | 1.395 | 0.822 | 219 | 1.705 | 1.353 | 2.149 | 0.116 |
| 1993 | 1.612 | 0.757 | 136 | 1.903 | 1.395 | 2.595 | 0.156 |
| 1994 | 1.764 | 0.621 | 124 | 1.178 | 0.799 | 1.736 | 0.196 |
| 1995 | 1.768 | 0.761 | 67 | 1.726 | 1.124 | 2.651 | 0.217 |
| 1996 | 1.022 | 0.582 | 79 | 0.884 | 0.527 | 1.483 | 0.263 |
| 1997 | 0.426 | 0.655 | 142 | 0.475 | 0.316 | 0.715 | 0.206 |
| 1998 | 0.585 | 0.583 | 223 | 0.356 | 0.244 | 0.519 | 0.190 |
| 1999 | 0.609 | 0.642 | 377 | 0.406 | 0.310 | 0.532 | 0.136 |
| 2000 | 0.396 | 0.578 | 422 | 0.345 | 0.258 | 0.461 | 0.146 |
| 2001 | 0.518 | 0.589 | 411 | 0.374 | 0.283 | 0.495 | 0.140 |
| 2002 | 0.388 | 0.521 | 470 | 0.303 | 0.225 | 0.407 | 0.149 |
| 2003 | 0.470 | 0.584 | 449 | 0.373 | 0.285 | 0.488 | 0.135 |
| 2004 | 0.655 | 0.650 | 711 | 0.518 | 0.427 | 0.628 | 0.097 |

Table 5. Linear regression statistics for the final GLM models on (A) proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper and (B) catch rates under leaders that observed vermilion snapper (ALL DATA).

## A)

LR Statistics For Type 3 Analysis

| Source | DF | CRED DEV/DF | Chi- <br> Square | Pr $>$ ChiSq |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 18 | 0.91 | 280.30 | $<.0001$ |
| MODE | 1 | 17.73 | 6966.86 | $<.0001$ |
| STATE | 1 | 5.41 | 570.78 | $<.0001$ |
| SEASON | 3 | 2.12 | 156.70 | $<.0001$ |
| year*SEASON | 54 | 1.46 | 313.19 | $<.0001$ |
| SEASON*STATE | 3 | 1.25 | 302.20 | $<.0001$ |
| year*STATE | 18 | 1.02 | 290.83 | $<.0001$ |

B)

LR Statistics For Type 3 Analysis

| Source | DF | \%RED DEV/DF | Chi- |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Square | Pr > ChiSq |
| year | 18 | 13.63 | 754.15 | $<.0001$ |
| REC_SEASON | 1 | 1.68 | 77.06 | $<.0001$ |

Table 6. Nominal CPUE, proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper and index results (ALL DATA).

| YEAR | Nominal <br> CPUE | Proportion <br> Positive | Obs | Rel. <br> Index | LCI | UCI | CV <br> Index |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1986 | 1.902 | 0.047 | 4092 | 1.140 | 0.382 | 3.400 | 0.590 |
| 1987 | 0.683 | 0.026 | 5483 | 0.649 | 0.185 | 2.279 | 0.695 |
| 1988 | 0.777 | 0.029 | 4363 | 0.830 | 0.251 | 2.746 | 0.656 |
| 1989 | 0.803 | 0.026 | 2851 | 0.651 | 0.161 | 2.622 | 0.791 |
| 1990 | 1.435 | 0.030 | 2330 | 2.320 | 0.803 | 6.708 | 0.570 |
| 1991 | 2.468 | 0.063 | 2398 | 1.910 | 0.731 | 4.990 | 0.509 |
| 1992 | 1.782 | 0.051 | 5163 | 2.320 | 0.983 | 5.478 | 0.450 |
| 1993 | 1.581 | 0.044 | 4383 | 2.498 | 1.035 | 6.030 | 0.463 |
| 1994 | 1.251 | 0.031 | 5045 | 1.529 | 0.568 | 4.121 | 0.528 |
| 1995 | 1.136 | 0.028 | 4471 | 1.569 | 0.565 | 4.360 | 0.546 |
| 1996 | 0.627 | 0.021 | 5509 | 0.880 | 0.273 | 2.836 | 0.639 |
| 1997 | 0.367 | 0.028 | 5770 | 0.358 | 0.086 | 1.487 | 0.813 |
| 1998 | 0.549 | 0.035 | 6773 | 0.358 | 0.097 | 1.328 | 0.732 |
| 1999 | 0.580 | 0.036 | 11015 | 0.307 | 0.086 | 1.095 | 0.705 |
| 2000 | 0.433 | 0.038 | 9771 | 0.187 | 0.041 | 0.845 | 0.876 |
| 2001 | 0.567 | 0.038 | 9538 | 0.328 | 0.093 | 1.162 | 0.701 |
| 2002 | 0.480 | 0.036 | 10021 | 0.297 | 0.081 | 1.092 | 0.727 |
| 2003 | 0.522 | 0.039 | 9803 | 0.303 | 0.083 | 1.100 | 0.718 |
| 2004 | 1.059 | 0.062 | 9946 | 0.565 | 0.202 | 1.581 | 0.551 |

Proportion Positive


Figure 1. Annual trend in proportion of leaders that observed vermilion snapper.


Figure 2. Annual trend in nominal CPUE.

## Nominal CPUE and Standarized Index <br> Species Comp Approach



Figure 3. Nominal CPUE (light black line with diamonds) and the delta-lognormal index (heavy blue line no symbols) constructed using the species composition approach. The dotted lines are the upper and lower $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

## Nominal CPUE and Standarized Index <br> ALL DATA



Figure 4. Nominal CPUE (light black line with diamonds) and the delta-lognormal index (heavy red line no symbols) constructed using all hook and line CB and PB trips that fished offshore, off AL and FL. The dotted lines are the upper and lower $95 \%$ confidence intervals.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Type- 3 model, error $=$ binomial, link $=$ logit, response variable $=$ success $($ where success $=1$ if vermilion snapper catch $>0$, else success $=0$ )
    ${ }^{2}$ Type-3 model, error $=$ normal, link $=$ identity, response variable $=\operatorname{logCPUE}($ where catch $\neq 0)$.

