# Pre-review draft of the Assessment Report 

$$
8-26-10
$$

## SEDAR24-AW13

This draft report was released for a public comment period that occurred during August 26-Sept 6, 2010. Following the public comment period the draft was made into a working document for the Assessment Process. This is working document SEDAR24-AW13. The final assessment report will be available on Sept 29, 2010.

## SEDAR

## SouthEast Data, Assessment, and Review

## South Atlantic Red Snapper

 SECTION III: Assessment ReportAugust 2010

## Table of Contents (to be completed)

1. Workshop Proceedings
1.1. Introduction
1.1.1. Workshop Time and Place
1.1.2. Terms of Reference
1.1.3. List of Participants
1.1.4. List of Assessment Workshop Working Papers
1.2. Panel Recommendations and Comment
2. Data Review and Update
3. Stock Assessment Models and Results
3.1. Model 1 (Repeat to $3 . \mathrm{X}$; $\mathrm{X}=$ \# models considered. Model 1 is typically the 'continuity case')
3.1.1. Model 1 Methods
3.1.1.1.Overview
3.1.1.2.Data Sources
3.1.1.3.Model Configuration and Equations
3.1.1.4.Parameters Estimated
3.1.1.5.Uncertainty and Measures of Precision
3.1.1.6.Benchmark / Reference points methods
3.1.1.7.Projection methods
3.1.2. Model 1 Results
3.1.2.1.Measures of Overall Model Fit
3.1.2.2.Parameter estimates \& associated measures of uncertainty
3.1.2.3.Stock Abundance and Recruitment
3.1.2.4.Stock Biomass (total and spawning stock)
3.1.2.5.Fishery Selectivity
3.1.2.6.Fishing Mortality
3.1.2.7.Stock-Recruitment Parameters
3.1.2.8.Evaluation of Uncertainty
3.1.2.9. Benchmarks / Reference Points / ABC values
3.1.2.10. Projections
3.1.3. Discussion
3.1.4. Tables
3.1.5. Figures
3.1.6. References
4. Pre-Review Process
4.1. Introduction
4.2. Summary of Comments Received
4.3. Assessment Panel Responses and Additional Analyses

## 1 Workshop Proceedings

### 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Assessment times and places The SEDAR 24 Assessement Stage I was conducted through a series of webinars between June 18 and August 24, 2010. Specific assessment webinar dates were June 18, July 14, August 6, August 9, August 11, August 13, August 18, August 20, and August 24, 2010.

The SEDAR 24 Assessment Stage II will continue September 7-29, 2010, to address comments regarding the Assessment report. Specific assessment webinar dates will be September 9 and September 21, 2010.

### 1.1.2 Terms of Reference

Assessment Process I

1. Review any changes in data following the data workshop and any analyses suggested by the data workshop. Summarize data as used in each assessment model. Provide justification for any deviations from Data Workshop recommendations.
2. Develop population assessment models that are compatible with available data and recommend which model and configuration is deemed most reliable or useful for providing advice. Document all input data, assumptions, and equations. Include a model configuration consistent with the SEDAR 15 base run and additional recent data observations.
3. Provide estimates of stock population parameters (fishing mortality, abundance, biomass, selectivity, stock-recruitment relationship, etc); include appropriate and representative measures of precision for parameter estimates.
4. Characterize uncertainty in the assessment and estimated values, considering components such as input data, modeling approach, and model configuration. Provide appropriate measures of model performance, reliability, and 'goodness of fit'.
5. Provide yield-per-recruit, spawner-per-recruit, and stock-recruitment evaluations including figures and tables of complete parameters.
6. Provide estimates for SFA criteria consistent with applicable FMPs, proposed FMPs and Amendments, other ongoing or proposed management programs, and National Standards. This may include evaluating existing SFA benchmarks, estimating alternative SFA benchmarks, and recommending proxy values; specific criteria for evaluation will be specified in the management summary.
7. Provide declarations of stock status relative to SFA benchmarks, considering both existing and proposed management parameters.
8. Perform a probabilistic analysis of proposed reference points and provide the probability of overfishing at various harvest or exploitation levels and, if the stock is determined to be overfished, the probability of rebuilding within mandated time periods as described in the management summary.
9. Project future stock conditions (biomass, abundance, and exploitation) and develop rebuilding schedules if warranted; include estimated generation time. Stock projections shall be developed in accordance with the following:
a. If stock is overfished:
10. $\mathrm{F}=0$, $\mathrm{F}=$ current, $\mathrm{F}=$ Fmsy, Ftarget ( OY ),
11. $\mathrm{F}=$ Frebuild (max that rebuild in allowed time)
a. If stock is overfishing
12. $\mathrm{F}=$ Fcurrent, $\mathrm{F}=$ Fmsy, $\mathrm{F}=$ Ftarget ( OY )
a. If stock is neither overfished nor overfishing
13. $\mathrm{F}=$ Fcurrent, $\mathrm{F}=$ Fmsy, $\mathrm{F}=$ Ftarget ( OY )
14. Provide recommendations for future research and data collection (field and assessment); be as specific as practicable in describing sampling design and sampling intensity and emphasize items which will improve future assessment capabilities and reliability.
15. Prepare an accessible, documented, labeled, and formatted spreadsheet containing all model parameter estimates and all relevant population information resulting from model estimates and any projection and simulation exercises. Include all data included in assessment report tables and all data that support assessment workshop figures.
16. No later than September 27, 2010, complete the Assessment Workshop Report (Section III of the SEDAR Stock Assessment Report). March 2010

Assessment Process II

1. Review comments submitted during the open pre-review period and review prior recommendations and assessment results in light of submitted comments.
2. Consider whether corrections, revisions, or additional analyses are justified.
3. Address submitted comments as appropriate and document results through working papers, addenda to the assessment report, or corrections to the assessment report.

### 1.1.3 List of Participants

| x = present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date: | 18-Jun | 14-Jul | 6-Aug | 9-Aug | 11- <br> Aug | 13- <br> Aug | 18- <br> Aug | $\begin{aligned} & 20- \\ & \text { Aug } \end{aligned}$ |
| First | Last | Web1 | Web2 | Web 2b | Web 2c | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Web } \\ & \text { 2d } \end{aligned}$ | Web 3 | Web 3b | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Web } \\ & \text { 3c } \end{aligned}$ |
| PANELISTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Steve | Amick |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Luiz | Barbieri | X | X | X | X |  |  | X | X |
| Zach | Bowen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bobby | Cardin |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |
| Rob | Cheshire | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Chip | Collier | X | X | X |  |  |  | X | X |
| Andy | Cooper | X |  | X | X |  |  | X | X |
| Kenny | Fex | X |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Frank | Hester |  | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Jim | Ianelli | X | X | X | X | X |  | X |  |
| Paul | Spencer |  | X |  |  | X |  | X | X |
| Robert | Johnson |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| Brian | Linton | X | X |  | X |  |  | X | X |
| Mike | Murphy | X | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| Behzad | Mahmoudi |  | X |  |  |  | X | X |  |
| Jennifer | Potts |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amy | Schueller | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Kyle | Shertzer | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Rodney | Smith |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Doug | Vaughan | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Erik | Williams | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| John | Quinlan | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| COUNCIL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| George | Geiger | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Charlie | Phillips | x | n | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STAFF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| John | Carmichael | x | x |  | x | x |  | x |  |
| Rick | DeVictor |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Kari | Fenske | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Rachael | Lindsay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Bob | Mahood |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Julie | Neer | x | x | x | x | x |  | x | x |
| Dale | Theiling | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gregg | Waugh |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OBSERVERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Joey | Ballenger | x | x | x |  |  |  | x |  |
| Dick | Brame |  | x | x | x | x |  | x | x |
| Chester | Brewer |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Richard | Cody | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roy | Crabtree |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scott | Crosson |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| David | Cupka |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Mac | Currin |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |
| Sera | Drevenak | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Nick | Farmer |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Ted | Forsgren | x | x | x |  | x | x |  |  |
| Bob | Gill |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| Rebekah | Hamed |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |


| Mathew | Hardy |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ben | Hartig |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rusty | Hudson | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Jimmy | Hull |  | x |  | x | x |  | x | x |
| John | larson |  | x | x |  | x | x |  | x |
| Michael | Kennedy | x | x | x | x | x | x |  |  |
| Anne | Lange | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Patrick | Magrady |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jack | McGovern |  | x |  |  | x |  | x | x |
| Jack | Mountford |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| David | Nelson |  | x |  | x | x | x | x | x |
| Don | Newhauser |  | x | x |  |  | x |  |  |
| Bonnie | Ponwith |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marcel | Reichert |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jessica | Stephen |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Andy | Strelcheck |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Ken | Stump |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| Jon | Turner |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jim | Waters |  | x | x |  |  | x | x |  |
| Karl | Wickstrom |  | x | x | x | x | x |  |  |

1.1.4 List of assessment working papers and reference documents added since the data workshop report

| Document \# | Title | Authors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Documents Prepared for the Assessment Workshop |  |  |
| SEDAR24-AW01 | Assessment History of Red Snapper (Lutjanus campechanus) in the U.S. Atlantic | Sustainable <br> Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW02 | The Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM) with application to red grouper1: mathematical description, implementation details, and computer code | Sustainable <br> Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW03 | Standardized discard rates of U.S. Atlantic red snapper (Lutjanus campechanus) from headboat at sea observer data. | Sustainable <br> Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW04 | Additional age data of south Atlantic red snapper (Lutjanus campechanus) from Florida Fish and Wildlife's dependent monitoring program | J. Tunnell, 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW05 | Selectivity of red snapper in the southeast U.S. Atlantic: dome-shaped or flat-topped? | Sustainable <br> Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW06 | Spawner-recruit relationships of demersal marine fishes: Prior distribution of steepness for possible use in SEDAR stock assessments | Sustainable Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW07 | Red snapper: Regression and Chapman-Robson estimators of total mortality from catch curve data | Sustainable <br> Fisheries Branch, NMFS 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW08 | Overviews of NMFS fishery-dependent data source surveys referenced in the SEDAR 24 data workshop report | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SEDAR 2010, } \\ & \text { Compiled by J. } \\ & \text { Carmichael } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| SEDAR24-AW09 | Vulnerability to Capture of Red Snapper (Lutjanus campechanus) in the Fisheries of the Southeast United States - a Preliminary look | F. Hester and D. Nelson, 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW10 | South Atlantic Red Snapper Fishery - A Fisherman's Perspective | D. Nelson, 2009 |
| SEDAR24-AW11 | Additional information for red snapper selectivity | F. Hester, 2010 |
| SEDAR24-AW12 | Selectivity of red snapper in the South Atlantic More than Just Depth | D. Nelson, 2010 |
|  | Reference Documents Added During Assessment Process |  |
| SEDAR24-RD64 | Shelf -edge and upper slope reef fish assemblages in the South Atlantic Bight: habitat characteristics, spatial variation, and reproductive behavior | C. M. Schobernd, G. <br> R. Sedberry 2009 |
| SEDAR24-RD65 | A survey of the number of anglers and of their fishing effort and expenditures in the coastal recreational fishery of Florida | Ellis et al., 1958 |

## 2 Data Review and Update

Processing of data for the assessment is described in the SEDAR 24 Red Snapper Data Workshop Report. This section summarizes the data input for the Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM) base run and describes additional processing prior to and during the AW. The length and age composition data, ageing error matrix, and generation time tables are large and not easily tabulated for reports. The Microsoft Excel workbook, RS_AW_InputFINAL.xlsx, contains these data and other information used in sensitivity runs and bootstrap procedures (e.g. upper and lower bounds on the point estimate of discard mortality). Data considerations for surplusproduction and SRA models are covered in those sections.

A summary of the base run model input is given in tables 1-4. The units and significant digits are consistent with the input values.

### 2.1 Additional Data

Several data elements were discussed and recommended at the SEDAR 24 DW but were not complete by the deadline for the final data workbook for the DW. The headboat discard index was completed and approved for use by the SEDAR 24 AW panel. (Table 1). The upper and lower bounds of the point estimates of discard mortality for the for-hire, private, and commercial handline gears were provided and approved for use in sensitivity runs and bootstrap procedures. The sample sizes for annual headboat discard length compositions were provided and approved by the AW panel (Table 2). Additional recreational age samples from Florida were discovered after the SEDAR 24 DW. The AW panel recommended including these additional samples. The age compositions and sample size were updated accordingly (see Table 2 for sample sizes and the SEDAR 24 AW spreadsheet for age compositions.

### 2.2 Data Updates and Revisions

2.2.1 Landings An error in the 1981-85 MRFSS charter landings estimates was discovered during the AW. For these years headboat landings were included with charter landings and represented the primary source for dockside sampling for those years. MRFSS personnel were contacted but were unable to separate the headboat and charter landings for SEDAR 24 and indicated any method to separate the landings would give poor estimates. The AW panel recommended applying the geometric mean of the ratio of charter landings to headboat landings from 1986-1991 to the headboat landings for 1981-85 to generate the charter boat landings. These values were combined with the headboat landings to give the for-hire landings estimates (Table 3).

SEDAR 24 AW panelists were concerned about the spike in MRFSS charter and private landings in 1984-85 which were not reflected to the same degree in the other sectors. The panel wanted to preserve the increase in landings but deflate the steepness of the increase. Examination of age and length compositions showed evidence of a strong year class recruiting to the fishery but the panel generally felt the MRFSS estimates exaggerated the increase. Several methods were examined for removing the spikes including smoothing options and averaging adjacent years landings. The panel recommended smoothing the MRFSS private landings (1981-2009) using a cubic spline procedure weighted by the inverse of the annual CVs. This was implemented in R programming software with the smoothing parameter (spar) set to 0 . The correction of the 1981-

85 landings scaled the $1984-85$ spike in MRFSS charter landings to the headboat and no smoothing was required. These changes were incorporated in the for-hire and private recreational landings for input into the model (Table 3).

The commercial ratio method estimates of historical recreational landings were recalculated with the adjusted recreational data from 1981-2009.

The SEDAR 24 AW panel felt the commercial ratio method used to estimate historical landings was inadequate to capture the inter-annual variability displayed in the predicted estimates. The scale of the historical landings is important to the model but not the annual variability. The panel recommended smoothing the historical recreational landings with a cubic spline procedure to be consistent with the smoothing of later data. The smoothing parameter was set slightly higher (0.5) than the smoothing parameter used for the 1981-2009 private landings to reflect the inability of the commercial ratio method to predict the inter-annual variability in landings.
2.2.2 Discards MRFSS charter and private estimates of discards had missing values for several years in the early MRFSS estimates (early 1980s). Analysts felt this would cause problems within the model and that it was unlikely to have no discards following a year with discards and no regulation change. The AW panel considered options for filling in the missing values and recommended the minimum discard estimate from the entire series for each sector be substituted for missing values.
2.2.3 Length and Age Compositions Age compositions were pooled at 20 years. The ageing error matrix was adjusted to a maximum age of 20 years to match the age compositions. Length composition bins were pooled into 3 cm bins from 18 cm to 101 cm labeled at the midpoint. Lengths less than 18 cm were dropped from composition and lengths greater than 101 cm were pooled into the 100 cm bin. The private recreational length composition sample sizes were low and therefore pooled across years to match regulation periods (1983-1991 and 19922009). The commercial diving length composition was reduced to just 2007 instead of pooling across years since almost all the samples in the pooled composition came from 2007.
2.2.4 Life History Generation time is not typically computed at the data workshop but may be required for stock projection.
Generation time (G) was estimated from Eq. 3.4 in Gotelli (1998, p. 57).
$G=\mathrm{Plxbxx} / \mathrm{Plxbx}$
where summation was over ages $x=1$ through 100 (by which age cumulative survival is essentially zero), $l x$ is the number of fish at age starting with 1 fish at age 1 and decrementing based on natural mortality only, and $b x$ is per capita birth rate at age. Because biomass is used as a proxy for reproduction in our model, we substitute the product of $P f_{x} M f_{x} W x$ for $b x$ in this equation, where $P f_{x}$ is the proportion female at age, $M m x$ is the proportion of mature females at age, and $W x$ is expected gonad weight at age. This weighted average of age for mature biomass yields an estimate of 22 years (rounded up from 21.7 yrs.).

## References

Gotelli, N. J. 1998. A Primer of Ecology 2nd Edition. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, MA, 236p.

|  | Recreational |  |  |  | Commercial |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Indices |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Headboat | CV <br> Headboat | Headboat discard | CV- <br> Headboat discard | Handline | CV Handline |
| 1976 | 2.30 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 2.24 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 2.11 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 2.12 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 1.42 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 2.88 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 1.14 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 1.53 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 1.31 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 1.99 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 0.47 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 0.56 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 0.54 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 0.91 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 0.84 | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 0.65 | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 0.08 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 0.15 | 0.07 |  |  | 1.14 | 0.06 |
| 1994 | 0.26 | 0.07 |  |  | 0.91 | 0.05 |
| 1995 | 0.28 | 0.06 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.05 |
| 1996 | 0.25 | 0.07 |  |  | 0.57 | 0.06 |
| 1997 | 0.27 | 0.08 |  |  | 0.57 | 0.06 |
| 1998 | 0.24 | 0.06 |  |  | 0.63 | 0.06 |
| 1999 | 0.30 | 0.06 |  |  | 0.76 | 0.06 |
| 2000 | 0.42 | 0.06 |  |  | 0.75 | 0.06 |
| 2001 | 0.80 | 0.06 |  |  | 1.22 | 0.05 |
| 2002 | 0.96 | 0.06 |  |  | 1.37 | 0.05 |
| 2003 | 0.53 | 0.07 |  |  | 1.11 | 0.05 |
| 2004 | 0.83 | 0.05 |  |  | 1.44 | 0.05 |
| 2005 | 0.80 | 0.06 | 0.56 | 0.30 | 1.23 | 0.06 |
| 2006 | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.37 | 0.61 | 0.07 |
| 2007 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 2.02 | 0.17 | 0.66 | 0.07 |
| 2008 | 1.86 | 0.05 | 1.39 | 0.21 | 1.20 | 0.07 |
| 2009 | 2.04 | 0.05 | 0.63 | 0.27 | 1.92 | 0.07 |

Table 1. Red snapper indices of abundance in fish/angler (headboat and headboat discard) and pounds/hook hour (handline). Headboat indices were applied to the for-hire sector.

|  | Recreational |  |  | Commercial |  |  | Recreational |  | Commercial |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length Comp. Sample Size (trips) |  |  |  |  |  | Age Comp. Sample Size (trips) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Headboat |  |  | Handline |  |  |  |  |
| Year | ForHire | Private | discard | Handline | Diving | discard | ForHire | Private | Handline | Diving |
| 1976 | 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 195 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 208 |  |  |  |  |  | 83 |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 91 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 93 |  |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 208 |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 308 | 79 pooled |  |  |  |  | 173 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 406 |  |  |  |  |  | 178 |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 364 |  |  | 153 |  |  | 161 |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 264 |  |  | 90 |  |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 164 |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 128 |  |  | 105 |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 172 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 140 |  |  | 98 |  |  | 23 |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 71 |  |  | 149 |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 55 | 165 pooled |  | 89 |  |  | 10 |  | 18 |  |
| 1993 | 107 |  |  | 128 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 83 |  |  | 132 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 84 |  |  | 145 |  |  | 11 |  | 13 |  |
| 1996 | 79 |  |  | 115 |  |  | 58 |  | 58 |  |
| 1997 | 54 |  |  | 84 |  |  | 12 |  | 144 |  |
| 1998 | 92 |  |  | 106 |  |  |  |  | 37 |  |
| 1999 | 113 |  |  | 153 | 13 |  |  |  | 156 |  |
| 2000 | 94 |  |  | 133 | 9 |  |  |  | 257 |  |
| 2001 | 151 |  |  | 168 | 6 |  | 27 |  | 28 | 124 |
| 2002 | 200 |  |  | 167 |  |  | 105 |  | 10 | 30 |
| 2003 | 191 |  |  | 223 | 12 |  | 108 |  | 10 |  |
| 2004 | 154 |  |  | 174 |  |  | 98 |  | 30 |  |
| 2005 | 118 |  | 44 |  |  |  | 130 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 125 |  | 30 |  |  |  | 123 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 86 |  | 65 | 142 |  |  | 51 |  | 138 |  |
| 2008 | 117 |  | 63 |  |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 210 |  | 56 | 135 | 10 | 6 | 359 | 11 | 294 | 17 |

Table 2. Red Snapper length and age composition sample sizes (number of trips sampled).

|  | Recreational |  |  |  | Commercial |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Landings |  | Discards |  | Landings |  | Discards |
|  | Numbers (1000's) |  |  |  | Whole Pounds (1000's) |  |  |
| Year | ForHire | Private | ForHire | Private | Handline | diving | Handline |
| 1955 | 150.885 | 29.714 |  |  | 497.800 |  |  |
| 1956 | 165.256 | 39.009 |  |  | 484.300 |  |  |
| 1957 | 179.645 | 48.918 |  |  | 868.900 |  |  |
| 1958 | 186.606 | 57.392 |  |  | 617.300 |  |  |
| 1959 | 189.092 | 65.019 |  |  | 662.700 |  |  |
| 1960 | 188.831 | 71.844 |  |  | 677.100 |  |  |
| 1961 | 184.514 | 77.015 |  |  | 799.800 |  |  |
| 1962 | 175.490 | 80.303 |  |  | 662.577 |  |  |
| 1963 | 169.065 | 85.378 |  |  | 504.840 |  |  |
| 1964 | 174.034 | 96.962 |  |  | 559.491 |  |  |
| 1965 | 191.198 | 115.819 |  |  | 656.795 |  |  |
| 1966 | 214.089 | 138.365 |  |  | 740.057 |  |  |
| 1967 | 231.702 | 157.512 |  |  | 963.706 |  |  |
| 1968 | 231.522 | 164.458 |  |  | 1069.332 |  |  |
| 1969 | 211.261 | 157.125 |  |  | 700.493 |  |  |
| 1970 | 183.356 | 144.275 |  |  | 640.918 |  |  |
| 1971 | 158.780 | 134.286 |  |  | 543.433 |  |  |
| 1972 | 144.995 | 133.576 |  |  | 468.602 |  |  |
| 1973 | 145.838 | 146.128 |  |  | 387.344 |  |  |
| 1974 | 158.545 | 169.804 |  |  | 632.507 |  |  |
| 1975 | 171.132 | 192.748 |  |  | 745.363 |  |  |
| 1976 | 174.612 | 205.356 |  |  | 619.011 |  |  |
| 1977 | 168.119 | 206.069 |  |  | 649.273 |  |  |
| 1978 | 152.125 | 194.560 |  |  | 589.918 |  |  |
| 1979 | 129.685 | 174.180 |  |  | 409.939 |  |  |
| 1980 | 105.730 | 151.399 |  |  | 380.596 |  |  |
| 1981 | 69.519 | 121.730 |  |  | 371.379 |  |  |
| 1982 | 37.726 | 52.932 |  |  | 306.128 |  |  |
| 1983 | 59.229 | 43.885 | 42.281 | 8.679 | 310.268 |  |  |
| 1984 | 60.094 | 161.385 | 121.668 | 22.845 | 248.195 | 1.317 |  |
| 1985 | 97.119 | 178.659 | 27.775 | 63.501 | 240.971 | 2.547 |  |
| 1986 | 98.995 | 78.195 | 0.158 | 8.679 | 215.743 | 0.508 |  |
| 1987 | 40.286 | 51.281 | 0.158 | 106.560 | 187.211 | 0.030 |  |
| 1988 | 62.664 | 98.608 | 0.158 | 48.373 | 164.123 | 0.013 |  |
| 1989 | 44.461 | 107.354 | 0.158 | 20.038 | 258.478 | 0.006 |  |
| 1990 | 26.656 | 11.091 | 0.158 | 8.679 | 215.047 | 1.859 |  |
| 1991 | 30.623 | 31.351 | 0.697 | 35.853 | 134.032 | 5.898 |  |
| 1992 | 45.611 | 38.345 | 17.936 | 19.492 | 89.062 | 9.614 | 14.233 |
| 1993 | 14.948 | 10.864 | 33.397 | 48.989 | 189.994 | 5.611 | 14.926 |
| 1994 | 22.589 | 13.567 | 7.359 | 62.577 | 179.615 | 13.116 | 20.638 |
| 1995 | 22.423 | 2.386 | 24.366 | 37.932 | 166.772 | 10.037 | 19.437 |
| 1996 | 8.681 | 11.419 | 5.053 | 17.628 | 130.650 | 6.153 | 24.867 |
| 1997 | 62.935 | 3.545 | 19.038 | 8.679 | 101.232 | 7.531 | 27.458 |
| 1998 | 18.112 | 7.585 | 8.856 | 22.970 | 80.009 | 8.063 | 21.106 |
| 1999 | 49.363 | 22.660 | 47.594 | 132.663 | 80.506 | 9.974 | 19.387 |
| 2000 | 19.508 | 57.664 | 32.530 | 223.334 | 92.109 | 10.376 | 18.975 |
| 2001 | 21.879 | 40.185 | 32.845 | 179.264 | 175.233 | 18.238 | 19.014 |
| 2002 | 30.115 | 33.865 | 25.886 | 105.891 | 163.092 | 22.097 | 42.356 |
| 2003 | 23.899 | 16.111 | 21.700 | 139.401 | 118.803 | 17.454 | 13.973 |
| 2004 | 24.796 | 25.390 | 37.465 | 163.953 | 149.791 | 19.647 | 5.170 |
| 2005 | 23.113 | 21.172 | 49.435 | 79.725 | 118.015 | 9.344 | 4.999 |
| 2006 | 17.293 | 14.541 | 23.194 | 115.593 | 80.291 | 4.163 | 7.425 |
| 2007 | 17.326 | 31.324 | 118.249 | 339.128 | 104.737 | 7.514 | 14.759 |
| 2008 | 41.780 | 84.502 | 59.846 | 352.213 | 240.735 | 6.304 | 15.512 |
| 2009 | 50.210 | 92.814 | 35.131 | 183.886 | 341.241 | 8.011 | 20.402 |

Table 3. Red snapper landings as input into the BAM base model.

| Equation/Conversion | units | Linf | $K$ | t0 | a | b |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| von Bertalanffy growth | mm | $902.00(4.29)$ | $0.24(0.004)$ | $0.03(0.03)$ |  |  |
| WW-FL Conversion | mm,grams |  |  |  | $7.150 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 3.12 |
| WW-GW conversion | grams |  |  |  | $3.142 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 1.743 |

Table 4. Red snapper input parameters for the von Bertalanffy growth equation, whole weightfork length conversion, and whole weight-gonad weight conversion. The standard error of the growth parameters are in parentheses.

## 3 Stock Assessment Models and Results

Four different models were discussed for red snapper during the Assessment Workshop (AW): the Beaufort statistical catch-age model (BAM), virtual population analysis (VPA), stochastic stock reduction analysis (SSRA), and surplus-production models. The BAM was selected at the AW to be the primary assessment model. This report focuses on the BAM, as well as surplus-production models. In addition, catch curve analysis was used to examine mortality (SEDAR-24-AW07). An SSRA application received preliminary examination by the AW panel and is described in a supporting document (SEDAR-24-RW02). Abbreviations used in this report are defined in Appendix A.

A VPA was not pursued, for several reasons. A major assumption of VPAs is that catch at age of each fleet in each year is known precisely, which is not a valid assumption for U.S. Atlantic snapper-grouper stocks in general, and the red snapper stock in particular. For example, only seven private recreational (a dominant fleet for red snapper) fishing trips were sampled for red snapper ages prior to 2009. Thus, developing catch-age matrices would require strong assumptions to fill in the data gaps; this obstacle is not insurmountable in principle, but if pursued, should likely be done at a Data Workshop by data providers who are most familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of each data set. Relaxing the assumption of known catch at age was one reason for the advent of statistical catch-age models (e.g., BAM). The AW panel thought that committing its limited resources to the BAM, SSRA, and surplus-production models would be more productive.

### 3.1 Model 1: Beaufort Assessment Model

### 3.1.1 Model 1 Methods

3.1.1.1 Overview The primary model in this assessment was the Beaufort statistical catch-age model (BAM). The model was implemented with the AD Model Builder software (ADMB Foundation 2009), and its structure and equations are detailed in SEDAR-24-RW-01. In essence, a statistical catch-age model simulates a population forward in time while including fishing processes (Quinn and Deriso 1999; Shertzer et al. 2008a). Quantities to be estimated are systematically varied until characteristics of the simulated populations match available data on the real population. Statistical catch-age models share many attributes with ADAPT-style tuned and untuned VPAs.

The method of forward projection has a long history in fishery models. It was introduced by Pella and Tomlinson (1969) for fitting production models and then used by Fournier and Archibald (1982), Deriso et al. (1985) in their CAGEAN model, and Methot (1989; 2009) in his stock-synthesis model. The catch-age model of this assessment is similar in structure to the CAGEAN and stock-synthesis models. Versions of this assessment model have been used in previous SEDAR assessments of reef fishes in the U.S. South Atlantic, such as red porgy, black sea bass, tilefish, snowy grouper, gag grouper, greater amberjack, vermilion snapper, Spanish mackerel, and red grouper, as well as in the previous (SEDAR-15) benchmark assessment of red snapper.
3.1.1.2 Data Sources The catch-age model included data from four fleets that caught southeastern U.S. red snapper: commercial lines (primarily handlines), commercial dive, recreational for-hire (headboats and charterboats), and recreational private boats. The model was fit to data on annual landings (in units of 1000 lb whole weight for commercial fleets, 1000 fish for recreational fleets), annual discard mortalities (in units of 1000 fish for commercial lines and recreational fleets), annual length compositions of landings, annual age compositions of landings, annual length compositions of discards, three fishery dependent indices of abundance (commercial lines, headboat, and headboat discards). Not all of the above data sources were available for all fleets in all years. Annual discard mortalities, as fit by the model, were computed by multiplying total discards (tabulated in the DW report) by the fleet-specific release mortality probability (commercial, 0.48 ; for-hire, 0.41 ; and private, 0.39 ). Data used in the model are tabulated in the DW report and in §III(2) of this report.
3.1.1.3 Model Configuration and Equations Model structure and equations of the BAM are detailed in SEDAR-24-RW01, along with AD Model Builder code for implementation. The assessment time period was 1955-2009. A general description of the assessment model follows:

Natural mortality rate The natural mortality rate $(M)$ was assumed constant over time, but decreasing with age. The form of $M$ as a function of age was based on Lorenzen (1996). The Lorenzen (1996) approach inversely relates the natural mortality at age to mean weight at age $\mathrm{W}_{a}$ by the power function $\mathrm{M}_{a}=\alpha W_{a}^{\beta}$, where $\alpha$ is a scale parameter and $\beta$ is a shape parameter. Lorenzen (1996) provided point estimates of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for oceanic fishes, which were used for this assessment. As in previous SEDAR assessments, the Lorenzen estimates of $M_{a}$ were rescaled to provide the same fraction of fish surviving through the oldest observed age (54 years) as would occur with constant $M=0.08$ from the DW. This approach using cumulative mortality is consistent with the findings of Hoenig (1983) and Hewitt and Hoenig (2005).

Stock dynamics In the assessment model, new biomass was acquired through growth and recruitment, while abundance of existing cohorts experienced exponential decay from fishing and natural mortality. The population was assumed closed to immigration and emigration. The model included age classes $1-20^{+}$, where the oldest age class $20^{+}$allowed for the accumulation of fish (i.e., plus group). Initial (1955) numbers at age assumed the stable age structure that corresponded to the initial, estimated total mortality rate and catchweighted average selectivity.

Growth Mean size at age of the population (total length, TL) was modeled with the von Bertalanffy equation, and weight at age (whole weight, WW) was modeled as a function of total length (Figure 3.1, Table 3.1). Parameters of growth and conversions (TL-WW) were estimated by the DW and were treated as input to the assessment model. For fitting length composition data, the distribution of size at age was assumed normal with standard deviation estimated by the assessment model. For fishery length composition data collected under a size limit regulation, the normal distribution of size at age was truncated at the size limit, such that length compositions of landings would include only fish of legal size. Similarly, length compositions of discards would include only fish below the size limit. Mean length at age of landings and discards were computed from these truncated distributions, and thus average weight at age of landings and discards would differ from those in the population at large.

Sex ratio The sex ratio was assumed to be 50:50, as suggested by the DW.

Female maturity Female maturity was modeled with a logistic function; parameters for this model were provided by the DW and treated as input to the assessment model (Table 3.1).

Spawning biomass Spawning biomass was modeled as total gonad biomass of mature females measured at the time of peak spawning. For red snapper, peak spawning was considered to occur at the end of July.

Recruitment Estimated recruitment of age-1 fish was predicted from spawning biomass using the BevertonHolt spawner-recruit model. Steepness, $h$, is a key parameter of this model; because $h$ is often difficult to estimate reliably (Conn et al. 2010), a normal prior distribution was used to inform estimation (SEDAR-24-AW06). In years when composition data could provide information on year-class strength (1973-2009), estimated recruitment varied with lognormal residuals. In years prior, recruitment followed the Beverton-Holt model precisely (similar to an age-structured production model).

Landings Time series of landings from four fleets were modeled: commercial lines, commercial dive, forhire, and private recreational. Landings were modeled with the Baranov catch equation (Baranov 1918) and were fitted in either weight or numbers, depending on how the data were collected ( 1000 lb whole weight for commercial fleets, and 1000 fish for for-hire/recreational fleets). The DW provided observed landings back to the first assessment year (1955) for each fleet. However, sampling of headboats began in 1972 and other recreational sectors in 1981. Thus, historical landings of for-hire and private fleets were estimated indirectly by the DW using a ratio method, and they are treated in this assessment as a source of uncertainty.

Discards As with landings, discard mortalities (in units of 1000 fish) were modeled with the Baranov catch equation (Baranov 1918), which required estimates of discard selectivities and release mortality probabilities. Discards were assumed to have fleet-specific mortality probabilities, as suggested by the DW (commercial lines, 0.48 ; for-hire, 0.41 ; private, 0.39 ). For for-hire and private fleets, discard time series were assumed to begin in 1983, with the start of the 12 -inch size limit; for the commercial lines fleet, discards were modeled starting in 1992 with the 20 -inch size limit. Discards from the commercial dive fleet were assumed negligible and not modeled.

Fishing For each time series of landings and discard mortalities, a separate full fishing mortality rate ( $F$ ) was estimated. Age-specific rates were then computed as the product of full $F$ and selectivity at age. Apical $F$ was computed as the maximum of $F$ at age summed across fleets.

Selectivities Selectivity curves applied to landings were estimated using a parametric approach. This approach applies plausible structure on the shape of the curves, and achieves greater parsimony than occurs with unique parameters for each age. Flat-topped selectivities were modeled as a two-parameter logistic function. Domeshaped selectivities were modeled by combining two logistic functions: a two-parameter logistic function to describe the ascending limb of the curve, and a three-parameter logistic function to describe the descending limb. The two functions were joined at the age of full selection, which was fixed for each model run. To model landings, the AW Panel recommended flat-topped selectivity for commercial lines and dome-shaped selectivity for commercial dive, for-hire, and private recreational fleets.

Selectivity of each fleet was fixed within each block of size-limit regulations, but was permitted to vary among blocks where possible or reasonable. Fisheries experienced three blocks of size-limit regulations (no limit prior to 1983, 12 -inch limit during 1983-1991, and 20-inch limit during 1992-2009). Age and length composition data are critical for estimating selectivity parameters, and ideally, a model would have sufficient composition data from each fleet over time to estimate distinct selectivities in each period of regulations. That was not the case here, and thus additional assumptions were applied to define selectivities, as follows. Because the private recreational fleet had little age or length composition data, this fleet assumed no change in selectivity with implementation of the 12 -inch size limit, but did allow a change with the 20 -inch limit. Furthermore, the descending limb of this selectivity mirrored that of the for-hire fleet. With no composition data for commercial dive prior to the last regulatory block, commercial dive selectivity was assumed constant over time.

Commercial lines selectivities in the first and second regulatory blocks were set equal, consistent with the DW recommendation that the 12 -inch size limit had little effect on commercial line fishing. Selectivities of fishery dependent indices were the same as those of the relevant fleet.

Selectivities of discards were partially estimated, assuming that discards consisted primarily of undersized fish, as implied by observed length compositions of discards. The general approach taken for for-hire discard selectivity was that the value for age 1 was estimated, age 2 was assumed to have full selection, and selectivity for each age $3^{+}$was set equal to the age-specific probability of being below the size limit, given the estimated normal distribution of size at age. In this way, selectivity would change with modification in the size limit. A similar approach was taken for commercial line discard selectivity, but distinct values for age 1 and age 2 were estimated, age 3 was assumed to have full selection, and ages $4^{+}$were set to probabilities of being below the size limit. For private recreational discards, no age or length composition data were available, and thus selectivity of those discards mirrored that of the for-hire fleet.

Diffuse priors were used for estimating parameters of selectivity functions. These priors assumed normal distributions with $C V=1.0$, and were intended to provide only weak information to help the optimization routine during model execution. Priors help by steering estimation away from parameter space with no response in the likelihood surface. Without these diffuse priors, it is possible during the optimization search that a selectivity parameter could become unimportant, for example if its bounds were set too wide and depending on values of other parameters. When this happens, the likelihood gradient with respect to the aimless parameter approaches zero even if the parameter is not at its globally best value. Diffuse priors help avoid that situation.

Indices of abundance The model was fit to three fishery dependent indices of abundance (headboat 19762009; headboat discards 2005-2009; and commercial lines 1993-2009). Predicted indices were conditional on selectivity of the corresponding fleet (for-hire, for-hire discards, or commercial lines) and were computed from abundance at the midpoint of the year or, in the case of commercial lines, biomass. The for-hire discard index, although short in duration, tracks young fish and was included as a measure of recruitment strength at the end of the assessment period.

Catchability In the BAM, catchability scales indices of abundance to estimated abundance at large. Several options for time-varying catchability were implemented in the BAM following recommendations of the 2009 SEDAR procedural workshop on catchability (SEDAR Procedural Guidance 2009). In particular, the BAM allows for density dependence, linear trends, and random walk, as well as time-invariant catchability. Parameters for these models could be estimated or fixed based on a priori considerations. The AW considered time-varying catchability, but did not believe that the data were sufficient for estimating annual variation, particularly without reliable fishery independent indices of abundance. However, the AW did believe that catchability has generally increased over time as a result of improved technology (SEDAR Procedural Guidance 2009) and as estimated for reef fishes (including red snapper) in the Gulf of Mexico (Thorson and Berkson 2010). Thus, the AW recommended linearly increasing catchability with a slope in the range of [0.0,0.04] until 2003, after which catchability was assumed constant. Choice of the year 2003 was based on recommendations from fishermen regarding when the effects of Global Positioning Systems likely saturated in the southeast U.S. Atlantic (SEDAR 2009).

Biological reference points Biological reference points (benchmarks) were calculated based on maximum sustainable yield (MSY) estimates from the Beverton-Holt spawner-recruit model with bias correction. Computed benchmarks included MSY, fishing mortality rate at MSY ( $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ), and spawning biomass at MSY ( $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ). In this assessment, spawning biomass measures total gonad weight of mature females. These benchmarks are conditional on the estimated selectivity functions. The selectivity pattern used here was the effort-weighted
selectivities at age, with effort from each fishery (including discard mortalities) estimated as the full $F$ averaged over the last three years of the assessment.

Fitting criterion The fitting criterion was a penalized likelihood approach in which observed landings and discards were fit closely, and observed composition data and abundance indices were fit to the degree that they were compatible. Landings, discards, and index data were fit using lognormal likelihoods. Length and age composition data were fit using multinomial likelihoods. The CVs of landings and discards (in arithmetic space) were assumed equal to 0.05 , to achieve a close fit to these time series while allowing some imprecision. The CVs of indices varied annually and were set equal to the values estimated by the DW. Effective sample sizes of the multinomial components were assumed equal to the number of trips sampled annually, rather than the number of fish measured. This approach reflects the belief that individual fish caught per trip do not represent independent samples, but rather the basic sampling unit occurs at the level of trip.

In addition to likelihoods, several penalties and prior distributions were included in the compound objective function. In some cases, as with spawner-recruit steepness and selectivity slope parameters, priors were applied. Variability around the spawner-recruit curve was assumed lognormal. Priors and penalties were applied to maintain parameter estimates near reasonable values, and to prevent the optimization routine from drifting into parameter space with negligible gradient in the likelihood.

The model includes the capability for each component of the likelihood to be weighted by user-supplied values (for instance, to give more influence to desired data sources). However, in the base-run application to red snapper, all weights to data sources were set to 1.0.

Configuration of base run The base run was configured as described above with data provided by the DW. Some key features include 1) discard mortalities of 0.48 for commercial lines fleet, 0.41 for the for-hire fleet, and 0.39 for the private recreational fleet; 2) age-dependent natural mortality scaled to $\mathrm{M}=0.08$; 3) linearly increasing catchability with slope of 0.02 until 2003 and constant after then; and 4) descending limb of selectivity for-hire and private recreational fleets saturates at the value 0.3 . The AW did not consider this configuration to represent reality better than all other possible configurations, and attempted to portray uncertainty in point estimates through sensitivity analyses and through a Monte-Carlo/bootstrap approach (described below).

Sensitivity analyses Sensitivity of results to some key model inputs and assumptions was examined through sensitivity analyses. These model runs, as well as retrospective analyses, vary from the base run as follows:

- S1: Low $M$ at age (Lorenzen estimates rescaled to constant $M=0.05$ so as to provide the same cumulative survival through the oldest observed age)
- S2: High $M$ at age (Lorenzen estimates rescaled to constant $M=0.12$ so as to provide the same cumulative survival through the oldest observed age)
- S3: Low discard mortality probabilities (commercial lines $\delta=0.34$, for-hire $\delta=0.29$, private $\delta=0.27$ )
- S4: High discard mortality probabilities (commercial lines $\delta=0.62$, for-hire $\delta=0.54$, private $\delta=0.52$ )
- S5: Constant catchability
- S6: Linearly increasing catchability with slope of 0.04 until 2003 and constant after then
- S7: Random walk catchability for each fleet (standard deviation of 0.1)
- S8: Ageing error matrix included
- S9: Continuity run (features include linearly increasing catchability with slope of 0.02 throughout the entire assessment period, flat-topped selectivities for for-hire and recreational fleets, and spawning biomass based on body weight rather than gonad weight.)
- S10: Starting year of the model was 1976. Initial (1976) numbers at age were estimated in this sensitivity run, with penalized deviation from the stable age structure that corresponded to the initial, estimated mortality rate.
- S11: Low landings and discards for for-hire and private recreational fleets (historic values based on the $20^{t h}$ percentile of ratio to commercial landings, 1981-2009 values based on point estimates minus 1 standard error)
- S12: High landings and discards for for-hire and private recreational fleets (historic values based on the $80^{\text {th }}$ percentile of ratio to commercial landings, 1981-2009 values based on point estimates plus 1 standard error)
- S13: Low landings and discards for commercial lines and dive fleets (values based on point estimates minus 1 standard error)
- S14: High landings and discards for commercial lines and dive fleets (values based on point estimates plus 1 standard error)
- S15: Headboat index de-emphasized through external weighting $\left(\omega_{5}^{2}=0.5\right)$
- S16: Headboat index emphasized through external weighting $\left(\omega_{5}^{2}=2.0\right)$
- S17: Commercial lines index de-emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{5}^{1}=0.5$ )
- S18: Commercial lines index emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{5}^{1}=2.0$ )
- S19: Age composition data de-emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{2}=0.5$ )
- S20: Age composition data emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{2}=2.0$ )
- S21: Length composition data de-emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{1}=0.5$ )
- S22: Length composition data emphasized through external weighting ( $\omega_{1}=2.0$ )
- S23: Flat-topped commercial lines selectivity; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.1
- S24: Flat-topped commercial lines selectivity; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.5
- S25: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.75 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.1
- S26: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.75 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.3
- S27: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.75 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.5
- S28: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.5 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.1
- S29: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.5 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.3
- S30: Dome-shaped commercial lines selectivity, descending limb saturates at 0.5 ; descending limb of recreational selectivities saturates at 0.5
- S31: Compound extreme 1: high bound on natural mortality (S2), low bounds on discard mortalities (S3), constant catchability (S5), lowest dome-shaped selectivities (S28)
- S32: Compound extreme 2: low bound on natural mortality (S1), high bounds on discard mortalities (S4), increasing catchability of 0.04 (S6), highest selectivities (S24)
- S33: Retrospective run with data through 2008
- S34: Retrospective run with data through 2007
- S35: Retrospective run with data through 2006
- S36: Retrospective run with data through 2005
3.1.1.4 Parameters Estimated The model estimated annual fishing mortality rates of each fishery, selectivity parameters, catchability coefficients associated with indices, Beverton-Holt spawner-recruit parameters, annual recruitment deviations, and standard deviation of size at age. Estimated parameters are described mathematically in the document, SEDAR-24-RW01.
3.1.1.5 Catch Curve Analysis Catch curve analysis was conducted to provide estimates of total mortality $(Z=F+M)$ from age composition data. These analyses are detailed in SEDAR-24-AW07. In short, catch curves were represented by synthetic cohorts (i.e., proportions at age within years) and limited true cohorts, and were analyzed using the Chapman-Robson estimator and using linear regression of the log-transformed proportions at age. Catch curve analysis requires the assumptions that mortality and catchability remain constant with age, and when using synthetic cohorts, that recruitment is constant. These assumptions are rarely met, if ever, by fish populations. Thus, the application of catch curve analysis here is for diagnostic purposes, primarily for comparing the general range of estimated mortality rates of catch curves with those of other models.
3.1.1.6 Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analyses Static spawning potential ratio (static SPR) of each year was computed as the asymptotic spawners per recruit given that year's fishery-specific $F$ s and selectivities, divided by spawners per recruit that would be obtained in an unexploited stock. In this form, static SPR ranges between zero and one, and it represents SPR that would be achieved under an equilibrium age structure given the year-specific $F$ (hence the word static).

Yield per recruit and spawning potential ratio were computed as functions of $F$, as were equilibrium landings and spawning biomass. Equilibrium landings and discards were also computed as functions of biomass $B$, which itself is a function of $F$. As in computation of MSY-related benchmarks (described in §3.1.1.7), per recruit and equilibrium analyses applied the most recent selectivity patterns averaged across fisheries, weighted by each fleet's $F$ from the last three years (2007-2009).
3.1.1.7 Benchmark/Reference Point Methods In this assessment of red snapper, the quantities $F_{\text {MSY }}$, $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, B_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, and MSY were estimated by the method of Shepherd (1982). In that method, the point of maximum yield is identified from the spawner-recruit curve and parameters describing growth, natural mortality, maturity, and selectivity. The value of $F_{\text {MSY }}$ is the $F$ that maximizes equilibrium landings.

On average, expected recruitment is higher than that estimated directly from the spawner-recruit curve, because of lognormal deviation in recruitment. Thus, in this assessment, the method of benchmark estimation accounted for lognormal deviation by including a bias correction in equilibrium recruitment. The bias correction ( $\varsigma$ ) was computed from the estimated variance ( $\sigma^{2}$ ) of recruitment deviation: $\varsigma=\exp \left(\sigma^{2} / 2\right)$. Then, equilibrium recruitment ( $R_{e q}$ ) associated with any $F$ is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{e q}=\frac{R_{0}\left[\varsigma 0.8 h \Phi_{F}-0.2(1-h)\right]}{(h-0.2) \Phi_{F}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $R_{0}$ is virgin recruitment, $h$ is steepness, and $\Phi_{F}$ is spawning potential ratio given growth, maturity, and total mortality at age (including natural, fishing, and discard mortality rates). The $R_{e q}$ and mortality schedule imply an equilibrium age structure and an average sustainable yield (ASY). The estimate of $F_{\text {MSY }}$ is the $F$ giving the highest ASY (excluding discards), and the estimate of MSY is that ASY. The estimate of SSB $_{\text {MSY }}$ follows from the corresponding equilibrium age structure, as does the estimate of discard mortalities ( $D_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ), here separated from ASY (and consequently, MSY).

Estimates of MSY and related benchmarks are conditional on selectivity pattern. The selectivity pattern used here was an average of terminal-year selectivities from each fishery, where each fishery-specific selectivity was weighted in proportion to its corresponding estimate of $F$ averaged over the last three years (2007-2009).

The maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT) is defined by the SAFMC as $F_{\text {MSY }}$, and the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) as MSST $=(1-M)$ SSB $_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ (Restrepo et al. 1998), with constant M here equated to 0.08 . Overfishing is defined as $F>$ MFMT and overfished as SSB < MSST. Current status of the stock is represented by SSB in the latest assessment year (2009), and current status of the fishery is represented by the geometric mean of $F$ from the latest three years (2007-2009).

In addition to the MSY-related benchmarks, proxies were computed based on per recruit analyses. These proxies include $F_{30 \%}, F_{40 \%}$, and $F_{50 \%}$ along with their associated yields. The values of $F_{X \%}$ are defined as those Fs corresponding to $\mathrm{X} \%$ spawning potential ratio (i.e., spawners per recruit relative to that at the unfished level). These quantities may serve as proxies for $F_{\text {MSY }}$, if the spawner-recruit relationship cannot be estimated reliably. Mace (1994) recommended $F_{40 \%}$ as a proxy; however, later studies have found that $F_{40 \%}$ is too high of a fishing rate across many life-history strategies (Williams and Shertzer 2003; Brooks et al. 2009) and can lead to undesirably low levels of biomass and recruitment (Clark 2002).
3.1.1.8 Uncertainty and Measures of Precision Uncertainty was in part examined through use of multiple models and sensitivity runs. For the base run of the catch-age model (BAM), uncertainty in results and precision of estimates was computed more thoroughly through a mixed Monte Carlo and bootstrap (MCB) approach. Monte Carlo and bootstrap methods (Efron and Tibshirani 1993; Manly 1997) are often used to characterize uncertainty in ecological studies, and the mixed approach has been applied successfully in stock assessment (Restrepo et al. 1992; Legault et al. 2001; SEDAR 2004; 2009). The approach translates uncertainty in model input into uncertainty in model output, by fitting the model many times with different values of "observed" data and key input parameters. A chief advantage of the approach is that the results describe a range of possible outcomes, so that uncertainty is characterized more thoroughly than it could be by any single fit or handful of sensitivity runs. A minor disadvantage of the approach is that computational demands are relatively high.

In this assessment, the BAM was successively re-fit $\mathrm{n}=3000$ trials that differed from the original inputs by bootstrapping on data sources, and by Monte Carlo sampling of natural mortality, discard mortality, catchability increase, recreational selectivity, and historical recreational landings (implementations described below). This number of trials was sufficient for convergence of standard errors in management quantities (Figure 3.2). Of the 3000 trials, approximately $1.2 \%$ were discarded, because the model didn't properly converge (in all of these cases the spawner-recruit parameter steepness hit its prescribed upper bound of 0.99). This left $\mathrm{n}=2963$ trials used to characterize uncertainty.
3.1.1.8.1 Bootstrap of observed data To include uncertainty in time series of observed landings, discards, and indices of abundance, multiplicative lognormal errors were applied through a parametric bootstrap. To implement this approach in the MCB trials, random variables ( $x_{s, y}$ ) were drawn for each year $y$ of time series $s$ from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_{s, y}^{2}$ [that is, $x_{s, y} \sim N\left(0, \sigma_{s, y}^{2}\right)$. Annual observations were then perturbed from their original values $\left(\hat{O}_{s, y}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
O_{s, y}=\hat{O}_{s, y}\left[\exp \left(x_{s, y}\right)-\sigma_{s, y}^{2} / 2\right] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The term $\sigma_{s, y}^{2} / 2$ is a bias correction that centers the multiplicative error on the value of 1.0. Standard deviations in logspace were computed from CVs in arithmetic space, $\sigma_{s, y}=\sqrt{\log \left(1.0+C V_{s, y}^{2}\right)}$. As used for fitting the base run, CVs of landings and discards were assumed to be 0.05 , and CVs of indices of abundance were those provided by the DW.

Uncertainty in age and length compositions were included by drawing new distributions for each year of each data source. Ages (or lengths) of individual fish were drawn at random with replacement using the probabilities and sample sizes (number trips) of the original data.
3.1.1.8.2 Monte Carlo sampling In each successive fit of the model, several parameters were fixed (i.e., not estimated) at values drawn at random from distributions described below.

Natural mortality Point estimates of natural mortality ( $M=0.08$ ) were provided by the DW, but with some uncertainty. To carry forward this source of uncertainty, Monte Carlo sampling was used to generate deviations from the point estimate. A new $M$ value was drawn for each MCB trial from a truncated normal distribution (range $[0.05,0.12]$ ) with mean equal to the point estimate $(M=0.08)$ and standard deviation set to provide a lower $95 \%$ confidence limit at 0.05 (the low end of the DW range). Each realized value of M was used to scale the age-specific Lorenzen $M$, as in the base run.

Discard mortalities Similarly, for discard mortalities, new $\delta$ values were drawn from normal distributions for each fleet, for each MCB trial. Each distribution was centered on the point estimates provided by the DW (commercial lines, 0.48 ; for-hire, 0.41 ; private, 0.39 ) and had standard deviations computed by the AW ( $\sim 0.05$ for each fleet). The distributions were truncated at their $95 \%$ confidence limits (commercial lines, [0.34, 0.62]; for-hire, [0.29, 0.54]; private, [0.27, 0.52]).

Increase in catchability The slope of linear increase in catchability was drawn from a uniform distribution over the range [0.0, 0.04]. In all cases, catchability was assumed constant after 2003.

For-hire and private recreational selectivity In each MCB trial, the descending limb of the for-hire and private recreational selectivity saturated at a value drawn at random from a uniform distribution spanning the range [0.1, 0.5].

Historical recreational landings The DW provided historical recreational (for-hire and private) landings estimates using ratios to commercial landings (in addition, the private fleet landings were interpolated linearly to zero in 1950). Uncertainty in these ratios was based on the $20^{t h}$ and $80^{t h}$ percentiles of observed ratios from which the point estimates were generated. Those bounds were then standardized around the value of one, and a uniform random number was drawn and applied as a multiplier to the historical time series (this approach conveniently preserves the smoothed structure). For for-hire historical landings, the multiplier was drawn from the range [ $0.68,1.38$ ], and for private historical landings, the multiplier was drawn from the range [0.44, 1.53].
3.1.1.9 Acceptable Biological Catch When a stock is not overfished, acceptable biological catch (ABC) could be computed through probability-based approaches, such as that of Shertzer et al. (2008b), designed to avoid overfishing. However, for overfished stocks, rebuilding projections would likely supersede other approaches for computing ABCs.
3.1.1.10 Projection Methods Projections were run to predict stock status in years after the assessment, 2010-2045. In most projections, this time frame included one year (2010) with fishing at the current fishing rate, but with landings converted to discards (to reflect the 2010 moratorium on red snapper), and the remaining years at the projection rate.

The structure of the projection model was the same as that of the assessment model, and parameter estimates were those from the assessment results. Time-varying quantities, such as fishery selectivity curves, were fixed to the most recent values of the assessment period. Fully selected $F$ was apportioned between landings and discard mortalities according to the selectivity curves averaged across fisheries, using geometric mean $F$ from the last three years of the assessment period.

Central tendencies of SSB (mid-year), $F$, recruits, landings, and discards were represented by deterministic projections using parameter estimates from the base run. These projections were built on the estimated spawner-recruit relationship with bias correction, and were thus consistent with estimated benchmarks in the sense that long-term fishing at $F_{\text {MSY }}$ would yield MSY from a stock size at $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Uncertainty in future time series was quantified through projections that extended the Monte Carlo/Bootstrap (MCB) fits of the stock assessment model.

Initialization of projections Fishing rates that define the projections were assumed to start in 2011, which is the earliest year management could react to this assessment. Because the assessment period ended in 2009, the projections required an initialization period (2010). Point estimates of initial abundance at age in the projection (start of 2010), other than at age 1, were taken to be the 2009 estimates from the assessment, discounted by 2009 natural and fishing mortalities. The initial abundance at age 1 was computed using the estimated spawner-recruit model and the 2009 estimate of SSB. The fully selected fishing mortality rate applied in the initialization period was $F=F_{\text {current }}$ (geometric mean of fully selected $F$ during 2007-2009), but without mortality from the commercial dive fleet.

Moratorium In 2010, a moratorium on red snapper was implemented. This was modeled in a three-step process. First, the current fishing rates by fleet, discounted by expected reduction in fishing effort, were applied to estimate landings by fleet. Second, all caught fish were assumed released, and fleet-specific discard mortality probabilities were applied to convert the potential landings to dead discards. Third, an optimization procedure was used to estimate the fishing mortality rates that produce those dead discards, as well as the mortality rates associated with undersized fish. That is, six mortality rates were estimated: the Fs of legalsized discards and undersized discards from commercial lines, for-hire, and private recreational fleets. These rates were then applied to compute the total dead discards and total mortality rates used to project the population forward in time. For most projection scenarios (described below), these mortality rates applied only in 2010, but one projection scenario (Scenario 7))applied the moratorium mortality rates throughout.

Because red snapper are but one species of a multispecies fishery, the AW believed that the moratorium on red snapper would not have a large effect on fishing effort. Thus fishing effort during the moratorium was assumed to be $80 \%-100 \%$ of current fishing effort. The central-tendency projections used the midpoint (90\%) of that range.

Uncertainty of projections To characterize uncertainty in future stock dynamics, stochasticity was included in replicate projections, each an extension of a single MCB assessment model fit. Thus, projections carried forward uncertainties in natural mortality and in discard mortality, as well as in estimated quantities such as spawner-recruit parameters, selectivity curves, and in initial (start of 2010) abundance of ages $2^{+}$. Initial and subsequent recruitment values were generated with stochasticity using a Monte Carlo procedure, in which the estimated Beverton-Holt model (without bias correction) of each MCB fit was used to compute expected annual recruitment values ( $\bar{R}_{y}$ ). Variability was added to the expected values by choosing multiplicative deviations at random from a lognormal distribution,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{y}=\bar{R}_{y} \exp \left(\epsilon_{y}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\epsilon_{y}$ was drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation $\hat{\sigma}$, where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the estimated standard deviation from the base assessment model. In addition, moratorium fishing effort relative to the current level was drawn for each replicate projection from a uniform distribution spanning the range [0.8, 1.0].

The procedure generated 30,000 replicate projections of MCB model fits drawn at random (with replacement) from the MCB runs. In cases where the same MCB run was drawn, projections would still differ as a result of stochastic recruitment streams and stochastic effort reduction during the moratorium. Precision of projections was represented graphically by the $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{t h}$ percentiles of the replicate projections.

Rebuilding time frame Based on the 2008 (SEDAR-15) benchmark assessment of red snapper, a rebuilding plan is now under consideration by the SAFMC. Under this rebuilding plan, year one is 2010 and the target time frame for rebuilding is by the start of 2045 (i.e., during the year 2044). Thus, most projections were run to 2045, with 2044 being the critical year for rebuilding. Rebuilding is defined by the criterion that X\% of projection replicates achieve stock recovery (i.e., $\operatorname{SSB} \geq$ SSB $_{\text {MSY }}$ ).
In addition, the rebuilding time frame was re-examined based on results of this assessment. Under U.S. regulations, the maximum allowable rebuilding time frame is 10 years, if a stock can rebuild within 10 years with $F=0$. If not, the maximum allowable rebuilding time frame is one generation time (22 years for red snapper) plus the time required to achieve rebuilding with $F=0$.
Projection scenarios Eleven constant $-F$ projection scenarios were considered. Unless otherwise stated, the fishing rate in 2010 was $F_{\text {current }}$. The $F_{\text {rebuild }}$ is defined as the maximum $F$ that achieves rebuilding $(0.5,0.7$, or 0.9 probability) in the allowable time frame.

- Scenario 1: $F=0$
- Scenario 2: $F=F_{\text {current }}$
- Scenario 3: $F=65 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$
- Scenario 4: $F=75 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$
- Scenario 5: $F=85 \% F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$
- Scenario 6: $F=F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$
- Scenario 7: $F=F_{\text {current }}$, but reduced to account for continued moratorium throughout the projection
- Scenario 8: $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with probability 0.5 in the year 2044
- Scenario 9: $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with probability 0.7 in the year 2044
- Scenario 10: $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with probability 0.9 in the year 2044
- Scenario 11: $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with probability 0.5 in the year 2019


### 3.1.2 Model 1 Results

3.1.2.1 Measures of Overall Model Fit Generally, the Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM) fit well to the available data. Annual fits to length compositions from each fishery were reasonable in most years, as were fits to age compositions (Figure 3.3). Residuals of fits to age and length compositions, by year and fishery, are summarized with bubble plots; differences between annual observed and predicted vectors are summarized with angular deviation (Figure 3.4-3.13). Angular deviation is defined as the arc cosine of the dot product of two vectors.

The residuals from fits to length compositions show some consistent patterns of positive and negative values across years for the same length bins. These patterns might in part be a reflection of simplifying assumptions for modeling growth. For instance, the transition from age to length applied an age-length transition matrix, constructed with fixed growth parameters and one estimated parameter for standard deviation of length at age. More complex growth models are possible but would likely require additional data to support estimation of additional parameters. Furthermore, this model assumes that only legal-sized fish were retained, which would result in negative residuals for any observed fish below the minimum size limit.

The model was configured to fit observed commercial and recreational landings closely (Figures 3.14-3.17), as well as observed discards (Figures 3.18-3.20).

Fits to indices of abundance were reasonable (Figures 3.21-3.23). Since the early 1990s, the general trend in the commercial and for-hire indices is one of increase.
3.1.2.2 Parameter Estimates Estimates of all parameters from the catch-age model are shown in Appendix B. Estimates of management quantities and some key parameters, such as those of the spawner-recruit model, are reported in sections below.
3.1.2.3 Stock Abundance and Recruitment In general, estimated abundance at age shows a truncation of the older ages (Figure 3.24; Table 3.2). Total estimated abundance at the end of the assessment period shows sharp increase, reaching levels not seen since the late 1970s, albeit with a quite different age structure. This increase appears to be driven by recent recruitment. Annual number of recruits is shown in Table 3.2 (age- 1 column) and in Figure 3.25. Notably strong year classes (age-1 fish) were predicted to have occurred in 2006 and 2007.
3.1.2.4 Total and Spawning Biomass Estimated biomass at age follows a similar pattern as abundance at age (Figure 3.26; Table 3.3). Total biomass and spawning biomass show similar trends-general decline until the mid-1990s, and general increase since then but with a downturn at the end of the time series (Figure 3.27; Table 3.4).
3.1.2.5 Selectivity Selectivity of landings from commercial lines shifted to older ages with implementation of the 20 -inch size limit in 1992 (shown in Figure 3.28). In the most recent period, fish were estimated to be near fully selected by age 4 . Selectivity of landings from commercial dive was dome-shaped, saturating by age 10 at a value near 0.44 (Figure 3.28). Selectivities of landings from the for-hire fleet are shown in Figure 3.29, and those of the private recreational fleet in Figure 3.30. For both of these fleets, the descending limb saturates at 0.3 (as assumed), with an estimated quick descent from the age at full selection (age 3).

Estimated selectivity of discard mortalities from the commercial line was mostly on age-2 and age-3 fish, with relatively small (but positive) selection of age-1 and age-4 fish (Figure 3.31). Estimated selectivity of discard mortalities from the recreational (for-hire and private) fleets was mostly of age 2-fish but included age-1 fish; since 1992, it included age- 3 and some age- 4 fish. For the 20 -inch size limit in place at the end of the assessment period, few age- $5^{+}$fish were undersized.

Average selectivities of landings and of discard mortalities were computed from $F$-weighted selectivities in the most recent period of regulations (Figure 3.32). These average selectivities were used to compute benchmarks and central-tendency projections. All selectivities from the most recent period, including average selectivities, are tabulated in Table 3.5.
3.1.2.6 Fishing Mortality The estimated fishing mortality rates $(F)$ increased through the 1970 s, and since then have been quite variable (Figure 3.33). Recreational fleets dominate the total F.

Estimates of total $F$ at age are shown in Table 3.7. In any given year, the maximum $F$ at age (i.e., apical $F$ ) may be less than that year's sum of fully selected $F$ s across fleets. This inequality is due to the combination of two features of estimated selectivities: full selection occurs at different ages among gears and several sources of mortality have dome-shaped selectivity.

Table 3.8 shows total landings at age in numbers, and Table 3.9 in 1000 lb . In general, the majority of estimated landings are from for-hire and private recreational fleets (Figures 3.34, 3.35; Tables 3.10, 3.11). Estimated discard mortalities occur on a smaller scale than landings (Figure 3.36; Tables 3.12, 3.13)
3.1.2.7 Catch Curve Analysis Catch curve analysis suggested total mortality rate ( $Z=F+M$ ) ranged from near 0.0 to greater than 1.0, but the bulk of the point estimates were between 0.4 and 1.0 (SEDAR-24-AW07). Based on the constant estimate of natural mortality, $M=0.08$, these values of $Z$ suggest that fully selected fishing mortality rate is on the scale of $F=0.32$ to $F=0.92$, generally consistent with estimates from the catch-age model (Figure 3.33, Table 3.4). Nonetheless, estimates of mortality from catch curve analysis are not readily comparable to those from the BAM because of dome-shaped selectivity.
3.1.2.8 Spawner-Recruitment Parameters The estimated Beverton-Holt spawner-recruit curve is shown in Figure 3.37, along with the effect of density dependence on recruitment, depicted graphically by recruits per spawner as a function of spawners. Values of recruitment-related parameters were as follows: steepness $\widehat{h}=0.97$, unfished age- 1 recruitment $\widehat{R_{0}}=498,328$, unfished spawning biomass per recruit $\phi_{0}=9.322 e-4$, and empirical standard deviation of recruitment residuals in $\log$ space $\hat{\sigma}=0.58$ (which resulted in bias correction $\hat{\varsigma}=1.18$ ). Uncertainty in these quantities was estimated through the Monte Carlo/bootstrap (MCB) analysis (Figure 3.38). Although the estimate of steepness is high, it generally did not hit its upper bound and appears to be robust across MCB trials.
3.1.2.9 Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analyses Static spawning potential ratio (static SPR) shows a general trend of decline until the mid-1970s, and since then a stable trend at low values (Figure 3.39, Table 3.4).

Yield per recruit and spawning potential ratio were computed as functions of $F$ (Figure 3.40). As in computation of MSY-related benchmarks, per recruit analyses applied the most recent selectivity patterns averaged across fisheries, weighted by $F$ from the last three years (2007-2009). The Fs that provide $30 \%$, 40\%, and 50\% SPR are $0.18,0.13$, and 0.09 , respectively. For comparison, $F_{\text {MSY }}$ corresponds to about $21 \%$ SPR. Although this rate of fishing appears high relative to $F_{X \%}$ proxies, it occurs because the size limit offers some protection for spawners and because of the high estimate of steepness.

As in per recruit analyses, equilibrium landings and spawning biomass were computed as functions of $F$ (Figures 3.41). By definition, the $F$ that maximizes equilibrium landings is $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, and the corresponding landings and spawning biomass are MSY and $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Equilibrium landings and discards could also be viewed as functions of biomass $B$, which itself is a function of $F$ (Figure 3.42).
3.1.2.10 Benchmarks / Reference Points As described in §3.1.1.7, biological reference points (benchmarks) were derived analytically assuming equilibrium dynamics, corresponding to the spawner-recruit curve with bias correction (Figure 3.37). This approach is consistent with methods used in rebuilding projections (i.e., fishing at $F_{\text {MSY }}$ yields MSY from a stock size of $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ). Reference points estimated were $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, MSY, $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ and $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Based on $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, three possible values of $F$ at optimum yield (OY) were considered $-F_{\mathrm{OY}}=65 \% F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, $F_{\mathrm{OY}}=75 \% F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, and $F_{\mathrm{OY}}=85 \% F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ —and for each, the corresponding yield was computed. Standard errors of benchmarks were approximated as those from Monte Carlo/bootstrap analysis (§3.1.1.8).

Estimates of benchmarks are summarized in Table 3.14. Point estimates of MSY-related quantities were $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=$ $0.24 \mathrm{y}^{-1}$, MSY $=2192 \mathrm{klb}, B_{\mathrm{MSY}}=10750 \mathrm{mt}$, and $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112 \mathrm{mt}$. Distributions of these benchmarks are shown in Figure 3.43.
3.1.2.11 Status of the Stock and Fishery Estimated time series of stock status (SSB/MSST) shows decline until the mid-1980s, and then some increase since the mid-1990s, (Figure 3.44, Table 3.4). The increase in stock status appears to have been initiated by the 1992 management regulations, and then perhaps reinforced by strong recruitment events. Base-run estimates of spawning biomass have remained below MSST throughout most of the time series. Current stock status was estimated in the base run to be $\mathrm{SSB}_{2009} / \mathrm{MSST}=0.07$ (Table 3.14). Uncertainty from the MCB analysis suggests that the estimate of overfished status (i.e., SSB < MSST) is robust (Figures 3.45, 3.46). Age structure estimated by the base run shows fewer older fish than the (equilibrium) age structure expected at MSY (Figure 3.47). However, in the terminal year (2009), ages 2, 3, and 4 approach the MSY age structure as a result of recent strong year classes.

The estimated time series of $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ suggests that overfishing has been occurring throughout most of the assessment period (Figure 3.44, Table 3.4). Current fishery status in the terminal year, with current $F$ represented by the geometric mean from 2007-2009, is estimated by the base run to be $F_{2007-2009} / F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=3.64$ (Table 3.14). This estimate indicates current overfishing and appears robust across MCB trials (Figures 3.45, 3.46).
3.1.2.12 Sensitivity and Retrospective Analyses Sensitivity runs, described in §3.1.1.3, may be useful for evaluating implications of assumptions in the base assessment model, and for interpreting MCB results in terms of expected effects from input parameters. Plotted are time series of $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ and SSB/MSST for sensitivity to natural mortality (Figure 3.48), discard mortality (Figure 3.49), catchability (Figure 3.50), ageing error (Figure 3.51), continuity assumptions (Figure 3.52), starting year of the assessment model (Figure 3.53), landings streams (Figure 3.54), component weights of data sources (Figure 3.55), selectivity patterns (Figure 3.56), and compound extremes (Figure 3.57). In concert, sensitivity analyses suggested that qualitative results of the base run and MCB analysis were robust: the tendency was toward the status estimate of overfished, and toward the estimate of overfishing (Figure 3.59, Table 3.15). Retrospective analyses did not reveal strong patterns of overestimation or underestimation (Figure 3.58).
3.1.2.13 Projections Projection scenario 1, in which $F=0$, predicted the stock could rebuild within 10 years with greater than $50 \%$ chance of recovery (Figure 3.60). If used to define the rebuilding time frame, this result would suggest that rebuilding should occur in 2019 (or by the start of 2020).

The projection with $F$ at $F_{\text {current }}$ predicted the stock to remain at low levels (Figure 3.61, Table 3.16). Projections with $F$ at $65 \%, 75 \%, 85 \%$, or $100 \%$ of $F_{\text {MSY }}$ predicted increased biomass and landings (Figures 3.62-3.65, Tables 3.17-3.20). The continued moratorium projection also predicted increased biomass, but suggested that the moratorium alone is insufficient for stock recovery (Figure 3.66, Table 3.21). The $F_{\text {rebuild }}$ projections did allow stock recovery, by design (Figures 3.67, 3.68, Tables 3.22, 3.23). Two $F_{\text {rebuild }}$ projections (S8 and S10) were not completed in time for this draft report.

### 3.2 Model 2: Surplus Production Model

### 3.2.1 Model 2 Methods

3.2.1.1 Overview Assessments based on age or length structure are often favored because they incorporate more data on the structure of the population. However, these approaches typically involve fitting a large number of parameters, decomposing population dynamics into multiple processes including growth, mortality, and recruitment. A simplified approach, which may sacrifice some bias in favor of precision, is to aggregate data across age or length classes, and to summarize the relationship between complex population processes by using a simple mathematical model such as a logistic population model.

A logistic surplus production model, implemented in ASPIC (Prager 2005), was used to estimate stock status of red snapper off the southeastern U.S. While primary assessment of the stock was performed via the age-structured BAM, the surplus production approach was intended as a complement, and for additional verification that the age-structured approach was providing reasonable results.
3.2.1.2 Data Sources For use in the production model, data developed at the DW required some additional formatting, described below.

Landings The landings input to ASPIC must be in units of biomass. Headboat (1976-present) and MRFSS Private and Charter mode (1981-present) recreational landings in numbers and whole pounds were developed at the SEDAR-24 DW and adjusted during the development of data for input into the age-structured model. Historical landings (1950-1980) in numbers were developed during the SEDAR-24 DW using ratios to commercial
handline landings (see SEDAR-24 DW report). The charter boat portion of the for hire fleet and private landings in number were converted to pounds using the annual average weight of red snapper from the headboat survey during 1972-1980. The 1950-1971 estimated recreational for-hire and private landings in number were converted to weight using the average of the 1972-1974 annual headboat mean weights (4.2 lb). Commercial landings were developed in pounds and required no conversions. The recommended removals and three alternate series of landings were developed at the SEDAR-24 DW and adjusted by the SEDAR-24 AW panel for input to the age-structured model. These include lower and upper bounds for the commercial ratio method and the adjusted saltwater angling survey (SWAS) estimates of historical landings. The upper and lower bounds were converted to pounds as described above. The SWAS estimates were converted using the headboat average weights for the entire series. The landings were combined with discards in weight for total removals (Table 3.24).

Dead Discards Discard estimates were generated in numbers at the SEDAR-24 DW and adjusted during the development of data for input into the age-structured model. The for-hire and private discard estimates began in 1981. The commercial handline discard estimates (in numbers) started in 1992 when the 20-inch size limit was enacted. The weight of recreationally discarded fish was determined for each regulation period (1983-1991,1992-present) by calculating the sum of the products of the mean weight at each length bin (using the weight-length relationship) by the proportion of fish in that bin up to the size limit. Discards prior to the 1983 regulation were given the same average weight as the 1983-1991 period since there was little change in the length compositions from 1982-1983. The average weight of commercially discarded fish from 1992-present was determined from observed fish ( 2.9 lbs ). For ASPIC, the dead discards were combined with landings in weight to represent total removals (Table 3.24).

Indices of Abundance The headboat index for red snapper was developed in numbers of landed fish per angler hour. The surplus-production model requires input in pounds and therefore the headboat index was converted by multiplying the annual index by the annual mean weight from the headboat survey and scaling to the series to the mean. The commercial lines index was developed in pounds per hook hour. (Table 3.24).

An additional index was generated that incorporates a $2 \%$ catchability increase per year from the beginning of the earliest index (1976) until 2003 to match the AW recommendations on catchability. Many surplusproduction model runs were completed prior to this decision and are presented here as there is considerable uncertainty in the degree and functional form of the catchability changes.
3.2.1.3 Model Configuration and Equations Production modeling used the model formulation and ASPIC software of Prager (1994; 2005). This is an observation-error estimator of the continuous-time form of the Schaefer (logistic) production model (Schaefer 1954; 1957). Estimation was conditioned on catch.

The logistic model for population growth is the simplest form of a differential equation which satisfies a number of ecologically realistic constraints, such as a carrying capacity (a consequence of limited resources). When written in terms of stock biomass, this model specifies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d B_{t}}{d t}=r B_{t}-\frac{r}{K} B_{t}^{2} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B_{t}$ is biomass in year $t, r$ is the intrinsic rate of increase in absence of density dependence, and $K$ is carrying capacity (Schaefer 1954; 1957). This equation may be rewritten to account for the effects of fishing
by introducing an instantaneous fishing mortality term, $F_{t}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d B_{t}}{d t}=\left(r-F_{t}\right) B_{t}-\frac{r}{K} B_{t}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

By writing the term $F_{t}$ as a function of catchability coefficients and effort expended by fishermen in different fisheries, Prager (1994) showed how to estimate model parameters from time series of yield and effort. Nonparametric confidence intervals on parameters were estimated through bootstrap.

For red snapper, the model was configured using various combinations of removals, starting dates, and assumptions about changes in catchability. These combinations are defined in Table 3.25. Initial runs indicated the model had difficulty estimating the ratio of initial biomass to carrying capacity ( $B 1 / k$ ) and either did not converge or gave unrealistic results. Runs with $B 1 / k$ fixed at $0.2,0.4,0.6$, and 0.8 were suggested to test the sensitivity of the model fit. This was implemented fully for the runs without catchability increase. Runs with catchability increasing were suggested later in the assessment process and due to time constraints a limited number of runs were completed to complement the estimated value of $B 1 / k$ from 0.4 to 0.8 .

### 3.2.2 Model 2 Results

3.2.2.1 Model Fit The fit to the indices were similar across runs. Runs with higher $B 1 / k$ values (estimated or fixed) had higher CPUE values during the earliest part of the landings series where there were no observed indices. The runs with no catchability increase fit the early headboat index slightly better than the runs with catchability increase (Figure 3.69). All runs missed the reduction in CPUE in 2006 and subsequent increase until 2009 for both the headboat and commercial lines indices (Figures 3.69 and 3.70). CPUE was estimated to increase linearly from about 2004 until 2007 and then decrease slightly in 2008 and 2009 for all runs. Because all runs were conditioned on catch, landings were fit exactly.
3.2.2.2 Parameter Estimates and Uncertainty confidence intervals on the parameters and stock status were evaluated by bootstrapping the run that best matched the base BAM run. Of the 1000 runs 40 were excluded because they were near the lower bound set for carry capacity and gave spurious estimates. Uncertainty can also be examined across the different configurations of model runs with the caveat that not all runs are equally likely. For example a $B 1 / k$ value of 0.8 in 1976 seems unlikely, as does a $B 1 / k$ estimate of 0.2 in 1950.

Estimated values of $B 1 / k$ varied from 0.33 to 0.41 across all runs except those that started in the highest year of the landings (1968) which estimated $B 1 / k$ at 0.56 and 0.88 (Table 3.25 ). The bootstrap estimated the $80 \%$ confidence interval of $B 1 / k$ between 0.19 and 0.53 with a point estimate of 0.32 . MSY estimates ranged from 0.97 to 2.2 million pounds for all runs except for the run with high recreational landings which was around 3 million pounds for different levels of $B 1 / k$ (Table 3.26). Bootstrap runs estimated MSY between 1.7 and 3.1 million pounds with $80 \%$ confidence and a point estimate of 2.0 million pounds. $F_{\text {MSY }}$ estimates from the different runs ranged from 0.16 to .31 (Table 3.27). The $80 \%$ confidence interval from the bootstrap estimated $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ between 0.17 and 2.0. $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ estimates varied from 3.2 to 22.1 million pounds. The low value comes from the run starting in 1976 with high $B 1 / k$ and the high value is from the high recreational landings run with a low $B 1 / k$, both of which are unlikely (Table 3.28 ). The bootstrap run estimated an $80 \%$ confidence that $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ is between 5.0 and 12.2 million pounds with a point estimate at 9.5 million pounds.

Output from the ASPIC run configured as closely as possible to the base run of the BAM is in Appendix C.
3.2.2.3 Status of the Stock and Fishery Across a wide range of historical landings and assumptions of catchability and initial biomass, the models estimated red snapper are overfished and current fishing mortality (2009) is above levels that optimize sustained yield (Tables 3.29 and 3.29 ). Estimates of $F / F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ for all runs range from 2.21 to 3.67 and $B_{2010} /$ MSST ranges from 0.15 to 0.58 . The bootstrap run estimates the $80 \%$ confidence interval of $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ between 2.2 and 8.0 and $B_{2010} /$ MSST between 0.06 and 0.34 . Uncertainty in results was evaluated by comparing model configurations (Figures 3.71 and 3.72). The historical values differ as expected due to uncertainty in landings. However, the recent trends and final estimates are very similar across runs. Confidence intervals (80\%) for $B /$ MSST and $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ from the 960 bootstrap runs show increased uncertainty in the biomass estimate at the beginning and end of the series and little uncertainty in the $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ estimate (Figure 3.74). Kernel density plots were generated to evaluate the shape of the distribution of the current relative fishing mortality rate $F / F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ and biomass relative to the minimum spawning stock threshold B/MSST (Figure 3.73).
3.2.2.4 Discussion - Surplus Production Model The production model estimates that current stock size is below MSST and that the current level of fishing is above the limit reference point $F_{\text {MSY }}$ across all runs. The general effect of including an increase in catchability increased the estimate of current $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ and decreased the estimate of current stock status $B / \mathrm{MSST}$. The surplus production model, because it omits population age and size structure, does not make use of data on those characteristics. Because such data are available for red snapper, a model that uses them would normally be preferred for a detailed assessment on which to base management.

### 3.3 Discussion

### 3.3.1 Comments on Assessment Results

Estimated benchmarks played a central role in this assessment. Values of $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}$ and $F_{\text {MSY }}$ were used to gauge status of the stock and fishery, and for rebuilding projections, SSB reaching $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}$ was the criterion that defined a successfully rebuilt stock. Computation of benchmarks was conditional on selectivity. If selectivity patterns change in the future, for example as a result of new size limits or different catch allocations among sectors, estimates of benchmarks would likely change as well.

The base run of the Beaufort catch-age assessment model indicated that the stock is overfished $\left(\mathrm{SSB}_{2009} / \mathrm{MSST}=\right.$ 0.07), and that overfishing is occurring ( $F_{2007-2009} / F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=3.64$ ). These results did not appear subject to retrospective error and were consistent across all configurations used in sensitivity runs. In addition, the same qualitative findings resulted from production model applications and stochastic stock reduction analysis (SEDAR24-RW-02). The increase in biomass since the mid-1990s could indicate that the federal regulations implemented in 1992 have been effective, however those regulations do not appear adequate for rebuilding the stock.

Although qualitative results were robust, uncertainties remain, as in all assessments. Compared to other species, this stock of red snapper matures young relative to its maximum observed age. This could indicate that life-history characteristics, such as growth and maturity schedules, have adapted over time in response to exploitation. Resource managers might wish to consider possible evolutionary effects of fishing (Dunlop et al. 2009).

One source of uncertainty not modeled here is the aggregation of headboats and charterboats into the for-hire fleet, which was recommended by the DW. It was recognized by the AW that charterboats generally fish in
deeper water than headboats. Depth of the entire for-hire fleet was accounted for when estimating discard mortality rates. However, if selectivities differ between headboats and charterboats, the estimated selectivity of the for-hire fleet should be considered to represent the "average." Charterboat landings were generally higher than those of headboats, so if depths fished by charterboats resulted in selectivity that is less domeshaped than the pattern used here, results of this assessment would likely be overly optimistic.

Among the many decisions deliberated over by the AW panel was choice of the starting year of the model. The panel thought that it was important to include the 1960s, when landings appeared to have peaked, and to examine sensitivity to those landings through sensitivity and uncertainty analyses. Ignoring this early time frame could have ignored potential stock productivity (Rosenberg et al. 2005). However, the historical period (pre-1976) did not include age or length composition data, and thus it was not possible to estimate variability of year-class strength in the 1950s and 1960s. If potential stock productivity was higher in the 1950s and 1960s than in more recent time, this assessment could be overestimating steepness and underestimating the long-term potential MSY. Alternatively, the stock dynamics and productivity in the recent years might have resulted from environmental or ecological changes, and therefore the results from this assessment would represent our best estimate for the near future.

### 3.3.2 Comments on Projections

As usual, projections should be interpreted in light of the model assumptions and key aspects of the data. Some major considerations are the following:

- In general, projections of fish stocks are highly uncertain, particularly in the long term (e.g., beyond 5-10 years).
- Although projections included many major sources of uncertainty, they did not include structural (model) uncertainty. That is, projection results are conditional on one set of functional forms used to describe population dynamics, selectivity, recruitment, etc.
- Fisheries were assumed to continue fishing at their estimated current proportions of total effort, using the estimated current selectivity patterns. New management regulations that alter those proportions or selectivities would likely affect projection results.
- During the moratorium, fishing effort was assumed to range between $80 \%$ and $100 \%$ of the current level. This range should be examined when data become available to do so.
- The projections assumed that the estimated spawner-recruit relationship applies in the future and that past residuals represent future uncertainty in recruitment. If future recruitment is characterized by runs of large or small year classes, possibly due to environmental or ecological conditions, stock trajectories may be affected.
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### 3.5 Tables

Table 3.1. Life-history characteristics at age of the population, including average body size and weight (midyear), gonad weight, and proportion females mature.

| Age | Total length (mm) | Total length (in) | CV length | Whole weight (kg) | Whole weight (lb) | Gonad weight (kg) | Female maturity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 277.2 | 10.9 | 0.22 | 0.30 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.22 |
| 2 | 410.5 | 16.2 | 0.15 | 1.02 | 2.25 | 0.01 | 0.55 |
| 3 | 515.4 | 20.3 | 0.12 | 2.07 | 4.57 | 0.02 | 0.84 |
| 4 | 597.9 | 23.5 | 0.10 | 3.29 | 7.26 | 0.04 | 0.96 |
| 5 | 662.8 | 26.1 | 0.09 | 4.54 | 10.01 | 0.07 | 0.99 |
| 6 | 713.8 | 28.1 | 0.09 | 5.72 | 12.61 | 0.11 | 1.00 |
| 7 | 754.0 | 29.7 | 0.08 | 6.79 | 14.96 | 0.15 | 1.00 |
| 8 | 785.6 | 30.9 | 0.08 | 7.71 | 17.01 | 0.19 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 810.4 | 31.9 | 0.08 | 8.50 | 18.74 | 0.22 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 829.9 | 32.7 | 0.07 | 9.16 | 20.19 | 0.25 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 845.3 | 33.3 | 0.07 | 9.70 | 21.38 | 0.28 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 857.4 | 33.8 | 0.07 | 10.14 | 22.35 | 0.30 | 1.00 |
| 13 | 866.9 | 34.1 | 0.07 | 10.49 | 23.13 | 0.32 | 1.00 |
| 14 | 874.4 | 34.4 | 0.07 | 10.78 | 23.76 | 0.34 | 1.00 |
| 15 | 880.3 | 34.7 | 0.07 | 11.00 | 24.26 | 0.35 | 1.00 |
| 16 | 884.9 | 34.8 | 0.07 | 11.19 | 24.66 | 0.36 | 1.00 |
| 17 | 888.6 | 35.0 | 0.07 | 11.33 | 24.98 | 0.37 | 1.00 |
| 18 | 891.4 | 35.1 | 0.07 | 11.44 | 25.23 | 0.37 | 1.00 |
| 19 | 893.7 | 35.2 | 0.07 | 11.53 | 25.43 | 0.38 | 1.00 |
| 20 | 895.5 | 35.3 | 0.07 | 11.61 | 25.59 | 0.38 | 1.00 |

Table 3.2. Estimated total abundance at age (1000 fish) at start of year.
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Table 3．3．Estimated biomass at age（1000 lb）at start of year
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Table 3.4. Estimated time series and status indicators. Fishing mortality rate is apical $F$, which includes discard mortalities. Total biomass (B, mt) is at the start of the year, and spawning biomass (SSB, female gonad weight, $m t)$ at the end of July (time of peak spawning). The MSST is defined by MSST $=(1-M) \mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, with constant $M=0.08$. SPR is static spawning potential ratio.

| Year | $F$ | $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ | B | $B / B_{\text {unfished }}$ | SSB | SSB / $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}$ | SSB / MSST | SPR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1955 | 0.181 | 0.747 | 11342 | 0.2815 | 120.36 | 1.0732 | 1.1666 | 0.25266 |
| 1956 | 0.204 | 0.840 | 11479 | 0.2849 | 123.24 | 1.0989 | 1.1945 | 0.22442 |
| 1957 | 0.249 | 1.026 | 11500 | 0.2854 | 122.29 | 1.0904 | 1.1853 | 0.15993 |
| 1958 | 0.260 | 1.071 | 11195 | 0.2778 | 119.91 | 1.0692 | 1.1622 | 0.16072 |
| 1959 | 0.279 | 1.150 | 10915 | 0.2709 | 116.84 | 1.0419 | 1.1324 | 0.14363 |
| 1960 | 0.294 | 1.214 | 10546 | 0.2617 | 112.75 | 1.0053 | 1.0928 | 0.13174 |
| 1961 | 0.311 | 1.282 | 10128 | 0.2514 | 107.64 | 0.9598 | 1.0432 | 0.11689 |
| 1962 | 0.306 | 1.261 | 9640 | 0.2393 | 102.52 | 0.9142 | 0.9937 | 0.12319 |
| 1963 | 0.301 | 1.239 | 9248 | 0.2295 | 98.28 | 0.8763 | 0.9525 | 0.13148 |
| 1964 | 0.328 | 1.354 | 8954 | 0.2222 | 93.94 | 0.8376 | 0.9104 | 0.11254 |
| 1965 | 0.390 | 1.609 | 8582 | 0.2130 | 88.17 | 0.7862 | 0.8546 | 0.08144 |
| 1966 | 0.482 | 1.988 | 8024 | 0.1991 | 80.27 | 0.7158 | 0.7780 | 0.05262 |
| 1967 | 0.606 | 2.499 | 7239 | 0.1797 | 69.68 | 0.6213 | 0.6753 | 0.02950 |
| 1968 | 0.715 | 2.947 | 6193 | 0.1537 | 57.27 | 0.5107 | 0.5551 | 0.01848 |
| 1969 | 0.710 | 2.930 | 5078 | 0.1260 | 46.47 | 0.4143 | 0.4504 | 0.01975 |
| 1970 | 0.675 | 2.785 | 4284 | 0.1063 | 38.17 | 0.3404 | 0.3700 | 0.02201 |
| 1971 | 0.618 | 2.547 | 3713 | 0.0922 | 32.05 | 0.2858 | 0.3107 | 0.02739 |
| 1972 | 0.587 | 2.420 | 3355 | 0.0833 | 27.71 | 0.2471 | 0.2686 | 0.03113 |
| 1973 | 0.600 | 2.473 | 3143 | 0.0780 | 24.54 | 0.2188 | 0.2378 | 0.03047 |
| 1974 | 0.728 | 3.002 | 3006 | 0.0746 | 21.13 | 0.1884 | 0.2048 | 0.01645 |
| 1975 | 0.890 | 3.669 | 2727 | 0.0677 | 17.01 | 0.1517 | 0.1649 | 0.00885 |
| 1976 | 0.893 | 3.682 | 2416 | 0.0600 | 13.48 | 0.1202 | 0.1307 | 0.00880 |
| 1977 | 0.853 | 3.519 | 2232 | 0.0554 | 11.06 | 0.0986 | 0.1072 | 0.00952 |
| 1978 | 0.900 | 3.710 | 2008 | 0.0498 | 9.28 | 0.0828 | 0.0900 | 0.00822 |
| 1979 | 0.945 | 3.898 | 1697 | 0.0421 | 7.90 | 0.0704 | 0.0765 | 0.00764 |
| 1980 | 0.975 | 4.019 | 1488 | 0.0369 | 6.67 | 0.0595 | 0.0647 | 0.00676 |
| 1981 | 0.722 | 2.978 | 1307 | 0.0324 | 6.06 | 0.0540 | 0.0587 | 0.01475 |
| 1982 | 0.568 | 2.341 | 1137 | 0.0282 | 6.05 | 0.0540 | 0.0587 | 0.02541 |
| 1983 | 0.667 | 2.751 | 1175 | 0.0292 | 6.08 | 0.0542 | 0.0589 | 0.02059 |
| 1984 | 0.997 | 4.111 | 1354 | 0.0336 | 5.89 | 0.0526 | 0.0571 | 0.00903 |
| 1985 | 1.079 | 4.448 | 1279 | 0.0317 | 5.40 | 0.0482 | 0.0524 | 0.00609 |
| 1986 | 1.119 | 4.614 | 947 | 0.0235 | 4.51 | 0.0402 | 0.0437 | 0.00439 |
| 1987 | 1.157 | 4.770 | 716 | 0.0178 | 3.81 | 0.0339 | 0.0369 | 0.00790 |
| 1988 | 1.065 | 4.390 | 718 | 0.0178 | 3.27 | 0.0292 | 0.0317 | 0.00590 |
| 1989 | 0.989 | 4.079 | 676 | 0.0168 | 2.70 | 0.0241 | 0.0262 | 0.00562 |
| 1990 | 0.430 | 1.773 | 558 | 0.0139 | 2.60 | 0.0232 | 0.0252 | 0.03507 |
| 1991 | 0.607 | 2.502 | 623 | 0.0155 | 2.95 | 0.0263 | 0.0286 | 0.03209 |
| 1992 | 1.750 | 7.215 | 669 | 0.0166 | 2.58 | 0.0230 | 0.0250 | 0.00511 |
| 1993 | 0.660 | 2.723 | 579 | 0.0144 | 2.38 | 0.0213 | 0.0231 | 0.02272 |
| 1994 | 0.759 | 3.129 | 600 | 0.0149 | 2.52 | 0.0225 | 0.0244 | 0.01987 |
| 1995 | 0.734 | 3.025 | 557 | 0.0138 | 2.61 | 0.0233 | 0.0253 | 0.02152 |
| 1996 | 0.672 | 2.770 | 531 | 0.0132 | 2.75 | 0.0245 | 0.0266 | 0.03316 |
| 1997 | 1.711 | 7.055 | 580 | 0.0144 | 2.34 | 0.0209 | 0.0227 | 0.00491 |
| 1998 | 0.692 | 2.852 | 543 | 0.0135 | 2.20 | 0.0196 | 0.0214 | 0.03220 |
| 1999 | 1.112 | 4.587 | 762 | 0.0189 | 2.36 | 0.0211 | 0.0229 | 0.01166 |
| 2000 | 1.231 | 5.075 | 863 | 0.0214 | 2.43 | 0.0216 | 0.0235 | 0.00915 |
| 2001 | 0.818 | 3.371 | 888 | 0.0220 | 2.77 | 0.0247 | 0.0268 | 0.01717 |
| 2002 | 0.894 | 3.686 | 894 | 0.0222 | 3.16 | 0.0282 | 0.0307 | 0.01711 |
| 2003 | 0.699 | 2.881 | 876 | 0.0217 | 3.64 | 0.0325 | 0.0353 | 0.03005 |
| 2004 | 0.781 | 3.219 | 928 | 0.0230 | 4.16 | 0.0371 | 0.0403 | 0.02115 |
| 2005 | 0.788 | 3.248 | 826 | 0.0205 | 4.50 | 0.0401 | 0.0436 | 0.02269 |
| 2006 | 0.750 | 3.091 | 951 | 0.0236 | 4.71 | 0.0420 | 0.0457 | 0.03269 |
| 2007 | 1.337 | 5.513 | 1403 | 0.0348 | 4.77 | 0.0425 | 0.0462 | 0.00839 |
| 2008 | 0.682 | 2.810 | 1738 | 0.0431 | 5.72 | 0.0510 | 0.0554 | 0.02943 |
| 2009 | 0.754 | 3.108 | 1786 | 0.0443 | 6.86 | 0.0612 | 0.0665 | 0.02516 |
| 2010 | . | . | 1686 | 0.0418 | . | . | . | . |

Table 3.5. Selectivity at age (end-of-assessment time period) for commercial lines (cl), commercial dive (cd), for-hire (hb), private recreational (pvt), commercial lines discard mortalities (D.cl), for-hire discard mortalities (D.hb), private recreational discard mortalities (D.pvt), selectivity of landings averaged across fisheries (L.avg), and selectivity of discard mortalities averaged across fisheries (D.avg). TL is total length.

| Age | TL(mm) | TL(in) | cl | co | hb | rec | D.cl | D.hb | D.rec | L.avg | D.avg | L.avg+D.avg |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 277.2 | 10.9 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.049 | 0.181 | 0.181 | 0.000 | 0.059 | 0.059 |
| 2 | 410.5 | 16.2 | 0.029 | 0.030 | 0.075 | 0.001 | 0.688 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.021 | 0.334 | 0.355 |
| 3 | 515.4 | 20.3 | 0.597 | 0.493 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.433 | 0.433 | 0.840 | 0.160 | 1.000 |
| 4 | 597.9 | 23.5 | 0.987 | 1.000 | 0.551 | 0.551 | 0.066 | 0.066 | 0.066 | 0.571 | 0.022 | 0.593 |
| 5 | 662.8 | 26.1 | 1.000 | 0.918 | 0.323 | 0.323 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.403 | 0.002 | 0.405 |
| 6 | 713.8 | 28.1 | 1.000 | 0.786 | 0.301 | 0.301 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.386 | 0.000 | 0.386 |
| 7 | 754.0 | 29.7 | 1.000 | 0.613 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.383 | 0.000 | 0.383 |
| 8 | 785.6 | 30.9 | 1.000 | 0.501 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 9 | 810.4 | 31.9 | 1.000 | 0.457 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 10 | 829.9 | 32.7 | 1.000 | 0.443 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 11 | 845.3 | 33.3 | 1.000 | 0.439 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 12 | 857.4 | 33.8 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 13 | 866.9 | 34.1 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 14 | 874.4 | 34.4 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 15 | 880.3 | 34.7 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 16 | 884.9 | 34.8 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 17 | 888.6 | 35.0 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 18 | 891.4 | 35.1 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 19 | 893.7 | 35.2 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |
| 20 | 895.5 | 35.3 | 1.000 | 0.438 | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.382 | 0.000 | 0.382 |

Table 3.6. Estimated time series of fully selected fishing mortality rates for commercial lines (F.cl), commercial dive (F.cd), for-hire (F.hb), private recreational (F.pvt), commercial lines discard mortalities (F.cl.D), for-hire discard mortalities (F.hb.D), private recreational discard mortalities (F.pvt.D). Also shown is apical F, the maximum $F$ at age summed across fleets, which may not equal the sum of fully selected F's because of dome-shaped selectivities.

| Year | F.cl | F.cd | F.hb | F.pvt | F.cl.D | F.hb.D | F.pvt.D | Apical F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1955 | 0.022 | 0.000 | 0.132 | 0.027 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.181 |
| 1956 | 0.021 | 0.000 | 0.147 | 0.036 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.204 |
| 1957 | 0.039 | 0.000 | 0.164 | 0.046 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.249 |
| 1958 | 0.028 | 0.000 | 0.175 | 0.056 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.260 |
| 1959 | 0.031 | 0.000 | 0.182 | 0.065 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.279 |
| 1960 | 0.033 | 0.000 | 0.187 | 0.074 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.294 |
| 1961 | 0.041 | 0.000 | 0.188 | 0.082 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.311 |
| 1962 | 0.036 | 0.000 | 0.183 | 0.087 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.306 |
| 1963 | 0.028 | 0.000 | 0.178 | 0.094 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.301 |
| 1964 | 0.033 | 0.000 | 0.187 | 0.109 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.328 |
| 1965 | 0.040 | 0.000 | 0.214 | 0.136 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.390 |
| 1966 | 0.050 | 0.000 | 0.258 | 0.175 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.482 |
| 1967 | 0.074 | 0.000 | 0.310 | 0.222 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.606 |
| 1968 | 0.099 | 0.000 | 0.351 | 0.264 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.715 |
| 1969 | 0.080 | 0.000 | 0.352 | 0.279 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.710 |
| 1970 | 0.087 | 0.000 | 0.320 | 0.269 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.675 |
| 1971 | 0.085 | 0.000 | 0.280 | 0.253 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.618 |
| 1972 | 0.082 | 0.000 | 0.255 | 0.251 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.587 |
| 1973 | 0.073 | 0.000 | 0.254 | 0.273 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.600 |
| 1974 | 0.131 | 0.000 | 0.277 | 0.319 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.728 |
| 1975 | 0.183 | 0.000 | 0.318 | 0.389 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.890 |
| 1976 | 0.181 | 0.000 | 0.310 | 0.402 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.893 |
| 1977 | 0.207 | 0.000 | 0.277 | 0.369 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.853 |
| 1978 | 0.212 | 0.000 | 0.289 | 0.399 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.900 |
| 1979 | 0.173 | 0.000 | 0.315 | 0.458 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.945 |
| 1980 | 0.198 | 0.000 | 0.297 | 0.480 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.975 |
| 1981 | 0.195 | 0.000 | 0.181 | 0.346 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.722 |
| 1982 | 0.183 | 0.000 | 0.152 | 0.232 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.568 |
| 1983 | 0.187 | 0.000 | 0.212 | 0.185 | 0.000 | 0.094 | 0.018 | 0.667 |
| 1984 | 0.140 | 0.001 | 0.157 | 0.538 | 0.000 | 0.174 | 0.031 | 0.997 |
| 1985 | 0.135 | 0.003 | 0.280 | 0.569 | 0.000 | 0.044 | 0.096 | 1.079 |
| 1986 | 0.161 | 0.001 | 0.516 | 0.442 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.035 | 1.119 |
| 1987 | 0.173 | 0.000 | 0.243 | 0.361 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.418 | 1.157 |
| 1988 | 0.163 | 0.000 | 0.296 | 0.529 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.123 | 1.065 |
| 1989 | 0.262 | 0.000 | 0.205 | 0.522 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.050 | 0.989 |
| 1990 | 0.229 | 0.004 | 0.136 | 0.062 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.028 | 0.430 |
| 1991 | 0.131 | 0.010 | 0.165 | 0.186 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.145 | 0.607 |
| 1992 | 0.124 | 0.017 | 0.782 | 0.769 | 0.070 | 0.053 | 0.055 | 1.750 |
| 1993 | 0.273 | 0.012 | 0.191 | 0.158 | 0.052 | 0.087 | 0.122 | 0.660 |
| 1994 | 0.234 | 0.023 | 0.256 | 0.166 | 0.085 | 0.026 | 0.207 | 0.759 |
| 1995 | 0.221 | 0.017 | 0.330 | 0.038 | 0.110 | 0.107 | 0.159 | 0.734 |
| 1996 | 0.178 | 0.011 | 0.151 | 0.214 | 0.153 | 0.023 | 0.075 | 0.672 |
| 1997 | 0.164 | 0.016 | 1.301 | 0.091 | 0.169 | 0.071 | 0.031 | 1.711 |
| 1998 | 0.151 | 0.021 | 0.322 | 0.163 | 0.076 | 0.020 | 0.050 | 0.692 |
| 1999 | 0.124 | 0.020 | 0.548 | 0.292 | 0.053 | 0.086 | 0.227 | 1.112 |
| 2000 | 0.136 | 0.019 | 0.214 | 0.736 | 0.042 | 0.046 | 0.296 | 1.231 |
| 2001 | 0.211 | 0.027 | 0.164 | 0.338 | 0.038 | 0.052 | 0.269 | 0.818 |
| 2002 | 0.170 | 0.026 | 0.243 | 0.292 | 0.120 | 0.058 | 0.230 | 0.894 |
| 2003 | 0.120 | 0.020 | 0.253 | 0.190 | 0.041 | 0.043 | 0.263 | 0.699 |
| 2004 | 0.137 | 0.021 | 0.228 | 0.258 | 0.015 | 0.084 | 0.351 | 0.781 |
| 2005 | 0.103 | 0.010 | 0.237 | 0.226 | 0.023 | 0.215 | 0.330 | 0.788 |
| 2006 | 0.072 | 0.005 | 0.284 | 0.248 | 0.041 | 0.053 | 0.250 | 0.750 |
| 2007 | 0.105 | 0.010 | 0.238 | 0.881 | 0.019 | 0.081 | 0.223 | 1.337 |
| 2008 | 0.145 | 0.005 | 0.139 | 0.307 | 0.014 | 0.046 | 0.259 | 0.682 |
| 2009 | 0.157 | 0.004 | 0.179 | 0.354 | 0.026 | 0.038 | 0.190 | 0.754 |

Table 3.7. Estimated instantaneous fishing mortality rate (per yr) at age, including discard mortality
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Table 3.8. Estimated total landings at age in numbers (1000 fish)

Table 3.9. Estimated total landings at age in whole weight (1000 lb)
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Table 3.10. Estimated time series of landings in numbers (1000 fish) for commercial lines (L.cl), commercial combined (L.cd), for-hire (L.fh), and private recreational (L.pvt)

| Year | L.cl | L.cd | L.hb | L.pvt | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1955 | 41.30 | 0.00 | 150.95 | 29.72 | 221.97 |
| 1956 | 39.70 | 0.00 | 165.34 | 39.01 | 244.05 |
| 1957 | 70.41 | 0.00 | 179.75 | 48.93 | 299.09 |
| 1958 | 49.67 | 0.00 | 186.72 | 57.40 | 293.80 |
| 1959 | 53.16 | 0.00 | 189.22 | 65.03 | 307.42 |
| 1960 | 54.39 | 0.00 | 188.96 | 71.86 | 315.22 |
| 1961 | 64.63 | 0.00 | 184.65 | 77.04 | 326.31 |
| 1962 | 54.13 | 0.00 | 175.61 | 80.33 | 310.08 |
| 1963 | 41.81 | 0.00 | 169.18 | 85.41 | 296.40 |
| 1964 | 46.89 | 0.00 | 174.16 | 97.00 | 318.06 |
| 1965 | 55.52 | 0.00 | 191.37 | 115.88 | 362.77 |
| 1966 | 62.97 | 0.00 | 214.31 | 138.46 | 415.74 |
| 1967 | 82.78 | 0.00 | 231.97 | 157.64 | 472.38 |
| 1968 | 94.01 | 0.00 | 231.79 | 164.60 | 490.39 |
| 1969 | 64.67 | 0.00 | 211.46 | 157.24 | 433.37 |
| 1970 | 63.52 | 0.00 | 183.47 | 144.35 | 391.35 |
| 1971 | 58.55 | 0.00 | 158.83 | 134.33 | 351.70 |
| 1972 | 54.51 | 0.00 | 144.97 | 133.56 | 333.04 |
| 1973 | 47.82 | 0.00 | 145.73 | 146.02 | 339.56 |
| 1974 | 83.60 | 0.00 | 158.37 | 169.60 | 411.56 |
| 1975 | 104.26 | 0.00 | 170.91 | 192.47 | 467.65 |
| 1976 | 99.10 | 0.00 | 175.63 | 206.82 | 481.55 |
| 1977 | 122.45 | 0.00 | 170.01 | 209.13 | 501.59 |
| 1978 | 110.45 | 0.00 | 154.07 | 197.97 | 462.49 |
| 1979 | 75.43 | 0.00 | 133.59 | 181.71 | 390.73 |
| 1980 | 67.68 | 0.00 | 108.84 | 158.72 | 335.24 |
| 1981 | 81.71 | 0.00 | 72.49 | 131.44 | 285.64 |
| 1982 | 51.86 | 0.00 | 40.04 | 57.92 | 149.82 |
| 1983 | 51.92 | 0.00 | 62.40 | 45.83 | 160.15 |
| 1984 | 48.41 | 0.14 | 62.18 | 181.39 | 292.12 |
| 1985 | 48.50 | 0.29 | 99.88 | 188.33 | 337.00 |
| 1986 | 33.51 | 0.06 | 101.35 | 79.83 | 214.75 |
| 1987 | 25.98 | 0.00 | 38.73 | 48.44 | 113.16 |
| 1988 | 27.95 | 0.00 | 59.10 | 89.16 | 176.21 |
| 1989 | 49.51 | 0.00 | 42.75 | 97.19 | 189.46 |
| 1990 | 41.98 | 0.25 | 26.38 | 11.04 | 79.65 |
| 1991 | 23.62 | 0.79 | 30.16 | 30.82 | 85.39 |
| 1992 | 8.78 | 1.07 | 40.30 | 34.03 | 84.18 |
| 1993 | 18.85 | 0.66 | 14.30 | 10.47 | 44.29 |
| 1994 | 19.67 | 1.62 | 21.88 | 13.29 | 56.46 |
| 1995 | 17.85 | 1.18 | 22.08 | 2.38 | 43.49 |
| 1996 | 13.23 | 0.68 | 8.56 | 11.20 | 33.67 |
| 1997 | 9.62 | 0.79 | 56.78 | 3.52 | 70.71 |
| 1998 | 8.19 | 0.91 | 17.92 | 7.54 | 34.55 |
| 1999 | 9.34 | 1.27 | 47.33 | 22.17 | 80.10 |
| 2000 | 10.92 | 1.34 | 19.17 | 54.33 | 85.75 |
| 2001 | 22.82 | 2.47 | 21.98 | 40.57 | 87.83 |
| 2002 | 21.47 | 2.90 | 31.28 | 35.42 | 91.07 |
| 2003 | 14.12 | 2.09 | 24.75 | 16.54 | 57.50 |
| 2004 | 17.25 | 2.28 | 25.62 | 26.35 | 71.50 |
| 2005 | 12.97 | 1.04 | 24.16 | 22.09 | 60.27 |
| 2006 | 7.66 | 0.42 | 17.95 | 15.02 | 41.06 |
| 2007 | 9.41 | 0.75 | 17.41 | 31.81 | 59.39 |
| 2008 | 30.55 | 0.87 | 41.78 | 84.49 | 157.69 |
| 2009 | 42.76 | 1.07 | 49.93 | 91.79 | 185.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.11. Estimated time series of landings in whole weight (1000 lb) for commercial lines (L.cl), commercial other (L.cd), for-hire (L.hb), and private recreational (L.pvt)

| Year | L.cl | L.cd | L.hb | L.pvt | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1955 | 497.87 | 0.00 | 1143.29 | 232.52 | 1873.68 |
| 1956 | 484.37 | 0.00 | 1270.18 | 309.72 | 2064.26 |
| 1957 | 869.12 | 0.00 | 1394.56 | 392.53 | 2656.21 |
| 1958 | 617.42 | 0.00 | 1449.94 | 461.36 | 2528.72 |
| 1959 | 662.84 | 0.00 | 1463.71 | 521.07 | 2647.62 |
| 1960 | 677.25 | 0.00 | 1449.03 | 571.21 | 2697.49 |
| 1961 | 800.03 | 0.00 | 1396.52 | 604.42 | 2800.97 |
| 1962 | 662.74 | 0.00 | 1303.02 | 618.69 | 2584.46 |
| 1963 | 504.94 | 0.00 | 1231.45 | 645.51 | 2381.90 |
| 1964 | 559.62 | 0.00 | 1249.09 | 722.60 | 2531.31 |
| 1965 | 656.99 | 0.00 | 1355.34 | 853.29 | 2865.62 |
| 1966 | 740.31 | 0.00 | 1494.31 | 1005.66 | 3240.28 |
| 1967 | 964.17 | 0.00 | 1574.47 | 1118.02 | 3656.66 |
| 1968 | 1069.93 | 0.00 | 1494.44 | 1113.47 | 3677.84 |
| 1969 | 700.76 | 0.00 | 1258.79 | 985.30 | 2944.86 |
| 1970 | 641.14 | 0.00 | 1001.45 | 830.19 | 2472.78 |
| 1971 | 543.59 | 0.00 | 800.76 | 713.02 | 2057.37 |
| 1972 | 468.69 | 0.00 | 689.86 | 668.17 | 1826.71 |
| 1973 | 387.35 | 0.00 | 658.28 | 695.36 | 1740.99 |
| 1974 | 632.47 | 0.00 | 676.45 | 763.17 | 2072.09 |
| 1975 | 745.31 | 0.00 | 678.60 | 810.96 | 2234.87 |
| 1976 | 621.00 | 0.00 | 602.86 | 758.29 | 1982.14 |
| 1977 | 654.51 | 0.00 | 553.99 | 715.44 | 1923.95 |
| 1978 | 595.48 | 0.00 | 530.69 | 714.89 | 1841.06 |
| 1979 | 417.96 | 0.00 | 479.88 | 681.31 | 1579.15 |
| 1980 | 391.70 | 0.00 | 359.04 | 563.84 | 1314.58 |
| 1981 | 392.00 | 0.00 | 239.42 | 444.46 | 1075.89 |
| 1982 | 333.00 | 0.00 | 174.07 | 262.28 | 769.35 |
| 1983 | 330.17 | 0.00 | 224.19 | 183.90 | 738.26 |
| 1984 | 257.98 | 1.32 | 189.68 | 605.72 | 1054.69 |
| 1985 | 244.01 | 2.55 | 337.12 | 661.44 | 1245.12 |
| 1986 | 215.28 | 0.51 | 420.66 | 350.51 | 986.96 |
| 1987 | 177.93 | 0.03 | 142.95 | 200.35 | 521.26 |
| 1988 | 155.28 | 0.01 | 179.01 | 297.49 | 631.79 |
| 1989 | 236.22 | 0.01 | 131.26 | 316.48 | 683.96 |
| 1990 | 204.10 | 1.86 | 89.72 | 39.44 | 335.12 |
| 1991 | 129.46 | 5.89 | 113.36 | 123.33 | 372.04 |
| 1992 | 85.12 | 9.57 | 305.97 | 272.42 | 673.08 |
| 1993 | 169.68 | 5.59 | 95.96 | 72.41 | 343.65 |
| 1994 | 168.08 | 13.05 | 147.98 | 91.40 | 420.51 |
| 1995 | 160.94 | 10.02 | 158.29 | 17.43 | 346.67 |
| 1996 | 127.56 | 6.15 | 64.08 | 86.08 | 283.87 |
| 1997 | 98.78 | 7.52 | 438.23 | 28.38 | 572.91 |
| 1998 | 79.22 | 8.05 | 124.16 | 55.12 | 266.55 |
| 1999 | 79.65 | 9.96 | 311.16 | 150.21 | 550.98 |
| 2000 | 90.72 | 10.36 | 124.97 | 370.90 | 596.95 |
| 2001 | 175.85 | 18.25 | 138.95 | 262.19 | 595.23 |
| 2002 | 170.39 | 22.23 | 206.61 | 237.35 | 636.58 |
| 2003 | 123.55 | 17.55 | 174.37 | 120.52 | 435.99 |
| 2004 | 156.40 | 19.75 | 179.72 | 189.71 | 545.58 |
| 2005 | 123.63 | 9.38 | 178.06 | 164.93 | 475.99 |
| 2006 | 82.15 | 4.17 | 153.39 | 130.61 | 370.33 |
| 2007 | 105.03 | 7.52 | 131.40 | 320.05 | 564.00 |
| 2008 | 236.29 | 6.30 | 259.75 | 534.38 | 1036.72 |
| 2009 | 336.66 | 8.01 | 330.28 | 617.57 | 1292.52 |

Table 3.12. Estimated time series of dead discards in numbers (1000 fish) for commercial lines (D.cl), headboat (D.fh), and private recreational (D.pvt)

| Year | D.cl | D.hb | D.pvt | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | 0.00 | 17.46 | 3.39 | 20.85 |
| 1984 | 0.00 | 50.87 | 8.94 | 59.81 |
| 1985 | 0.00 | 11.42 | 24.90 | 36.32 |
| 1986 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 3.39 | 3.45 |
| 1987 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 40.84 | 40.91 |
| 1988 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 18.69 | 18.75 |
| 1989 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 7.80 | 7.86 |
| 1990 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 3.39 | 3.45 |
| 1991 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 14.00 | 14.28 |
| 1992 | 6.80 | 7.33 | 7.58 | 21.70 |
| 1993 | 7.12 | 13.63 | 18.99 | 39.75 |
| 1994 | 9.89 | 3.02 | 24.36 | 37.26 |
| 1995 | 9.34 | 10.00 | 14.82 | 34.17 |
| 1996 | 11.83 | 2.07 | 6.86 | 20.76 |
| 1997 | 13.13 | 7.80 | 3.38 | 24.32 |
| 1998 | 10.12 | 3.63 | 8.95 | 22.70 |
| 1999 | 9.27 | 19.44 | 51.20 | 79.91 |
| 2000 | 9.09 | 13.31 | 86.02 | 108.41 |
| 2001 | 9.14 | 13.48 | 70.18 | 92.80 |
| 2002 | 20.53 | 10.65 | 41.87 | 73.05 |
| 2003 | 6.71 | 8.90 | 54.47 | 70.09 |
| 2004 | 2.48 | 15.39 | 64.51 | 82.39 |
| 2005 | 2.40 | 20.39 | 31.39 | 54.18 |
| 2006 | 3.57 | 9.52 | 45.35 | 58.44 |
| 2007 | 7.09 | 48.59 | 133.03 | 188.71 |
| 2008 | 7.45 | 24.55 | 137.90 | 169.91 |
| 2009 | 9.79 | 14.40 | 71.65 | 95.85 |

Table 3.13. Estimated time series of dead discards in whole weight (1000 lb) for commercial lines (D.cl), for-hire (D.fh), and private recreational (D.pvt)

| Year | D.cl | D.hb | D.pvt | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1983 | 0.00 | 9.41 | 1.83 | 11.24 |
| 1984 | 0.00 | 28.11 | 4.94 | 33.05 |
| 1985 | 0.00 | 6.63 | 14.46 | 21.10 |
| 1986 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 1.91 | 1.94 |
| 1987 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 21.90 | 21.93 |
| 1988 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 10.30 | 10.33 |
| 1989 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 4.44 | 4.48 |
| 1990 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 1.94 | 1.98 |
| 1991 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 7.82 | 7.98 |
| 1992 | 15.27 | 13.89 | 14.36 | 43.51 |
| 1993 | 17.66 | 28.54 | 39.75 | 85.95 |
| 1994 | 25.86 | 6.52 | 52.66 | 85.04 |
| 1995 | 23.79 | 20.94 | 31.03 | 75.77 |
| 1996 | 29.11 | 4.15 | 13.74 | 47.00 |
| 1997 | 29.80 | 14.10 | 6.12 | 50.02 |
| 1998 | 23.13 | 6.91 | 17.05 | 47.10 |
| 1999 | 21.86 | 36.23 | 95.44 | 153.53 |
| 2000 | 20.87 | 25.95 | 167.71 | 214.54 |
| 2001 | 23.05 | 28.84 | 150.22 | 202.11 |
| 2002 | 53.14 | 21.79 | 85.67 | 160.60 |
| 2003 | 15.93 | 17.58 | 107.59 | 141.10 |
| 2004 | 6.28 | 33.32 | 139.63 | 179.22 |
| 2005 | 6.56 | 47.20 | 72.65 | 126.40 |
| 2006 | 6.59 | 10.75 | 51.21 | 68.56 |
| 2007 | 14.52 | 91.92 | 251.70 | 358.14 |
| 2008 | 19.27 | 52.79 | 296.47 | 368.52 |
| 2009 | 25.60 | 32.22 | 160.33 | 218.15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.14. Estimated status indicators, benchmarks, and related quantities from the Beaufort catch-age model, conditional on estimated current selectivities averaged across fisheries. Precision is represented by standard errors (SE) approximated from Monte Carlo/Bootstrap analysis. Estimates of yield do not include discards; $D_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ represents discard mortalities expected when fishing at $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Rate estimates ( $F$ ) are in units of $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$; status indicators are dimensionless; and biomass estimates are in units of metric tons or pounds, as indicated. Spawning stock biomass (SSB) is measured by total gonad weight of mature females. Symbols, abbreviations, and acronyms are listed in Appendix A.

| Quantity | Units | Estimate | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $F_{\text {MSY }}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.243 | 0.040 |
| $85 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.206 | 0.034 |
| 75\% $F_{\text {MSY }}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.182 | 0.030 |
| $65 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.158 | 0.026 |
| $F_{30 \%}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.175 | 0.033 |
| $F_{40 \%}$ | $\mathrm{y}^{-1}$ | 0.127 | 0.025 |
| $F_{50 \%}$ | $y^{-1}$ | 0.092 | 0.019 |
| $B_{\text {MSY }}$ | mt | 10750 | 2426 |
| $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}$ | mt | 112 | 32 |
| MSST | mt | 103 | 31 |
| MSY | 1000 lb | 2192 | 381 |
| $D_{\text {MSY }}$ | 1000 fish | 49 | 9 |
| $R_{\text {MSY }}$ | 1000 age-1 fish | 576 | 108 |
| Y at $85 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$ | 1000 lb | 2175 | 379 |
| Y at $75 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$ | 1000 lb | 2141 | 374 |
| Y at $65 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$ | 1000 lb | 2080 | 365 |
| $F_{2007-2009} / F_{\text {MSY }}$ | - | 3.64 | 0.57 |
| $\mathrm{SSB}_{2009} / \mathrm{MSST}$ | - | 0.07 | 0.03 |

Table 3.15. Results from sensitivity runs of the Beaufort catch-age model. Current F represented by geometric mean of last three assessment years. Spawning biomass was based on total gonad weight of mature females, with the exception of S9 which used body weight of mature females. See text for full description of sensitivity runs.

| Run | Description | $F_{\text {MSY }}$ | $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}(\mathrm{mt})$ | MSY(1000 lb) | $F_{2007-2009} / F_{\text {MSY }}$ | SSB $2009 / \mathrm{MSST}$ | steep | R0(1000) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base | - | 0.242 | 112 | 2192 | 3.64 | 0.07 | 0.972 | 498 |
| S1 | low M | 0.189 | 200 | 2657 | 5.05 | 0.03 | 0.989 | 374 |
| S2 | high M | 0.291 | 68 | 1875 | 2.7 | 0.13 | 0.93 | 737 |
| S3 | low disc M | 0.246 | 109 | 2284 | 3.46 | 0.07 | 0.967 | 502 |
| S4 | high disc M | 0.24 | 115 | 2111 | 3.81 | 0.07 | 0.976 | 494 |
| S5 | q const | 0.248 | 114 | 2149 | 3.08 | 0.09 | 0.972 | 500 |
| S6 | q 0.04 | 0.239 | 111 | 2208 | 3.98 | 0.06 | 0.972 | 493 |
| S7 | rand walk q | 0.239 | 117 | 2116 | 3.38 | 0.08 | 0.973 | 511 |
| S8 | age error | 0.264 | 113 | 2123 | 3.58 | 0.07 | 0.973 | 490 |
| S9 | continuity | 0.129 | 5061 | 2672 | 4.71 | 0.09 | 0.959 | 532 |
| S10 | styr 1976 | 0.237 | 148 | 2809 | 3.71 | 0.05 | 0.962 | 642 |
| S11 | low recr LD | 0.236 | 73 | 1477 | 3.88 | 0.08 | 0.976 | 322 |
| S12 | high recr LD | 0.248 | 153 | 2946 | 3.49 | 0.06 | 0.969 | 684 |
| S13 | low comm LD | 0.245 | 102 | 2002 | 3.77 | 0.07 | 0.973 | 453 |
| S14 | high comm LD | 0.24 | 123 | 2388 | 3.51 | 0.07 | 0.97 | 545 |
| S15 | U.hb 0.5 | 0.236 | 113 | 2206 | 4.05 | 0.05 | 0.971 | 510 |
| S16 | U.hb 2 | 0.251 | 111 | 2178 | 3.26 | 0.08 | 0.973 | 484 |
| S17 | U.cl 0.5 | 0.244 | 115 | 2167 | 3.18 | 0.08 | 0.972 | 504 |
| S18 | U.cl 2 | 0.239 | 109 | 2220 | 4.2 | 0.05 | 0.972 | 491 |
| S19 | age 0.5 | 0.257 | 110 | 2186 | 3.63 | 0.07 | 0.972 | 489 |
| S20 | age 2 | 0.233 | 113 | 2173 | 3.63 | 0.07 | 0.973 | 498 |
| S21 | len 0.5 | 0.236 | 109 | 2171 | 3.73 | 0.06 | 0.973 | 481 |
| S22 | len 2 | 0.25 | 114 | 2201 | 3.52 | 0.07 | 0.971 | 506 |
| S23 | comm 1.0 recr 0.1 | 0.308 | 106 | 1889 | 3.2 | 0.07 | 0.964 | 469 |
| S24 | comm 1.0 recr 0.5 | 0.196 | 113 | 2429 | 4 | 0.06 | 0.976 | 517 |
| S25 | comm 0.75 recr 0.1 | 0.322 | 106 | 1819 | 3.03 | 0.08 | 0.962 | 462 |
| S26 | comm 0.75 recr 0.3 | 0.247 | 113 | 2159 | 3.51 | 0.07 | 0.971 | 497 |
| S27 | comm 0.75 recr 0.5 | 0.197 | 115 | 2391 | 3.78 | 0.06 | 0.975 | 517 |
| S28 | comm 0.5 recr 0.1 | 0.343 | 106 | 1727 | 2.78 | 0.09 | 0.959 | 454 |
| S29 | comm 0.5 recr 0.3 | 0.254 | 114 | 2120 | 3.31 | 0.08 | 0.969 | 497 |
| S30 | comm 0.5 recr 0.5 | 0.2 | 114 | 2378 | 3.69 | 0.06 | 0.975 | 517 |
| S31 | extreme 1 | 0.386 | 72 | 1591 | 1.7 | 0.24 | 0.866 | 734 |
| S32 | extreme 2 | 0.144 | 226 | 3051 | 5.74 | 0.02 | 0.99 | 418 |

Table 3.16. Projection results under scenario 2—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {current }}$. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ midyear spawning stock ( mt ), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings ( 1000 lb ). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$ (mt), and MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Expected values presented are from deterministic projections (klb=1000 lb).

| Year | F(per yr) | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)$ | SSB(mt) | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | D(klb) | L(1000) | L(klb) | Sum L(klb) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.877 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 95 | 188 | 154 | 1318 | 1318 |
| 2012 | 0.877 | 0 | 10.54 | 465 | 105 | 209 | 153 | 1290 | 2608 |
| 2013 | 0.877 | 0 | 10.25 | 448 | 113 | 229 | 152 | 1272 | 3880 |
| 2014 | 0.877 | 0 | 9.85 | 445 | 112 | 229 | 158 | 1285 | 5165 |
| 2015 | 0.877 | 0 | 9.43 | 440 | 110 | 226 | 155 | 1248 | 6413 |
| 2016 | 0.877 | 0 | 9.07 | 435 | 109 | 223 | 153 | 1220 | 7633 |
| 2017 | 0.877 | 0 | 8.78 | 431 | 108 | 221 | 151 | 1196 | 8829 |
| 2018 | 0.877 | 0 | 8.54 | 427 | 107 | 219 | 149 | 1176 | 10,006 |
| 2019 | 0.877 | 0 | 8.36 | 423 | 106 | 217 | 147 | 1159 | 11,165 |
| 2020 | 0.877 | 0 | 8.2 | 421 | 105 | 215 | 146 | 1145 | 12,310 |
| 2021 | 0.877 | 0 | 8.07 | 418 | 104 | 214 | 144 | 1132 | 13,442 |
| 2022 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.97 | 416 | 104 | 212 | 143 | 1122 | 14,563 |
| 2023 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.88 | 415 | 103 | 211 | 142 | 1113 | 15,676 |
| 2024 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.8 | 413 | 103 | 210 | 142 | 1105 | 16,781 |
| 2025 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.73 | 412 | 103 | 210 | 141 | 1099 | 17,879 |
| 2026 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.68 | 411 | 102 | 209 | 140 | 1093 | 18,972 |
| 2027 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.63 | 410 | 102 | 208 | 140 | 1088 | 20,060 |
| 2028 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.59 | 409 | 102 | 208 | 139 | 1084 | 21,144 |
| 2029 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.55 | 409 | 102 | 208 | 139 | 1080 | 22,225 |
| 2030 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.52 | 408 | 101 | 207 | 139 | 1077 | 23,302 |
| 2031 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.5 | 408 | 101 | 207 | 138 | 1075 | 24,377 |
| 2032 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.47 | 407 | 101 | 207 | 138 | 1073 | 25,450 |
| 2033 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.45 | 407 | 101 | 206 | 138 | 1071 | 26,520 |
| 2034 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.44 | 406 | 101 | 206 | 138 | 1069 | 27,589 |
| 2035 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.42 | 406 | 101 | 206 | 138 | 1067 | 28,657 |
| 2036 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.41 | 406 | 101 | 206 | 137 | 1066 | 29,723 |
| 2037 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.4 | 406 | 101 | 206 | 137 | 1065 | 30,788 |
| 2038 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.39 | 405 | 101 | 206 | 137 | 1064 | 31,852 |
| 2039 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.38 | 405 | 101 | 206 | 137 | 1063 | 32,915 |
| 2040 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.38 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1063 | 33,978 |
| 2041 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.37 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1062 | 35,040 |
| 2042 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.36 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1062 | 36,102 |
| 2043 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.36 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1061 | 37,163 |
| 2044 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.36 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1061 | 38,224 |
| 2045 | 0.877 | 0 | 7.35 | 405 | 101 | 205 | 137 | 1060 | 39,284 |

Table 3.17. Projection results under scenario 3—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=65 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right.$ ) = proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ midyear spawning stock (mt), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings ( 1000 lb ). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$ (mt), and MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Expected values presented are from deterministic projections (klb=1000 lb).

| Year | F(per yr) | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)$ | SSB(mt) | R(1000) | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | D(klb) | L(1000) | L(klb) | Sum L(klb) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.158 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 19 | 39 | 34 | 288 | 288 |
| 2012 | 0.158 | 0 | 17.69 | 465 | 23 | 50 | 49 | 401 | 689 |
| 2013 | 0.158 | 0 | 23.56 | 497 | 26 | 56 | 60 | 507 | 1195 |
| 2014 | 0.158 | 0 | 30.39 | 518 | 28 | 60 | 70 | 613 | 1808 |
| 2015 | 0.158 | 0 | 38.07 | 533 | 29 | 64 | 79 | 721 | 2529 |
| 2016 | 0.158 | 0 | 46.42 | 544 | 30 | 66 | 87 | 827 | 3356 |
| 2017 | 0.158 | 0 | 55.25 | 552 | 31 | 67 | 94 | 931 | 4286 |
| 2018 | 0.158 | 0.01 | 64.35 | 559 | 31 | 69 | 101 | 1032 | 5318 |
| 2019 | 0.158 | 0.03 | 73.5 | 563 | 32 | 69 | 106 | 1128 | 6446 |
| 2020 | 0.158 | 0.08 | 82.49 | 567 | 32 | 70 | 112 | 1218 | 7664 |
| 2021 | 0.158 | 0.16 | 91.18 | 570 | 32 | 71 | 116 | 1303 | 8967 |
| 2022 | 0.158 | 0.28 | 99.47 | 572 | 32 | 71 | 120 | 1382 | 10,349 |
| 2023 | 0.158 | 0.42 | 107.29 | 573 | 33 | 71 | 124 | 1454 | 11,802 |
| 2024 | 0.158 | 0.56 | 114.58 | 575 | 33 | 71 | 127 | 1520 | 13,322 |
| 2025 | 0.158 | 0.68 | 121.33 | 576 | 33 | 72 | 129 | 1580 | 14,902 |
| 2026 | 0.158 | 0.78 | 127.51 | 577 | 33 | 72 | 132 | 1634 | 16,536 |
| 2027 | 0.158 | 0.86 | 133.15 | 578 | 33 | 72 | 134 | 1683 | 18,220 |
| 2028 | 0.158 | 0.91 | 138.25 | 578 | 33 | 72 | 136 | 1727 | 19,947 |
| 2029 | 0.158 | 0.94 | 142.87 | 579 | 33 | 72 | 138 | 1767 | 21,714 |
| 2030 | 0.158 | 0.96 | 147.02 | 579 | 33 | 72 | 139 | 1802 | 23,516 |
| 2031 | 0.158 | 0.98 | 150.74 | 580 | 33 | 72 | 141 | 1834 | 25,349 |
| 2032 | 0.158 | 0.99 | 154.06 | 580 | 33 | 72 | 142 | 1862 | 27,211 |
| 2033 | 0.158 | 0.99 | 157.03 | 580 | 33 | 72 | 143 | 1887 | 29,098 |
| 2034 | 0.158 | 0.99 | 159.66 | 581 | 33 | 72 | 144 | 1909 | 31,006 |
| 2035 | 0.158 | 1 | 162.01 | 581 | 33 | 72 | 145 | 1928 | 32,935 |
| 2036 | 0.158 | 1 | 164.09 | 581 | 33 | 72 | 145 | 1946 | 34,881 |
| 2037 | 0.158 | 1 | 165.94 | 581 | 33 | 72 | 146 | 1961 | 36,842 |
| 2038 | 0.158 | 1 | 167.58 | 581 | 33 | 73 | 146 | 1975 | 38,817 |
| 2039 | 0.158 | 1 | 169.03 | 581 | 33 | 73 | 147 | 1987 | 40,804 |
| 2040 | 0.158 | 1 | 170.32 | 581 | 33 | 73 | 147 | 1998 | 42,802 |
| 2041 | 0.158 | 1 | 171.46 | 582 | 33 | 73 | 148 | 2007 | 44,809 |
| 2042 | 0.158 | 1 | 172.47 | 582 | 33 | 73 | 148 | 2016 | 46,825 |
| 2043 | 0.158 | 1 | 173.36 | 582 | 33 | 73 | 148 | 2023 | 48,848 |
| 2044 | 0.158 | 1 | 174.15 | 582 | 33 | 73 | 149 | 2030 | 50,877 |
| 2045 | 0.158 | 1 | 174.85 | 582 | 33 | 73 | 149 | 2035 | 52,913 |

Table 3.18. Projection results under scenario 4-fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=75 \% F_{\text {MSY }} . F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ midyear spawning stock (mt), $R=$ recruits (1000 age-1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings ( 1000 lb ). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$ (mt), and MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Expected values presented are from deterministic projections ( $\mathrm{klb}=1000 \mathrm{lb}$ ).

| Year | $\mathrm{F}($ per yr $)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\right.$ SSB $\left._{\text {MSY }}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{mt})$ | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{klb})$ | $\mathrm{L}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{klb})$ | Sum L(klb) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.182 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 22 | 45 | 39 | 330 | 330 |
| 2012 | 0.182 | 0 | 17.38 | 465 | 27 | 57 | 55 | 453 | 783 |
| 2013 | 0.182 | 0 | 22.89 | 496 | 30 | 64 | 67 | 568 | 1352 |
| 2014 | 0.182 | 0 | 29.22 | 516 | 32 | 69 | 78 | 683 | 2034 |
| 2015 | 0.182 | 0 | 36.26 | 531 | 33 | 72 | 88 | 797 | 2832 |
| 2016 | 0.182 | 0 | 43.85 | 542 | 34 | 75 | 96 | 909 | 3741 |
| 2017 | 0.182 | 0 | 51.8 | 550 | 35 | 76 | 104 | 1018 | 4759 |
| 2018 | 0.182 | 0.01 | 59.93 | 556 | 36 | 78 | 111 | 1122 | 5882 |
| 2019 | 0.182 | 0.01 | 68.04 | 561 | 36 | 79 | 117 | 1222 | 7103 |
| 2020 | 0.182 | 0.04 | 75.95 | 565 | 37 | 80 | 122 | 1314 | 8418 |
| 2021 | 0.182 | 0.08 | 83.55 | 568 | 37 | 80 | 127 | 1400 | 9818 |
| 2022 | 0.182 | 0.14 | 90.74 | 570 | 37 | 81 | 131 | 1480 | 11,298 |
| 2023 | 0.182 | 0.23 | 97.47 | 572 | 37 | 81 | 134 | 1552 | 12,849 |
| 2024 | 0.182 | 0.34 | 103.7 | 573 | 37 | 81 | 137 | 1618 | 14,467 |
| 2025 | 0.182 | 0.45 | 109.43 | 574 | 37 | 81 | 140 | 1677 | 16,144 |
| 2026 | 0.182 | 0.55 | 114.64 | 575 | 37 | 82 | 143 | 1730 | 17,874 |
| 2027 | 0.182 | 0.64 | 119.36 | 576 | 37 | 82 | 145 | 1778 | 19,652 |
| 2028 | 0.182 | 0.72 | 123.61 | 577 | 38 | 82 | 147 | 1820 | 21,472 |
| 2029 | 0.182 | 0.78 | 127.42 | 577 | 38 | 82 | 148 | 1858 | 23,331 |
| 2030 | 0.182 | 0.83 | 130.82 | 578 | 38 | 82 | 150 | 1892 | 25,222 |
| 2031 | 0.182 | 0.87 | 133.85 | 578 | 38 | 82 | 151 | 1922 | 27,144 |
| 2032 | 0.182 | 0.9 | 136.54 | 578 | 38 | 82 | 152 | 1948 | 29,092 |
| 2033 | 0.182 | 0.92 | 138.92 | 579 | 38 | 82 | 153 | 1971 | 31,064 |
| 2034 | 0.182 | 0.94 | 141.02 | 579 | 38 | 82 | 154 | 1992 | 33,055 |
| 2035 | 0.182 | 0.95 | 142.88 | 579 | 38 | 82 | 155 | 2010 | 35,065 |
| 2036 | 0.182 | 0.96 | 144.51 | 579 | 38 | 82 | 155 | 2026 | 37,091 |
| 2037 | 0.182 | 0.97 | 145.95 | 579 | 38 | 82 | 156 | 2040 | 39,131 |
| 2038 | 0.182 | 0.97 | 147.22 | 580 | 38 | 82 | 157 | 2052 | 41,183 |
| 2039 | 0.182 | 0.98 | 148.34 | 580 | 38 | 82 | 157 | 2063 | 43,246 |
| 2040 | 0.182 | 0.98 | 149.32 | 580 | 38 | 82 | 157 | 2072 | 45,318 |
| 2041 | 0.182 | 0.98 | 150.19 | 580 | 38 | 82 | 158 | 2081 | 47,399 |
| 2042 | 0.182 | 0.98 | 150.95 | 580 | 38 | 82 | 158 | 2088 | 49,487 |
| 2043 | 0.182 | 0.99 | 151.61 | 580 | 38 | 83 | 158 | 2094 | 51,581 |
| 2044 | 0.182 | 0.99 | 152.2 | 580 | 38 | 83 | 159 | 2100 | 53,681 |
| 2045 | 0.182 | 0.99 | 152.71 | 580 | 38 | 83 | 159 | 2105 | 55,786 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.19. Projection results under scenario 5—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=85 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ midyear spawning stock (mt), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings ( 1000 lb ). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$ (mt), and MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Expected values presented are from deterministic projections ( $k l b=1000 \mathrm{lb}$ ).

| Year | $\mathrm{F}($ per yr$)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\right.$ SSB $\left._{\text {MSY }}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{mt})$ | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{klb})$ | $\mathrm{L}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{klb})$ | Sum L(klb) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.206 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 25 | 51 | 44 | 371 | 371 |
| 2012 | 0.206 | 0 | 17.07 | 465 | 30 | 64 | 61 | 504 | 876 |
| 2013 | 0.206 | 0 | 22.24 | 494 | 33 | 71 | 74 | 626 | 1502 |
| 2014 | 0.206 | 0 | 28.09 | 514 | 36 | 77 | 85 | 747 | 2249 |
| 2015 | 0.206 | 0 | 34.55 | 529 | 37 | 81 | 96 | 867 | 3116 |
| 2016 | 0.206 | 0 | 41.43 | 540 | 38 | 83 | 105 | 982 | 4098 |
| 2017 | 0.206 | 0 | 48.57 | 548 | 39 | 85 | 113 | 1094 | 5192 |
| 2018 | 0.206 | 0 | 55.82 | 554 | 40 | 87 | 120 | 1200 | 6392 |
| 2019 | 0.206 | 0.01 | 63 | 559 | 40 | 88 | 126 | 1301 | 7693 |
| 2020 | 0.206 | 0.01 | 69.96 | 563 | 41 | 89 | 131 | 1394 | 9086 |
| 2021 | 0.206 | 0.03 | 76.58 | 566 | 41 | 89 | 136 | 1479 | 10,566 |
| 2022 | 0.206 | 0.06 | 82.81 | 568 | 41 | 90 | 140 | 1558 | 12,124 |
| 2023 | 0.206 | 0.1 | 88.6 | 570 | 42 | 90 | 143 | 1629 | 13,753 |
| 2024 | 0.206 | 0.16 | 93.93 | 571 | 42 | 91 | 147 | 1693 | 15,446 |
| 2025 | 0.206 | 0.23 | 98.79 | 572 | 42 | 91 | 149 | 1751 | 17,196 |
| 2026 | 0.206 | 0.31 | 103.18 | 573 | 42 | 91 | 152 | 1802 | 18,998 |
| 2027 | 0.206 | 0.38 | 107.13 | 574 | 42 | 91 | 154 | 1847 | 20,846 |
| 2028 | 0.206 | 0.45 | 110.66 | 575 | 42 | 91 | 156 | 1888 | 22,733 |
| 2029 | 0.206 | 0.52 | 113.81 | 575 | 42 | 92 | 157 | 1924 | 24,657 |
| 2030 | 0.206 | 0.58 | 116.61 | 576 | 42 | 92 | 159 | 1955 | 26,612 |
| 2031 | 0.206 | 0.64 | 119.07 | 576 | 42 | 92 | 160 | 1983 | 28,595 |
| 2032 | 0.206 | 0.68 | 121.25 | 577 | 42 | 92 | 161 | 2007 | 30,603 |
| 2033 | 0.206 | 0.72 | 123.16 | 577 | 42 | 92 | 162 | 2029 | 32,631 |
| 2034 | 0.206 | 0.75 | 124.84 | 577 | 42 | 92 | 163 | 2047 | 34,678 |
| 2035 | 0.206 | 0.78 | 126.31 | 577 | 42 | 92 | 163 | 2064 | 36,742 |
| 2036 | 0.206 | 0.8 | 127.6 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 164 | 2078 | 38,820 |
| 2037 | 0.206 | 0.82 | 128.73 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 164 | 2090 | 40,910 |
| 2038 | 0.206 | 0.83 | 129.72 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 165 | 2101 | 43,012 |
| 2039 | 0.206 | 0.84 | 130.58 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 165 | 2111 | 45,123 |
| 2040 | 0.206 | 0.86 | 131.33 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 166 | 2119 | 47,242 |
| 2041 | 0.206 | 0.87 | 131.99 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 166 | 2126 | 49,368 |
| 2042 | 0.206 | 0.87 | 132.56 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 166 | 2133 | 51,501 |
| 2043 | 0.206 | 0.88 | 133.06 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 166 | 2138 | 53,639 |
| 2044 | 0.206 | 0.88 | 133.5 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 167 | 2143 | 55,782 |
| 2045 | 0.206 | 0.89 | 133.88 | 578 | 42 | 92 | 167 | 2147 | 57,929 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.20. Projection results under scenario 6 -fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {MSY }}$. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right.$ ) = proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ midyear spawning stock (mt), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings ( 1000 lb ). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$ (mt), and MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Expected values presented are from deterministic projections (klb=1000 lb).

| Year | $\mathrm{F}($ per yr) | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\right.$ SSB $\left._{\text {MSY }}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{mt})$ | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{klb})$ | $\mathrm{L}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{klb})$ | Sum L(klb) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.242 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 29 | 59 | 52 | 432 | 432 |
| 2012 | 0.242 | 0 | 16.62 | 465 | 35 | 74 | 70 | 576 | 1009 |
| 2013 | 0.242 | 0 | 21.3 | 492 | 39 | 82 | 83 | 707 | 1715 |
| 2014 | 0.242 | 0 | 26.49 | 511 | 41 | 89 | 96 | 834 | 2550 |
| 2015 | 0.242 | 0 | 32.13 | 525 | 43 | 93 | 106 | 958 | 3508 |
| 2016 | 0.242 | 0 | 38.05 | 536 | 44 | 96 | 116 | 1076 | 4584 |
| 2017 | 0.242 | 0 | 44.12 | 544 | 45 | 98 | 124 | 1189 | 5773 |
| 2018 | 0.242 | 0 | 50.21 | 550 | 46 | 100 | 131 | 1295 | 7068 |
| 2019 | 0.242 | 0 | 56.17 | 555 | 47 | 101 | 137 | 1394 | 8462 |
| 2020 | 0.242 | 0 | 61.88 | 559 | 47 | 102 | 143 | 1486 | 9948 |
| 2021 | 0.242 | 0.01 | 67.27 | 562 | 47 | 103 | 147 | 1569 | 11,516 |
| 2022 | 0.242 | 0.01 | 72.28 | 564 | 48 | 103 | 151 | 1644 | 13,160 |
| 2023 | 0.242 | 0.02 | 76.89 | 566 | 48 | 104 | 155 | 1711 | 14,872 |
| 2024 | 0.242 | 0.04 | 81.09 | 568 | 48 | 104 | 158 | 1772 | 16,644 |
| 2025 | 0.242 | 0.06 | 84.89 | 569 | 48 | 104 | 160 | 1825 | 18,469 |
| 2026 | 0.242 | 0.08 | 88.28 | 570 | 48 | 105 | 163 | 1873 | 20,341 |
| 2027 | 0.242 | 0.1 | 91.3 | 571 | 48 | 105 | 165 | 1914 | 22,256 |
| 2028 | 0.242 | 0.13 | 93.98 | 572 | 48 | 105 | 166 | 1951 | 24,207 |
| 2029 | 0.242 | 0.16 | 96.35 | 572 | 49 | 105 | 168 | 1983 | 26,190 |
| 2030 | 0.242 | 0.19 | 98.43 | 573 | 49 | 105 | 169 | 2011 | 28,201 |
| 2031 | 0.242 | 0.22 | 100.25 | 573 | 49 | 105 | 170 | 2035 | 30,236 |
| 2032 | 0.242 | 0.24 | 101.83 | 574 | 49 | 106 | 171 | 2056 | 32,292 |
| 2033 | 0.242 | 0.27 | 103.22 | 574 | 49 | 106 | 172 | 2075 | 34,367 |
| 2034 | 0.242 | 0.29 | 104.42 | 574 | 49 | 106 | 173 | 2091 | 36,458 |
| 2035 | 0.242 | 0.31 | 105.46 | 574 | 49 | 106 | 173 | 2105 | 38,562 |
| 2036 | 0.242 | 0.33 | 106.37 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 174 | 2117 | 40,679 |
| 2037 | 0.242 | 0.35 | 107.16 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 174 | 2127 | 42,806 |
| 2038 | 0.242 | 0.36 | 107.84 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 175 | 2136 | 44,942 |
| 2039 | 0.242 | 0.37 | 108.42 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 175 | 2144 | 47,086 |
| 2040 | 0.242 | 0.39 | 108.93 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 175 | 2150 | 49,236 |
| 2041 | 0.242 | 0.4 | 109.37 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 175 | 2156 | 51,392 |
| 2042 | 0.242 | 0.4 | 109.75 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 176 | 2161 | 53,553 |
| 2043 | 0.242 | 0.41 | 110.08 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 176 | 2165 | 55,718 |
| 2044 | 0.242 | 0.41 | 110.36 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 176 | 2169 | 57,888 |
| 2045 | 0.242 | 0.42 | 110.61 | 575 | 49 | 106 | 176 | 2172 | 60,060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.21. Projection results under scenario 7 -fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {current }}$, but all potential landings converted to discards (continued moratorium). $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}^{>} \mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)$ $=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$, $S S B=$ mid-year spawning stock (mt), $R=$ recruits (1000 age-1 fish), $D=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings (1000 lb). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr ), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112(\mathrm{mt})$, and $\mathrm{MSY}=2192(1000 \mathrm{lb})$. Expected values presented are from deterministic projections $(k l b=1000 \mathrm{lb})$.

| Year | $\mathrm{F}($ per yr $)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\right.$ SSB $\left._{\text {MSY }}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{mt})$ | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{klb})$ | $\mathrm{L}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{klb})$ | Sum L(klb) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.413 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 119 | 556 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 0.413 | 0 | 16.36 | 465 | 142 | 691 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 0.413 | 0 | 20.58 | 490 | 159 | 809 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 0.413 | 0 | 25.07 | 509 | 174 | 924 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | 0.413 | 0 | 29.79 | 522 | 186 | 1029 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 | 0.413 | 0 | 34.62 | 532 | 196 | 1126 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 0.413 | 0 | 39.49 | 540 | 204 | 1218 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 | 0.413 | 0 | 44.32 | 546 | 211 | 1303 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2019 | 0.413 | 0 | 49.02 | 551 | 217 | 1382 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2020 | 0.413 | 0 | 53.5 | 554 | 222 | 1455 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2021 | 0.413 | 0 | 57.71 | 558 | 226 | 1520 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 | 0.413 | 0 | 61.63 | 560 | 230 | 1580 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2023 | 0.413 | 0 | 65.22 | 562 | 233 | 1633 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2024 | 0.413 | 0 | 68.5 | 564 | 236 | 1681 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2025 | 0.413 | 0.01 | 71.47 | 565 | 238 | 1723 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 | 0.413 | 0.01 | 74.12 | 566 | 240 | 1760 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2027 | 0.413 | 0.01 | 76.49 | 567 | 242 | 1793 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2028 | 0.413 | 0.01 | 78.59 | 568 | 244 | 1822 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2029 | 0.413 | 0.02 | 80.45 | 568 | 245 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2030 | 0.413 | 0.02 | 82.09 | 569 | 246 | 1870 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2031 | 0.413 | 0.03 | 83.53 | 569 | 247 | 1889 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2032 | 0.413 | 0.03 | 84.79 | 570 | 248 | 1906 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2033 | 0.413 | 0.04 | 85.9 | 570 | 249 | 1921 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2034 | 0.413 | 0.04 | 86.86 | 570 | 249 | 1934 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2035 | 0.413 | 0.04 | 87.7 | 571 | 250 | 1945 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2036 | 0.413 | 0.05 | 88.42 | 571 | 250 | 1955 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2037 | 0.413 | 0.05 | 89.06 | 571 | 251 | 1963 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2038 | 0.413 | 0.06 | 89.61 | 571 | 251 | 1971 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2039 | 0.413 | 0.06 | 90.09 | 571 | 251 | 1977 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2040 | 0.413 | 0.06 | 90.5 | 571 | 252 | 1982 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2041 | 0.413 | 0.07 | 90.86 | 572 | 252 | 1987 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2042 | 0.413 | 0.07 | 91.18 | 572 | 252 | 1991 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2043 | 0.413 | 0.07 | 91.45 | 572 | 252 | 1995 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2044 | 0.413 | 0.07 | 91.68 | 572 | 252 | 1998 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2045 | 0.413 | 0.07 | 91.88 | 572 | 252 | 2001 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 3.22. Projection results under scenario 9-fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with rebuilding probability of 0.7 in 2044. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ mid-year spawning stock ( $m t$ ), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D$ $=$ discard mortalities ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings (1000 lb). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112(m t)$, and $\mathrm{MSY}=2192(1000 \mathrm{lb})$. Expected values presented are from deterministic projections (klb $=1000 \mathrm{lb}$ ).

| Year | F(per yr) | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)$ | SSB(mt) | R(1000) | D(1000) | D(klb) | L(1000) | L(klb) | Sum L(klb) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.223 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 27 | 55 | 48 | 400 | 400 |
| 2012 | 0.223 | 0 | 16.86 | 465 | 32 | 68 | 65 | 538 | 938 |
| 2013 | 0.223 | 0 | 21.8 | 493 | 36 | 76 | 78 | 665 | 1603 |
| 2014 | 0.223 | 0 | 27.34 | 513 | 38 | 82 | 90 | 789 | 2392 |
| 2015 | 0.223 | 0 | 33.4 | 527 | 40 | 86 | 101 | 911 | 3303 |
| 2016 | 0.223 | 0 | 39.82 | 538 | 41 | 89 | 110 | 1028 | 4331 |
| 2017 | 0.223 | 0 | 46.45 | 546 | 42 | 91 | 118 | 1141 | 5471 |
| 2018 | 0.223 | 0 | 53.14 | 552 | 43 | 93 | 125 | 1247 | 6719 |
| 2019 | 0.223 | 0 | 59.73 | 557 | 43 | 94 | 131 | 1347 | 8066 |
| 2020 | 0.223 | 0.01 | 66.08 | 561 | 44 | 95 | 137 | 1440 | 9506 |
| 2021 | 0.223 | 0.02 | 72.1 | 564 | 44 | 96 | 141 | 1525 | 11,031 |
| 2022 | 0.223 | 0.03 | 77.74 | 566 | 44 | 96 | 145 | 1602 | 12,633 |
| 2023 | 0.223 | 0.05 | 82.95 | 568 | 45 | 97 | 149 | 1672 | 14,305 |
| 2024 | 0.223 | 0.09 | 87.72 | 570 | 45 | 97 | 152 | 1734 | 16,039 |
| 2025 | 0.223 | 0.13 | 92.05 | 571 | 45 | 97 | 155 | 1790 | 17,829 |
| 2026 | 0.223 | 0.18 | 95.95 | 572 | 45 | 98 | 157 | 1840 | 19,669 |
| 2027 | 0.223 | 0.23 | 99.44 | 573 | 45 | 98 | 159 | 1884 | 21,552 |
| 2028 | 0.223 | 0.28 | 102.55 | 573 | 45 | 98 | 161 | 1922 | 23,474 |
| 2029 | 0.223 | 0.33 | 105.31 | 574 | 45 | 98 | 162 | 1956 | 25,431 |
| 2030 | 0.223 | 0.38 | 107.74 | 575 | 45 | 98 | 164 | 1986 | 27,417 |
| 2031 | 0.223 | 0.43 | 109.88 | 575 | 45 | 98 | 165 | 2012 | 29,429 |
| 2032 | 0.223 | 0.47 | 111.76 | 575 | 45 | 98 | 166 | 2035 | 31,465 |
| 2033 | 0.223 | 0.5 | 113.4 | 576 | 45 | 98 | 167 | 2055 | 33,520 |
| 2034 | 0.223 | 0.54 | 114.84 | 576 | 45 | 98 | 168 | 2073 | 35,593 |
| 2035 | 0.223 | 0.57 | 116.1 | 576 | 45 | 98 | 168 | 2088 | 37,680 |
| 2036 | 0.223 | 0.59 | 117.19 | 576 | 45 | 98 | 169 | 2101 | 39,781 |
| 2037 | 0.223 | 0.61 | 118.14 | 576 | 45 | 98 | 169 | 2112 | 41,894 |
| 2038 | 0.223 | 0.63 | 118.97 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 170 | 2122 | 44,016 |
| 2039 | 0.223 | 0.64 | 119.69 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 170 | 2131 | 46,147 |
| 2040 | 0.223 | 0.66 | 120.32 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 170 | 2139 | 48,286 |
| 2041 | 0.223 | 0.67 | 120.87 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 171 | 2145 | 50,431 |
| 2042 | 0.223 | 0.68 | 121.34 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 171 | 2151 | 52,582 |
| 2043 | 0.223 | 0.69 | 121.75 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 171 | 2156 | 54,738 |
| 2044 | 0.223 | 0.7 | 122.11 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 171 | 2160 | 56,898 |
| 2045 | 0.223 | 0.7 | 122.42 | 577 | 45 | 99 | 172 | 2164 | 59,062 |

Table 3.23. Projection results under scenario 11 -fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with rebuilding probability of 0.5 in 2019. $F=$ fishing mortality rate (per year), $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}\right)=$ proportion of stochastic projection replicates exceeding $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}, S S B=$ mid-year spawning stock ( $m t$ ), $R=$ recruits (1000 age- 1 fish), $D$ $=$ discard mortalities (1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), $L=$ landings ( 1000 fish or 1000 lb whole weight), and Sum $L=$ cumulative landings (1000 lb). For reference, estimated benchmarks are $F_{\text {MSY }}=0.24$ (per yr), $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112(m t)$, and $\mathrm{MSY}=2192(1000 \mathrm{lb})$. Expected values presented are from deterministic projections (klb $=1000 \mathrm{lb}$ ).

| Year | $\mathrm{F}(\mathrm{per} \mathrm{yr})$ | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{SSB}>\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}\right)$ | $\mathrm{SSB}(\mathrm{mt})$ | $\mathrm{R}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{klb})$ | $\mathrm{L}(1000)$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{klb})$ | Sum L(klb) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2010 | 0.413 | 0 | 8.06 | 396 | 111 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0.032 | 0 | 12.47 | 416 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 61 | 61 |
| 2012 | 0.032 | 0 | 19.42 | 465 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 90 | 151 |
| 2013 | 0.032 | 0 | 27.4 | 504 | 6 | 12 | 14 | 119 | 270 |
| 2014 | 0.032 | 0 | 37.3 | 527 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 150 | 419 |
| 2015 | 0.032 | 0 | 49.06 | 543 | 6 | 14 | 20 | 182 | 602 |
| 2016 | 0.032 | 0.01 | 62.5 | 554 | 7 | 14 | 22 | 216 | 818 |
| 2017 | 0.032 | 0.07 | 77.36 | 562 | 7 | 15 | 24 | 251 | 1069 |
| 2018 | 0.032 | 0.23 | 93.33 | 568 | 7 | 15 | 26 | 286 | 1354 |
| 2019 | 0.032 | 0.5 | 110.07 | 572 | 7 | 15 | 28 | 320 | 1674 |

Table 3.24. Input for Surplus-production model runs. Total removals in pounds including discards from historical time period (1950-1980) with alternate removal series in million pounds. Alternate series include a low recreational, high recreational, and adjusted Saltwater Angling Survey (SWAS) recreational estimate combined with commercial estimates. The removals from 1981-2009 are identical for all runs. The indices for headboat and commercial logbook are in units of pounds per angler hour and pounds per hook hour. An alternate series with a $2 \%$ increase in catchability starting in 1976 and saturating in 2003 after which there is no increase was developed by the SEDAR-24 AW panel.

| Year | Historic Removals (million pounds) |  |  |  | Indices |  |  | Removals(million pounds) Proposed | Indices |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Headboat | Headboat |  |  | Headboat | Headboat | Com. Logbook | Com. Logbook |
|  | Proposed | Low Rec. | High Rec. | SWAS |  | 2\%catch inc. | Year |  |  | 2\% catch. Inc. |  | 2\% catch. Inc. |
| 1950 | 0.807 | 0.537 | 1.473 | 0.697 |  |  | 1981 | 1.011 | 2.07 | 1.87 |  |  |
| 1951 | 1.014 | 0.710 | 1.739 | 0.941 |  |  | 1982 | 0.798 | 1.26 | 1.11 |  |  |
| 1952 | 0.930 | 0.594 | 1.706 | 0.897 |  |  | 1983 | 0.566 | 0.81 | 0.70 |  |  |
| 1953 | 1.000 | 0.622 | 1.843 | 0.995 |  |  | 1984 | 0.827 | 0.75 | 0.63 |  |  |
| 1954 | 1.271 | 0.840 | 2.205 | 1.276 |  |  | 1985 | 0.965 | 1.15 | 0.94 |  |  |
| 1955 | 1.254 | 0.763 | 2.288 | 1.260 |  |  | 1986 | 0.376 | 0.34 | 0.27 |  |  |
| 1956 | 1.340 | 0.778 | 2.493 | 1.331 |  |  | 1987 | 0.438 | 0.40 | 0.31 |  |  |
| 1957 | 1.826 | 1.192 | 3.101 | 1.800 |  |  | 1988 | 0.451 | 0.42 | 0.32 |  |  |
| 1958 | 1.639 | 0.956 | 2.985 | 1.633 |  |  | 1989 | 0.585 | 0.61 | 0.45 |  |  |
| 1959 | 1.727 | 1.009 | 3.113 | 1.763 |  |  | 1990 | 0.462 | 0.58 | 0.42 |  |  |
| 1960 | 1.769 | 1.026 | 3.175 | 1.862 |  |  | 1991 | 0.385 | 0.75 | 0.52 |  |  |
| 1961 | 1.895 | 1.144 | 3.291 | 1.900 |  |  | 1992 | 0.761 | 0.09 | 0.06 |  |  |
| 1962 | 1.734 | 0.993 | 3.085 | 1.678 |  |  | 1993 | 0.466 | 0.19 | 0.13 | 1.14 | 0.75 |
| 1963 | 1.570 | 0.828 | 2.898 | 1.435 |  |  | 1994 | 0.497 | 0.30 | 0.19 | 0.91 | 0.58 |
| 1964 | 1.694 | 0.897 | 3.092 | 1.404 |  |  | 1995 | 0.358 | 0.40 | 0.25 | 0.92 | 0.57 |
| 1965 | 1.942 | 1.034 | 3.510 | 1.417 |  |  | 1996 | 0.310 | 0.46 | 0.28 | 0.57 | 0.34 |
| 1966 | 2.216 | 1.169 | 4.002 | 1.914 |  |  | 1997 | 0.330 | 0.52 | 0.30 | 0.57 | 0.33 |
| 1967 | 2.593 | 1.434 | 4.554 | 2.553 |  |  | 1998 | 0.282 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 0.63 | 0.35 |
| 1968 | 2.727 | 1.543 | 4.709 | 3.073 |  |  | 1999 | 0.459 | 0.42 | 0.23 | 0.76 | 0.41 |
| 1969 | 2.243 | 1.129 | 4.066 | 3.118 |  |  | 2000 | 0.835 | 0.54 | 0.28 | 0.75 | 0.39 |
| 1970 | 2.013 | 0.995 | 3.595 | 3.473 |  |  | 2001 | 0.758 | 1.01 | 0.50 | 1.22 | 0.61 |
| 1971 | 1.770 | 0.807 | 3.116 | 3.203 |  |  | 2002 | 0.738 | 1.16 | 0.56 | 1.37 | 0.66 |
| 1972 | 1.625 | 0.819 | 3.111 | 3.088 |  |  | 2003 | 0.568 | 0.85 | 0.39 | 1.11 | 0.51 |
| 1973 | 1.447 | 0.791 | 3.064 | 2.709 |  |  | 2004 | 0.696 | 1.35 | 0.60 | 1.44 | 0.63 |
| 1974 | 1.988 | 0.951 | 3.355 | 2.652 |  |  | 2005 | 0.542 | 1.17 | 0.49 | 1.23 | 0.52 |
| 1975 | 2.238 | 1.172 | 3.709 | 2.514 |  |  | 2006 | 0.473 | 0.70 | 0.28 | 0.61 | 0.24 |
| 1976 | 1.952 | 0.958 | 3.460 | 2.143 | 1.80 | 1.80 | 2007 | 0.813 | 0.55 | 0.21 | 0.66 | 0.25 |
| 1977 | 2.313 | 0.996 | 3.995 | 2.327 | 2.14 | 2.10 | 2008 | 1.362 | 2.49 | 0.90 | 1.20 | 0.43 |
| 1978 | 1.924 | 0.902 | 3.298 | 1.884 | 1.74 | 1.67 | 2009 | 1.525 | 2.95 | 1.00 | 1.92 | 0.65 |
| 1979 | 2.034 | 0.808 | 3.984 | 2.138 | 2.64 | 2.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 1.262 | 0.584 | 2.213 | 1.290 | 1.08 | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3.25. Red snapper- Surplus-production model runs with several removal series (SEDAR-24 DW proposed removals, removals with the low recreational estimates, high recreational estimates and adjusted saltwater angling survey estimates), model starting years, and with and without a $2 \%$ change in catchability from 19762003. Runs designated with "nc" did not converge, runs designated "Lmsy" had MSY estimates much larger than the highest landings and are considered unreasonable. Many fixed B1/k runs were evaluated but were limited due to time constraints.

| Runs | Removals | Start <br> Year | 2\% q <br> increase | Estimated$B 1 / k$ | Fixed $B 1 / k$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 1 | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 0.33 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 2 | low recreational | 1950 | no | Lmsy | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 0.34 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no | Lmsy | nc | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 0.35 | Lmsy | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 0.56 | Lmsy | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no | Lmsy | Lmsy | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 0.32 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes | nc |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes | Lmsy |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 0.38 |  |  | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 0.88 |  | 0.4 | 0.6 |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 0.41 |  |  | 0.6 | nc |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 0.39 |  |  | 0.6 | 0.8 |

Table 3.26. Red snapper- Surplus-production model estimates of MSY in millions of pounds.

| Runs | Removals | Start <br> Year | $2 \% \mathrm{q}$ <br> increase | Estimated B1/k | Fixed $B 1 / k$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 1 | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 1.771 | 1.967 | 1.73 | 1.766 | 1.760 |
| 2 | low recreational | 1950 | no |  | 1.153 | 0.980 | 0.974 | 0.972 |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 3.083 | 3.636 | 3.011 | 2.907 | 2.839 |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no |  |  | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.136 |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 2.100 |  | 1.986 | 1.772 | 1.665 |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 1.771 |  | 1.998 | 1.603 | 1.451 |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no |  |  | 1.639 | 1.234 | 1.092 |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 1.980 | 2.538 | 1.862 | 1.784 | 1.699 |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 2.216 |  |  | 2.112 | 2.137 |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 1.633 |  | 1.971 | 1.731 |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 1.906 |  |  | 1.647 |  |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 1.672 |  |  | 1.29 | 1.151 |

Table 3.27. Red snapper-Surplus-production model estimates of $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$.

| Runs | Removals | Start <br> Year | $2 \%$ q <br> increase | Estimated <br> $B 1 / k$ | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 0.221 | 0.199 | 0.204 | 0.249 | 0.249 |
|  | low recreational | 1950 | no |  | 0.231 | 0.302 | 0.305 | 0.306 |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 0.169 | 0.164 | 0.169 | 0.168 | 0.162 |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no |  |  | 0.176 | 0.183 | 0.229 |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 0.205 |  | 0.203 | 0.232 | 0.222 |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 0.221 |  | 0.221 | 0.211 | 0.214 |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no |  |  | 0.261 | 0.246 | 0.265 |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 0.209 | 0.201 | 0.227 | 0.246 | 0.208 |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 0.241 |  |  | 0.214 | 0.229 |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 0.218 |  | 0.186 | 0.204 |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 0.19 |  |  | 0.236 |  |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 0.268 |  |  | 0.276 | 0.299 |

Table 3.28. Red snapper-Surplus-production model estimates of $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}-$ million pounds.

|  | Removals | Start <br> Runs | $2 \%$ q <br> increase | Estimated <br> $B 1 / k$ | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 8.01 | 9.908 | 8.474 | 7.083 | 7.077 |
| 2 | low recreational | 1950 | no |  | 4.992 | 3.252 | 3.189 | 3.174 |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 18.24 | 22.146 | 17.786 | 17.292 | 17.579 |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no |  |  | 11.382 | 10.955 | 9.321 |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 10.261 |  | 9.769 | 7.643 | 7.494 |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 8.01 |  | 9.051 | 7.592 | 6.785 |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no |  |  | 6.286 | 5.012 | 4.113 |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 9.460 | 12.643 | 8.208 | 7.246 | 8.164 |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 9.202 |  |  | 9.881 | 9.332 |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 7.496 |  | 10.569 | 8.476 |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 10.018 |  |  | 6.969 | 3.85 |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 6.244 |  |  | 4.674 | 3.85 |

Table 3.29. Red snapper- Surplus-production model estimates of $F_{2009} / F_{\text {MSY }}$.

|  | Removals | Start <br> Year | $2 \%$ <br> increase | $B 1 / k$ | Estimated | Fixed $B 1 / k$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Runs | Rem | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 2.31 | 2.35 | 2.33 | 2.27 | 2.28 |  |
| 2 | low recreational | 1950 | no |  | 2.6 | 2.64 | 2.64 | 2.65 |  |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 2.21 | 2.21 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.24 |  |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no |  |  | 2.39 | 2.38 | 2.29 |  |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 2.28 |  | 2.28 | 2.29 | 2.28 |  |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 2.31 |  | 2.29 | 2.27 | 2.3 |  |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no |  |  | 2.27 | 2.31 | 2.31 |  |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.59 | 3.5 | 3.7 |  |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 3.47 |  |  | 3.67 | 3.57 |  |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 3.65 |  | 3.81 | 3.72 |  |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 3.8 |  |  | 3.48 |  |  |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 3.45 |  |  | 3.37 | 3.41 |  |

Table 3.30. Red snapper- Surplus-production model estimates of $B_{2010} /$ MSST.

|  |  | Start | 2\% q | Estimated |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Runs | Removals | Year | increase | $B 1 / k$ | 0.3 | Fixed $B 1 / k$ |  |  |
| 1 | DW proposed | 1950 | no | 0.38 | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| 2 | low recreational | 1950 | no |  | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| 3 | high recreational | 1950 | no | 0.23 | 0.2 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| 4 | SWAS recreational | 1950 | no |  |  | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.32 |
| 5 | DW proposed | 1962 | no | 0.33 |  | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.4 |
| 6 | DW proposed | 1968 | no | 0.38 |  | 0.34 | 0.42 | 0.46 |
| 7 | DW proposed | 1976 | no |  |  | 0.41 | 0.52 | 0.58 |
| Match to Base | DW proposed | 1955 | yes | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.21 | $0.21 \mid$ |
| 9 | low recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | high recreational | 1955 | yes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | SWAS recreational | 1955 | yes | 0.18 |  |  | 0.17 | 0.18 |
| 12 | DW proposed | 1962 | yes | 0.23 |  | 0.18 | 0.21 |  |
| 13 | DW proposed | 1968 | yes | 0.19 |  |  | 0.23 |  |
| 14 | DW proposed | 1976 | yes | 0.23 |  |  | 0.3 | 0.32 |

### 3.6 Figures

Figure 3.1. Mean length at age (mm) and estimated 95\% confidence interval of the population.


Figure 3.2. Standard errors of management quantities with increased number of Monte Carlo/bootstrap trials.



Figure 3.3. Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey. In panels indicating the data set, lcomp refers to length compositions, acomp to age compositions, cl to commercial lines, cd to commercial dive, hb to for-hire, pvt to private recreational, cl.D to commercial discards, and hb.D to for-hire discards. The two years of pvt length compositions represent compositions pooled across years within the relevant time block of size-limit regulations. $N$ indicates the number of trips from which individual fish samples were taken.


Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
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Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
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Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
















Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
















Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
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Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
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Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.
















Figure 3.3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual length and age compositions by fleet or survey.





Figure 3.4. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from commercial lines landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.5. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from commercial dive landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.6. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from for-hire landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.7. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from private recreational landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. The two years shown represent length compositions pooled across years within the relevant time block of size-limit regulations. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.8. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from commercial lines discards; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.9. Top panel is a bubble plot of length composition residuals from for-hire discards; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.10. Top panel is a bubble plot of age composition residuals from commercial lines landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.11. Top panel is a bubble plot of age composition residuals from commercial dive landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.12. Top panel is a bubble plot of age composition residuals from for-hire landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.13. Top panel is a bubble plot of age composition residuals from private recreational landings; Dark represents overestimates and light underestimates. Bottom panel shows the angle (in degrees) between vectors of observations and estimates, with a reference line at 20 degrees. Error is bounded between 0 and 90 degrees, with 0 indicating a perfect fit.


Figure 3.14. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial lines landings (1000 lb whole weight).


Figure 3.15. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial dive (1000 lb whole weight).


Figure 3.16. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) for-hire landings (1000 fish).


Figure 3.17. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) private recreational landings (1000 fish). In years without observations, values were predicted using average $F$ (see §3.1.1.3 for details).


Figure 3.18. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial lines discard mortalities (1000 dead fish).


Figure 3.19. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) for-hire discard mortalities (1000 dead fish).


Figure 3.20. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) private recreational discard mortalities (1000 dead fish).


Figure 3.21. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) index of abundance from commercial lines.


Figure 3.22. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) index of abundance from the for-hire (headboats) fleet.


Figure 3.23. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) abundance from for-hire (headboat) discards.


Figure 3.24. Estimated abundance at age at start of year.


Figure 3.25. Top panel: Estimated recruitment of age-1 fish. Horizontal dashed line indicates $R_{\text {Msy. }}$. Bottom panel: log recruitment residuals.


Figure 3.26. Estimated biomass at age at start of year.


Figure 3.27. Top panel: Estimated total biomass (metric tons) at start of year. Horizontal dashed line indicates $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel: Estimated spawning stock (gonad biomass of mature females) at time of peak spawning.


Figure 3.28. Selectivities of commercial fleets. Top panel: commercial lines, 1955-1991. Middle panel: commercial lines, 1992-2009. Bottom panel: commercial dive.



Figure 3.29. Selectivities of the for-hire fleet. Top panel: 1955-1983. Middle panel: 1983-1991. Bottom panel: 1992-2009.


Figure 3.30. Selectivities of the private recreational fleet. Top panel: 1955-1983. Bottom panel: 1992-2009.



Figure 3.31. Selectivities of discard mortalities. Top panel: commercial lines, 1992-2009. Middle panel: recreational (for-hire and private), 1983-1991. Bottom panel: recreational (for-hire and private), 1992-2009.


Figure 3.32. Average selectivities from the terminal assessment year (2009, 20-inch limit), weighted by geometric mean Fs from the last three assessment years, and used in computation of benchmarks and central-tendency projections. Top panel: average selectivity applied to landings. Middle panel: average selectivity applied to discard mortalities. Bottom panel: total average selectivity.


Figure 3.33. Estimated fully selected fishing mortality rate (per year) by fishery. cl refers to commercial lines, $c d$ to commercial dive, $h b$ to for-hire, pvt to private recreational, cl.D to commercial discard mortalities, hb. $D$ to for-hire discard mortalities, and pvt.D to private recreational discard mortalities.


Figure 3.34. Estimated landings in numbers by fishery from the catch-age model. cl refers to commercial lines, cd to commercial dive, hb to for-hire, pvt to private recreational.



Figure 3.35. Estimated landings in whole weight by fishery from the catch-age model. cl refers to commercial lines, cd to commercial dive, hb to for-hire, pvt to private recreational.


| Fishery |
| :---: |
| $\square \mathrm{pvt}$ |
| $\square$ |
| $\square \mathrm{hb}$ |
| $\square \mathrm{cd}$ |
| $\square$ |
| $\square$ |



|  |
| :---: |

Figure 3.36. Estimated discard mortalities by fishery from the catch-age model. cl refers to commercial lines, hb to for-hire, pvt to private recreational.


Figure 3.37. Top panel: Beverton-Holt spawner-recruit curves, with and without lognormal bias correction. Years within panel indicate year of recruitment generated from spawning biomass one year prior. Bottom panel: log of recruits (number age-1 fish) per spawner (mature female gonad weight) as a function of spawners.



Figure 3.38. Probability densities of spawner-recruit quantities R0 (unfished recruitment of age-1 fish), steepness, unfished spawners per recruit, and standard deviation of recruitment residuals in log space. Vertical lines represent point estimates or values from the base run of the Beaufort Assessment Model.


Figure 3.39. Estimated time series of static spawning potential ratio, the annual equilibrium spawners per recruit relative to that at the unfished level.


Figure 3.40. Top panel: yield per recruit. Bottom panel: spawning potential ratio (spawning biomass per recruit relative to that at the unfished level), from which the $y \%$ levels provide $F_{y \%}$. Both curves are based on average selectivity from the end of the assessment period.


Figure 3.41. Top panel: equilibrium landings. The peak occurs where fishing rate is $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.24$ and equilibrium landings are MSY $=2192$ (1000 lb). Bottom panel: equilibrium spawning biomass. Both curves are based on average selectivity from the end of the assessment period.


Fishing mortality rate


Fishing mortality rate

Figure 3.42. Top panel: equilibrium landings as a function of equilibrium biomass, which itself is a function of fishing mortality rate. The peak occurs where equilibrium biomass is $B_{\mathrm{MSY}}=10750 \mathrm{mt}$ and equilibrium landings are MSY $=2192(1000 \mathrm{lb})$. Bottom panel: equilibrium discard mortality as a function of equilibrium biomass.



Equilibrium biomass (1000 mt)

Figure 3.43. Probability densities of MSY-related benchmarks from MCB analysis of the Beaufort Assessment Model. Vertical lines represent point estimates from the base run.


Figure 3.44. Estimated time series relative to benchmarks. Solid line indicates estimates from base run of the Beaufort Assessment Model; gray error bands indicate $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of the MCB trials. Top panel: spawning biomass relative to the minimum stock size threshold (MSST). Bottom panel: F relative to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$.



Figure 3.45. Probability densities of terminal status estimates from MCB analysis of the Beaufort Assessment Model. Vertical lines represent point estimates from the base run.



Figure 3.46. Phase plot of terminal status estimates from MCB analysis of the Beaufort Assessment Model. The intersection of crosshairs indicates estimates from the base run; lengths of crosshairs defined by $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles.


Figure 3.47. Age structure relative to the equilibrium expected at MSY.


Figure 3.48. Sensitivity to changes in natural mortality (sensitivity runs S1 and S2). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.49. Sensitivity to discard mortality rates (sensitivity runs $S 3$ and $S 4$ ). Top panel:Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel:Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.50. Sensitivity to catchability assumptions (sensitivity runs S5-S7). Top panel: Ratio of F to $F_{\mathrm{MSy}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.51. Sensitivity to ageing error (sensitivity run S8). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.52. Comparison to continuity assumptions (sensitivity run S9). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSy}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.53. Sensitivity to starting year of the assessment model (sensitivity run S10). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.54. Sensitivity to landings streams (sensitivity runs S11-S14). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSy}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.55. Sensitivity to component weights of data sources (sensitivity runs S15-S22). Top panel: Ratio of F to $F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.56. Sensitivity to selectivity patterns (sensitivity runs S23-S30). Top panel: Ratio of F to $F_{\mathrm{MSy}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.57. Sensitivity to compound extremes (sensitivity runs S31 and S32). Top panel: Ratio of $F$ to $F_{\mathrm{MSy}}$. Bottom panel: Ratio of SSB to MSST.



Figure 3.58. Retrospective analyses. Sensitivity to terminal year of data (sensitivity runs S33-S36). Top panel: Fishing mortality rate. Bottom panel: Spawning biomass.



Figure 3.59. Phase plot of terminal status estimates from sensitivity runs of the Beaufort Assessment Model.


Figure 3.60. Projection results under scenario 1 -fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=0$. Curve represents the proportion of projection replicates for which SSB(mid-year) has reached at least $\mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=112$.


Figure 3.61. Projection results under scenario 2—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {current }}$. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.62. Projection results under scenario 3-fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=65 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.63. Projection results under scenario 4-fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=75 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.64. Projection results under scenario 5—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=85 \% F_{\text {MSY }}$. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.65. Projection results under scenario 6-fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.66. Projection results under scenario 7-moratorium projection (all potential landings converted to discards). Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.67. Projection results under scenario 9—fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {rebuild }}$, with rebuilding probability of 0.70 in 2044. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.68. Projection results under scenario 11 -fishing mortality rate fixed at $F=F_{\text {rebuild, }}$ with rebuilding probability of 0.50 in 2019. Expected values represented by dotted solid lines, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to $5^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles of replicate projections. Horizontal lines mark MSY-related quantities. Spawning stock (SSB) is at mid-year.


Figure 3.69. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Fit of production model to the headboat index with and without a $2 \%$ catchability increase since 1976 saturating in 2003. The initial biomass relative to the carrying capacity $B 1 / k$ was estimated and fixed at a range of values.


Figure 3.70. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Fit of production model to the commercial lines index with and without a $2 \%$ catchability increase since 1976 saturating in 2003. The initial biomass relative to the carrying capacity $B 1 / k$ was estimated and fixed at a range of values.


Figure 3.71. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Production model estimates of relative biomass, B/MSST. The runs were made with and without a $2 \%$ catchability increase since 1976 saturating in 2003. The initial biomass relative to the carrying capacity $B 1 / k$ was estimated and fixed at a range of values.


Figure 3.72. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Production model estimates of relative fishing mortality rate. The runs were made with and without a $2 \%$ catchability increase since 1976 saturating in 2003. The initial biomass relative to the carrying capacity $B 1 / k$ was estimated and fixed at a range of values.


Figure 3.73. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Production model kernel density plots of relative biomass and relative fishing rate from 960 bootstrap runs of the model configured to match the input to the age structured model with $B 1 / k$ estimated.



Figure 3.74. Red Snapper in Atlantic: Production model time series plots of relative fishing rate and relative biomass from 960 bootstrap runs of the model configured to match the input to the age structured model with B1/k estimated.



## Appendix A Abbreviations and symbols

Table A.1. Acronyms and abbreviations used in this report

| Symbol | Meaning |
| :---: | :---: |
| ABC | Acceptable Biological Catch |
| AW | Assessment Workshop (here, for red snapper) |
| ASY | Average Sustainable Yield |
| B | Total biomass of stock, conventionally on January 1r |
| BAM | Beaufort Assessment Model (a statistical catch-age formulation) |
| CPUE | Catch per unit effort; used after adjustment as an index of abundance |
| CV | Coefficient of variation |
| DW | Data Workshop (here, for red snapper) |
| F | Instantaneous rate of fishing mortality |
| $F_{\text {MSY }}$ | Fishing mortality rate at which MSY can be attained |
| FL | State of Florida |
| GA | State of Georgia |
| GLM | Generalized linear model |
| K | Average size of stock when not exploited by man; carrying capacity |
| kg | Kilogram(s); 1 kg is about 2.2 lb . |
| klb | Thousand pounds; thousands of pounds |
| lb | Pound(s); 1 lb is about 0.454 kg |
| m | Meter(s); 1 m is about 3.28 feet. |
| M | Instantaneous rate of natural (non-fishing) mortality |
| MARMAP | Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction Program, a fishery-independent data collection program of SCDNR |
| MFMT | Maximum fishing-mortality threshold; a limit reference point used in U.S. fishery management; often based on $F_{\text {MSY }}$ |
| mm | Millimeter(s); 1 inch $=25.4 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| MRFSS | Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, a data-collection program of NMFS |
| MSST | Minimum stock-size threshold; a limit reference point used in U.S. fishery management. The SAFMC has defined MSST for red snapper as $(1-M) \mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}=0.7 \mathrm{SSB}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. |
| MSY | Maximum sustainable yield (per year) |
| mt | Metric ton(s). One mt is 1000 kg , or about 2205 lb . |
| $N$ | Number of fish in a stock, conventionally on January 1 |
| NC | State of North Carolina |
| NMFS | National Marine Fisheries Service, same as "NOAA Fisheries Service" |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; parent agency of NMFS |
| OY | Optimum yield; SFA specifies that OY $\leq$ MSY. |
| PSE | Proportional standard error |
| $R$ | Recruitment |
| SAFMC | South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (also, Council) |
| SC | State of South Carolina |
| SCDNR | Department of Natural Resources of SC |
| SEDAR | SouthEast Data Assessment and Review process |
| SFA | Sustainable Fisheries Act; the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as amended |
| SL | Standard length (of a fish) |
| SPR | Spawning potential ratio |
| SRA | Stock reduction analysis |
| SS3 | Stock Synthesis version 3, stock assessment software |
| SSB | Spawning stock biomass; mature biomass of males and females |
| $\mathrm{SSB}_{\text {MSY }}$ | Level of SSB at which MSY can be attained |
| SW | Scoping workshop; first of 3 workshops in SEDAR updates |
| TIP | Trip Interview Program, a fishery-dependent biodata collection program of NMFS |
| TL | Total length (of a fish), as opposed to FL (fork length) or SL (standard length) |
| VPA | Virtual population analysis, an age-structured assessment |
| WW | Whole weight, as opposed to GW (gutted weight) |
| yr | Year(s) |

## Appendix B Parameter estimates from the Beaufort Assessment Model

```
# Number of parameters = 341 Objective function value = 8803.92 Maximum gradient component = 7.82158e-05
# len_sd_val:
62.1739656172
# log_R0:
13.1190137910
# steep:
0.971542695316
# rec_sigma:
0.550608462688
# log_rec_dev:
    0.289966339531 0.295040266690 0.462316219626 0.719561565737 0.483442233820 0.357575647936
    0.0185408565987 0.639775967877 -0.988107251728 -0.310583765476 0.459521922872 0.671910403650
    -0.408871339301 -0.617576564635 0.0233647707307 0.259771013276 -0.1623188544410-0.426537302662
    -0.216723126502 -0.197334557123 -0.500795960728 -0.640847153619 -0.740910150534
    -0.608118813019 -0.0871771640455 0.190656178889 0.705278520674 0.525370576364
    -0.0929449857930 0.160339851000 0.0675242045289 -0.783646851600 -1.53681671954
    1.15112550534 0.784251902679 0.443833809405 -0.389857196516
# R_autocorr:
0.00000000000
# selpar_L50_cL2:
1.56993220797
# selpar_slope_cL2:
5.41405190827
# selpar_L50_cL3:
2.89975804541
# selpar_slope_cL3:
3.91642748811
# selpar_L502_cL:
8.00000000000
# selpar_slope2_cL:
1.00000000000
# selpar_min_cL:
0.500000000000
# se1par_Age1_cL_D3_1ogit:
-2.95886192771
# selpar_Age2_cL_D3_logit:
0.791379063303
# selpar_L50_cD3:
3.00854906162
# selpar_slope_cD3:
3.43961794021
# selpar_L502_cD:
6.38314900713
# selpar_slope2_cD:
1.28018789398
# selpar_min_cD:
0.437597689631
# selpar_L50_HB1:
1.19665963336
# selpar_slope_HB1:
7.39777597838
# se1par_L50_HB2:
1.21576215229
# se1par_slope_HB2:
5.43785033263
# selpar_L50_HB3:
2.49303883337
# selpar_slope_HB3:
5.08756028871
# selpar_L502_HB:
3.79179572603
# selpar_slope2_HB:
2.78336393366
# selpar_min_HB:
0.300000000000
# selpar_Age1_HB_D3_logit:
```

```
-1.50716863151
# selpar_L50_PVT2:
1.39021077897
# selpar_slope_PVT2:
4.74102175514
# selpar_L50_PVT3:
4.66795292916
# selpar_slope_PVT3:
2.68627785077
# selpar_L502_HB:
3.79179572603
# selpar_slope2_HB:
2.78336393366
# se1par_min_HB:
0.300000000000
# log_q_cL:
-6.91087207539
# log_q_HB:
-12.5270724835
# log_q_HBD:
-13.1545856055
# q_rate:
0.02000000000000
# q_DD_beta:
0.00000000000
# q_RW_1og_dev_cL:
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
# q_RW_1og_dev_HB:
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.000000000000
# q_RW_log_dev_HBD:
    0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000 0.00000000000
# log_avg_F_cL:
-2.25395301716
# log_F_dev_cL:
    -1.56090614880 -1.59715307262 -1.00135832801 -1.31743964390 -1.21637579903
    -1.15642211886 -0.943030820702 -1.08306021798 -1.31523404077 -1.17252749704
    -0.954686546598 -0.746741408918 -0.347202366970 -0.0545942846822 -0.275580183614
    -0.186982723907-0.207728584138-0.250457111620-0.3606344447675 0.225014067247
    0.557048040248 0.543627820764 0.677413357073 0.701120691854 0.498923565688 0.632816189034
    0.619780955235 0.555522082198 0.576721439792 0.285429284397 0.255097662843 0.425653222784
    0.499578635172 0.440295042733 0.916214272190 0.779767895216 0.222036036221 0.164599698128
    0.957427320662 0.799913225387 0.746523219706 0.526424534919 0.445158799032 0.361468664640
    0.166133435933 0.260043442347 0.696825374588 0.484544327589 0.131990746905 0.264081778880
    -0.0216568487061 -0.378704931036 0.00368856500702 0.322261240355 0.405332490811
# log_avg_F_cD:
-5.31969616941
# log_F_dev_cD:
    -1.29871357898 -0.512156770461 -1.98068857497 -4.59871446630 -5.20469504922 -5.76303091987
    -0.0933058397821 0.740158630364 1.25698783416 0.868123946623 1.52854232277 1.23609412143
    0.778628442636 1.19725009794 1.44773647685 1.41427600427 1.37084946079 1.69534841945
    1.66885518349 1.40186976919 1.46111719080 0.698900965084 -0.0182624520624 0.754461000193
    0.0515630205289 -0.101195234934
# log_avg_F_HB:
-1.41049285287
# log_F_dev_HB:
    -0.614016511088 -0.509631887378 -0.398149423733 -0.329994235352 -0.290854066706 -0.265327437399
    -0.260337816184 -0.288784642696 -0.314249916490 -0.267111438386-0.131327690354 0.0537692932699
    0.238589112694 0.363567628565 0.366019817166 0.269634007399 0.135981813400 0.0422397618960
    0.0390127736378 0.128313512541 0.264492862565 0.240292839193 0.128379198045 0.169034738887
    0.254616252138 0.195934926750 -0.297498906183-0.470728939324 -0.139387508959-0.440048109886
    0.136821371184 0.748353443613 -0.00618000081424 0.192072664981 -0.172480522989 -0.583113315989
    -0.391413594766 1.16407563659 -0.244171930160 0.0472392162121 0.300577228155 -0.479084712162
    1.67371898871 0.276769407022 0.808469473170 -0.132956232702 -0.397920306407-0.00514980619927
    0.0374108375243 -0.0670115705722 -0.0298706812492 0.151449231734 -0.0254959599676
```

```
-0.564630492138-0.309908380817
# log_avg_F_PVT:
-1.55225410872
# log_F_dev_PVT:
    -2.05832981789 -1.77261147990 -1.51759884751 -1.32667768573 -1.17514711119 -1.04746942187
    -0.948806866358 -0.884318160781 -0.810622513312 -0.664702664110 -0.444066387315 -0.191853951818
    0.0473693004688 0.221747064683 0.275352118645 0.238147097968 0.177472603682 0.168762549327
    0.253545004320 0.410376312535 0.606955666654 0.640816090997 0.555843318957 0.634052063709
    0.770428143026 0.818844141125 0.490643968106 0.0930298984019 -0.135346445926 0.932159945966
    0.987522589180 0.736175741840 0.532099416040 0.915875733910 0.901329079928-1.22586970020
    -0.129407027557 1.28962910823-0.295149670059 -0.242947697372 -1.71568167961 0.0126600110579
    -0.841077319283 -0.259422344584 0.319763525646 1.24637136249 0.466511826865 0.322092684546
    -0.107201602297 0.195688163718 0.0645315508658 0.157537957944 1.42533111361
    0.372940807682 0.512702432545
# F_init_ratio:
0.157678466915
# log_avg_F_cL_D:
-3.01569371075
# log_F_dev_cL_D:
    0.353148058022 0.0554898618258 0.555062880122 0.807385674279 1.13589400017 1.23489556557
    0.437439486262 0.0873623206375 -0.160611604588 -0.251031747329 0.892306591013-0.173720937807
    -1.20819998690 -0.773654849586 -0.166640270635 -0.964943703206 -1.23047055879 -0.629710779060
# log_avg_F_HB_D:
-3.80374694581
# log_F_dev_HB_D:
    1.43845010763 2.05751383000 0.683833963958 -3.51516334311 -3.51565806108 -3.95894546295
    -3.99152464524 -3.74497843873-2.01796652641 0.873357390461 1.36738084336 0.141795482549
    1.57307593525 0.0114384274700 1.16194577718 -0.102132963322 1.35253369491 0.720461411547
    0.841005257248 0.963221874719 0.656392806137 1.32396764035 2.26531919251 0.856922074979
    1.29451491642 0.725805229538 0.537433584639
# log_avg_F_PVT_D:
-2.11305516124
# log_F_dev_PVT_D:
    -1.89137498544 -1.37187985313 -0.227014101385 -1.24915180417 1.24018700061 0.0150204492568
    -0.891876522509 -1.47852214567 0.182790799070 -0.784265695998 0.00812623634908 0.539852802678
    0.275655777743 -0.481288118205 -1.36407885339 -0.890035120694 0.630454340063 0.895691187563
    0.800496395916 0.641485939122 0.777390065766 1.06621715523 1.00584312194 0.727091614722
    0.611103660163 0.760796054822 0.451284599565
```


# Appendix C ASPIC Output: Results of production model run matched to the base run of the BAM with a $2 \%$ increase in catchability and starting in 1955. 
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FIT program mode LOGISTIC mode1 mode YLD conditioning
SSE optimization
ASPIC User's Manual is available gratis from the author.

CONTROL PARAMETERS (FROM INPUT FILE) Input file: w: \... 24\assessment $\backslash$ aspic $\backslash$ inc catchability
Operation of ASPIC: Fit logistic (Schaefer) model by direct optimization.

| Number of years analyzed: | 55 | Number of bootstrap trials: | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Number of data series: | 2 | Bounds on MSY (min, max): | $8.000 \mathrm{E}+03$ |
| Objective function: | Least squares | Bounds on K (min, max): | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+07$ |
| Relative conv. criterion (simplex): | $1.000 \mathrm{E}-08$ | Monte Carlo search mode, trials: | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+07$ |
| Relative conv. criterion (restart): | $3.000 \mathrm{E}-08$ | Random number seed: | 100000 |
| Relative conv. criterion (effort): | $1.000 \mathrm{E}-04$ | Identical convergences required in fitting: |  |
| Maximum F allowed in fitting: | 8.000 |  | 82184571 |

PROGRAM STATUS INFORMATION (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED ANALYSIS) error code 0

Norma1 convergence
Number of restarts required for convergence: 116

CORRELATION AMONG INPUT SERIES EXPRESSED AS CPUE (NUMBER OF PAIRWISE OBSERVATIONS BELOW)


GOODNESS-OF-FIT AND WEIGHTING (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED ANALYSIS)

| Loss component number and title |  | Weighted SSE | N | Weighted MSE | Current weight | Inv. var. weight | R-squared in CPUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss(-1) | SSE in yield | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loss(0) | Penalty for B1 > K | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 1 | N/A | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | N/A |  |
| Loss(1) | Headboat Index (1976-2009), Total Ldgs | $1.450 \mathrm{E}+01$ | 34 | $4.530 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $7.920 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.363 |
| Loss(2) | Commercial | $3.801 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 17 | $2.534 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.416 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -1.051 |
| TOTAL OBJECTIVE FUNCTION, MSE, RMSE: |  | . $82985252 \mathrm{E}+01$ |  | $3.978 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 6.307E-01 |  |  |
| Estimated contrast index (ideal = 1.0): |  | 0.3943 |  | $\mathrm{C}^{*}=$ (Bmax | in)/K |  |  |
| Estimated nearness index (ideal = 1.0): |  | 0.9488 |  | $\mathrm{N}^{*}=1$ - | (B-Bmsy) \| |  |  |
| SAFMC Red Snapper (2010) Landings and Indices |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 2 |

MODEL PARAMETER ESTIMATES (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED)

| Parameter |  | Estimate | User/pgm guess | 2nd guess | Estimated | User guess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B1/K | Starting relative biomass (in 1955) | 3.219E-01 | $5.000 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $7.071 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 1 | 1 |
| MSY | Maximum sustainable yield | $1.980 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.500 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.041 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1 | 1 |
| K | Maximum population size | $1.892 \mathrm{E}+07$ | $3.000 \mathrm{E}+07$ | $4.800 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1 | 1 |


| phi | Shape of production curve (Bmsy/K) | 0.5000 | 0.5000 | ---- | 0 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Catchability Coefficients by Data Serie |  |  |  |  |  |
| q(1) | Headboat Index (1976-2009), Total Ldgs | $2.778 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5.000 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.750 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 1 | 1 |
| q(2) | Commercial | $4.514 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5.000 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4.750 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 1 | 1 |

MANAGEMENT and DERIVED PARAMETER ESTIMATES (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED)

| Parameter |  | Estimate | Logistic formula | General formula |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSY | Maximum sustainable yield | 1.980E+06 | ---- |  |
| Bmsy | Stock biomass giving MSY | $9.460 \mathrm{E}+06$ | K/2 | K*n**(1/(1-n)) |
| Fmsy | Fishing mortality rate at MSY | $2.093 \mathrm{E}-01$ | MSY/Bmsy | MSY/Bmsy |
| n | Exponent in production function | 2.0000 | ---- |  |
| g | Fletcher's gamma | $4.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | ---- | $[n * *(n /(n-1))] /[n-1]$ |
| B./Bmsy | Ratio: B (2010)/Bmsy | 1.716E-01 | ---- |  |
| F./Fmsy | Ratio: F(2009)/Fmsy | $3.668 \mathrm{E}+00$ | ---- |  |
| Fmsy/F. | Ratio: Fmsy/F(2009) | $2.726 \mathrm{E}-01$ | ---- |  |
| Y. (Fmsy) | Approx. yield available at Fmsy in 2010 | $3.398 \mathrm{E}+05$ | MSY*B./Bmsy | MSY*B./Bmsy |
|  | ...as proportion of MSY | $1.716 \mathrm{E}-01$ | ---- |  |
| Ye. | Equilibrium yield available in 2010 | $6.213 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4 * M S Y *(B / K-(B / K) * * 2)$ | $g * M S Y *(B / K-(B / K) * * n)$ |
|  | ...as proportion of MSY | $3.137 \mathrm{E}-01$ |  |  |
| fmsy(1) Headboat Index (1976-2009), Tota1 Ldgs SAFMC Red Snapper (2010) Landings and Indices |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $7.536 \mathrm{E}+05$ | Fmsy/q( 1) | Fmsy/q( 1 )Page 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

ESTIMATED POPULATION TRAJECTORY (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED)


| 33 | 1987 | 0.352 | $1.221 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.245 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.383 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.383 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.869 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.682 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.290 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | 1988 | 0.348 | $1.269 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.297 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.506 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.506 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.056 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.660 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.342 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 35 | 1989 | 0.457 | $1.324 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.281 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $5.852 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.852 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.999 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.182 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.400 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 36 | 1990 | 0.369 | $1.239 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.253 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.620 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.620 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.898 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.762 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.310 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 37 | 1991 | 0.289 | $1.267 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.333 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $3.851 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.851 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.186 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.381 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.339 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 38 | 1992 | 0.603 | $1.400 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.261 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $7.607 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.607 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.924 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.883 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.480 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 39 | 1993 | 0.417 | $1.132 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.119 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.663 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.663 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.407 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.991 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.196 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 40 | 1994 | 0.465 | $1.106 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.068 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.969 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.969 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.220 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.222 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.169 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 41 | 1995 | 0.337 | $1.031 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.062 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $3.580 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.580 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.197 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.610 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.090 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 42 | 1996 | 0.266 | $1.093 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.166 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $3.102 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.102 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.579 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.271 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.156 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 43 | 1997 | 0.247 | $1.241 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.334 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $3.298 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.298 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.189 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.181 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.312 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 44 | 1998 | 0.178 | $1.430 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.589 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.822 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.822 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $6.091 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.485 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.512 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 45 | 1999 | 0.244 | $1.757 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.880 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.593 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.593 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.086 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.167 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.857 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 46 | 2000 | 0.427 | $2.006 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.955 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $8.350 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.350 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.338 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.041 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.121 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 47 | 2001 | 0.403 | $1.905 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.880 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $7.581 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.581 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.089 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.926 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.014 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 48 | 2002 | 0.403 | $1.856 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.833 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $7.384 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.384 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $6.930 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.925 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.962 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 49 | 2003 | 0.302 | $1.810 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.880 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $5.682 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.682 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.089 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.443 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.914 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 50 | 2004 | 0.353 | $1.951 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.973 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $6.959 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $6.959 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.399 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.685 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.063 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 51 | 2005 | 0.256 | $1.995 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.116 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $5.418 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.418 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.867 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.223 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.109 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 52 | 2006 | 0.193 | $2.240 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.445 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $4.731 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.731 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.910 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $9.243 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $2.368 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 53 | 2007 | 0.297 | $2.658 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.742 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $8.135 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.135 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $9.815 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $1.417 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.810 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 54 | 2008 | 0.522 | $2.826 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.608 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.362 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.362 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $9.410 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.495 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.987 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 55 | 2009 | 0.768 | $2.405 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.986 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.525 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.525 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $7.430 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.668 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $2.542 \mathrm{E}-01$ |
| 56 | 2010 |  | $1.623 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | $1.716 \mathrm{E}-01$ |  |
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RESULTS FOR DATA SERIES \# 1 (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED)
Headboat Index (1976-2009), Total Ldgs w

| Data type CC: CPUE-catch series |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Series weight: 1.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Obs | Year | Observed CPUE | Estimated CPUE | Estim F | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Observed } \\ \text { yield } \end{array}$ | Mode1 <br> yield | Resid in log scale | Statist weight |  |
| 1 | 1955 | * | $1.764 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.1975 | 1.254E+06 | 1.254E+06 | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 2 | 1956 | * | $1.903 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.1955 | $1.340 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.340 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 3 | 1957 | * | $1.975 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2569 | $1.826 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.826 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 4 | 1958 | * | $2.012 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2263 | $1.639 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.639 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 5 | 1959 | * | $2.067 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2321 | $1.727 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.727 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 6 | 1960 | * | $2.108 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2331 | $1.769 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.769 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 7 | 1961 | * | $2.128 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2473 | $1.895 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.895 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 8 | 1962 | * | $2.156 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2234 | $1.734 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.734 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 9 | 1963 | * | $2.232 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.1954 | $1.570 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.570 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 10 | 1964 | * | $2.319 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2029 | $1.694 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.694 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 11 | 1965 | * | $2.356 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2290 | $1.942 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.942 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 12 | 1966 | * | $2.321 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.2652 | 2.216E+06 | $2.216 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 13 | 1967 | * | $2.189 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3291 | $2.593 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.593 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 14 | 1968 | * | $1.973 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3840 | $2.727 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.727 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 15 | 1969 | * | $1.791 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3479 | $2.243 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.243 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 16 | 1970 | * | $1.688 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3312 | $2.013 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.013 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 17 | 1971 | * | $1.639 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3000 | $1.770 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.770 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 18 | 1972 | * | 1.641E+00 | 0.2751 | $1.625 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.625 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 19 | 1973 | * | 1.691E+00 | 0.2377 | $1.447 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.447 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 20 | 1974 | * | $1.692 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3263 | $1.988 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.988 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 21 | 1975 | * | $1.574 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3950 | $2.238 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.238 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 22 | 1976 | $1.801 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.443 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.3757 | $1.952 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.952 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0.22131 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 23 | 1977 | $2.095 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.267 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.5071 | $2.313 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.313 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0. 50302 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 24 | 1978 | $1.671 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.058 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.5049 | $1.924 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.924 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0.45683 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 25 | 1979 | $2.486 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 8.257E-01 | 0.6844 | $2.034 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $2.034 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -1.10217 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 26 | 1980 | 9.914E-01 | $6.372 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.5502 | $1.262 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.262 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0.44199 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 27 | 1981 | $1.867 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $5.413 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.5188 | $1.011 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.011 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -1.23815 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 28 | 1982 | $1.107 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $4.845 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4577 | $7.985 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.985 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.82589 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 29 | 1983 | 6.977E-01 | 4.785E-01 | 0.3287 | $5.661 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.661 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.37723 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 30 | 1984 | $6.327 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 4.639E-01 | 0.4953 | 8.272E+05 | $8.272 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.31040 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 31 | 1985 | $9.436 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.730 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.7184 | $9.647 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $9.647 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.92819 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 32 | 1986 | $2.734 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.270 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3195 | $3.761 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.761 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.17891 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 33 | 1987 | $3.145 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.458 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3521 | $4.383 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.383 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.09476 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 34 | 1988 | 3.214E-01 | 3.602E-01 | 0.3475 | $4.506 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.506 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.11391 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 35 | 1989 | $4.488 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.558 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4568 | $5.852 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.852 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.23226 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 36 | 1990 | $4.166 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.480 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3688 | $4.620 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.620 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.17986 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |
| 37 | 1991 | $5.245 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.702 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2890 | $3.851 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.851 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.34851 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |  |


| 38 | 1992 | $6.395 \mathrm{E}-02$ | $3.502 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.6034 | $7.607 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.607 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 1.70023 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 39 | 1993 | $1.271 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.108 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4167 | $4.663 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.663 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.89417 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 40 | 1994 | $1.912 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $2.967 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4651 | $4.969 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.969 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.43976 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 41 | 1995 | $2.471 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $2.950 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3370 | $3.580 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.580 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.17743 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 42 | 1996 | $2.790 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.238 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2661 | $3.102 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.102 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.14914 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 43 | 1997 | $3.010 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $3.705 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2473 | $3.298 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $3.298 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.20751 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 44 | 1998 | $1.645 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $4.413 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.1776 | $2.822 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $2.822 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.98695 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 45 | 1999 | $2.260 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.221 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2443 | $4.593 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.593 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.83745 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 46 | 2000 | $2.805 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.430 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4271 | $8.350 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.350 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.66048 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 47 | 2001 | $5.031 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.222 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4032 | $7.581 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.581 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.03731 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 48 | 2002 | $5.578 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.091 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.4029 | $7.384 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $7.384 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.09142 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 49 | 2003 | $3.895 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.223 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3022 | $5.682 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.682 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.29332 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 50 | 2004 | $6.227 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.481 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.3527 | $6.959 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $6.959 \mathrm{E}+05$ | -0.12758 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 51 | 2005 | $5.363 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $5.878 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2560 | $5.418 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $5.418 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.09171 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 52 | 2006 | $3.206 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $6.791 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.1935 | $4.731 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $4.731 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0.75057 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 53 | 2007 | $2.545 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $7.617 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.2967 | $8.135 \mathrm{E}+05$ | $8.135 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 1.09622 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 54 | 2008 | $1.146 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $7.244 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.5223 | $1.362 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.362 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0.45892 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 55 | 2009 | $1.358 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $5.516 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.7678 | $1.525 \mathrm{E}+06$ | $1.525 \mathrm{E}+06$ | -0.90081 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |

RESULTS FOR DATA SERIES \# 2 (NON-BOOTSTRAPPED)
Commercial
Data type I1: Abundance index (annual average)
Series weight: 1.000

| Obs | Year | Observed effort | Estimated effort | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Estim } \\ \mathrm{F} \end{array}$ | Observed index | Mode1 <br> index | Resid in log index | Statist weight |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1955 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.866 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 2 | 1956 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.092 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 3 | 1957 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.209 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 4 | 1958 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.269 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | 1.000E +00 |
| 5 | 1959 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.358 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 6 | 1960 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.425 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 7 | 1961 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.458 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 8 | 1962 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.503 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 9 | 1963 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.628 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 10 | 1964 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.768 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 11 | 1965 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.829 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 12 | 1966 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.771 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 13 | 1967 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.556 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 14 | 1968 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $3.206 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 15 | 1969 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.910 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 16 | 1970 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.743 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 17 | 1971 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.664 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 18 | 1972 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.666 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 19 | 1973 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.747 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 20 | 1974 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.750 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 21 | 1975 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.558 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 22 | 1976 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.345 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 23 | 1977 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $2.059 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 24 | 1978 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $1.720 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 25 | 1979 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $1.342 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 26 | 1980 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $1.036 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 27 | 1981 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | 8.797E-01 | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 28 | 1982 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $7.874 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 29 | 1983 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $7.775 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 30 | 1984 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $7.538 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 31 | 1985 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $6.061 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 32 | 1986 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.314 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 33 | 1987 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.619 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 34 | 1988 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.853 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 35 | 1989 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.782 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 36 | 1990 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.655 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 37 | 1991 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $6.015 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 38 | 1992 | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $0.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | * | $5.690 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.00000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 39 | 1993 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $1.137 \mathrm{E}+00$ | 5.051E-01 | 0.81143 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 40 | 1994 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | 8.957E-01 | $4.822 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.61926 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 41 | 1995 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | 8.851E-01 | $4.794 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.61314 | 1.000E+00 |
| 42 | 1996 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $5.386 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 5.262E-01 | 0.02330 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 43 | 1997 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $5.216 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 6.020E-01 | -0.14328 | 1.000E+00 |


| 44 | 1998 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $5.688 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $7.172 \mathrm{E}-01$ | -0.23176 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 45 | 1999 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $6.653 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $8.484 \mathrm{E}-01$ | -0.24320 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 46 | 2000 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $6.407 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $8.824 \mathrm{E}-01$ | -0.32005 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 47 | 2001 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $1.023 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $8.487 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.18696 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 48 | 2002 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $1.119 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $8.273 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.30227 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 49 | 2003 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $8.888 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $8.488 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.04609 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 50 | 2004 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $1.123 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $8.907 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.23193 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 51 | 2005 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $9.333 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $9.552 \mathrm{E}-01$ | -0.02324 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 52 | 2006 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $4.499 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.104 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -0.89728 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 53 | 2007 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $4.781 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.238 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -0.95124 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 54 | 2008 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $8.407 \mathrm{E}-01$ | $1.177 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -0.33661 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |
| 55 | 2009 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ | -- | $1.304 \mathrm{E}+00$ | $8.963 \mathrm{E}-01$ | 0.37506 | $1.000 \mathrm{E}+00$ |

