

SEDAR

Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review

SEDAR 66

South Atlantic Tilefish

Stock Assessment Report

April 2021

Revised May 6, 2021

Revised May 14, 2021

SEDAR

4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201 North Charleston, SC 29405


Please cite this document as:

SEDAR. 2021. SEDAR 66 South Atlantic Tilefish Stock Assessment Report. SEDAR, North Charleston SC. 145 pp. available online at: <http://sedarweb.org/sedar-66>

Table of Contents

Each Section is Numbered Separately

Section I Introduction	Pg. 4
Section II Assessment Report	Pg. 37



SEDAR

Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review

SEDAR 66

South Atlantic Tilefish

Section I: Introduction

April 2021

SEDAR
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201 North Charleston, SC 29405

I. Introduction	2
1. SEDAR Process Description	2
2. Management Overview	3
2.1 Fishery Management Plan and Amendments	3
2.2 Emergency and Interim Rules	8
2.3 Secretarial Amendments	9
2.4 Control Date Notices	9
2.5 Management Program Specifications	9
2.6 Management and Regulatory Timeline	14
2.7 Closures Due to Meeting Quota/ACL	17
2.8 State Management Histories	18
2.8.1 North Carolina:	18
2.8.2 South Carolina	19
2.8.3 Georgia	19
2.8.4 Florida Regulatory History	20
3. Assessment History	29
4. Regional Maps	30
5. Abbreviations	31

I. Introduction

1. SEDAR Process Description

SouthEast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) is a cooperative Fishery Management Council process initiated in 2002 to improve the quality and reliability of fishery stock assessments in the South Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and US Caribbean. The improved stock assessments from the SEDAR process provide higher quality information to address fishery management issues. SEDAR emphasizes constituent and stakeholder participation in assessment development, transparency in the assessment process, and a rigorous and independent scientific review of completed stock assessments.

SEDAR is managed by the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic Regional Fishery Management Councils in coordination with NOAA Fisheries and the Atlantic and Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commissions. Oversight is provided by a Steering Committee composed of NOAA Fisheries representatives: Southeast Fisheries Science Center Director and the Southeast Regional Administrator; Regional Council representatives: Executive Directors and Chairs of the South Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils; a representative from the Highly Migratory Species Division of NOAA Fisheries; and Interstate Commission representatives: Executive Directors of the Atlantic States and Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commissions.

SEDAR 66 addressed the stock assessment for South Atlantic Tilefish. The assessment process consisted of a series of webinars held from April 2020 to February, 2021 and a webinar workshop. Due to the 2020 Pandemic the in person workshop that was originally scheduled for November 17-19 in Beaufort, NC was rescheduled to be four 5 hour long webinars held November 16-19. The Stock Assessment Report is organized into 2 sections. Section I –Introduction contains a brief description of the SEDAR Process, Assessment and Management Histories for the species of interest, and the management specifications requested by the Cooperator. Section II is the Assessment Process report. This section details the assessment model, as well as documents any data recommendations that arise for new data sets presented during this assessment process, or changes to data sets used previously.

The final Stock Assessment Reports (SAR) for South Atlantic Tilefish was disseminated to the public in April 2021. The Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) will review the SAR for its stock. The SSCs are tasked with recommending whether the assessments represent Best Available Science, whether the results presented in the SARs are useful for providing management advice and developing fishing level recommendations for the Council. An SSC may request additional analyses be conducted or may use the information provided in the SAR as the basis for their Fishing Level Recommendations (e.g., Overfishing Limit and Acceptable Biological Catch). The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's SSC will review the assessment at its April 2021 meeting, followed by the Council receiving that information at its June 2021 meeting. Documentation on SSC recommendations is not part of the SEDAR process and is handled through each Council.

2. Management Overview

2.1 Fishery Management Plan and Amendments

The following summary describes only those management actions that likely affect golden tilefish fisheries and harvest.

Original Snapper Grouper FMP

The Fishery Management Plan (FMP), Regulatory Impact Review, and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region, approved in 1983 and implemented in August of 1983, established a management regime for the fishery for snappers, groupers and related demersal species of the Continental Shelf of the southeastern United States in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) under the area of authority of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the territorial seas of the states, extending from the North Carolina/Virginia border through the Atlantic side of the Florida Keys to 83° W longitude. Regulations apply only to federal waters.

Measures in the original FMP that affected golden tilefish include data reporting and research needs. No regulations specific to golden tilefish were included.

SAFMC FMP Amendments affecting golden tilefish

Description of Action	FMP/Amendment	Effective
<p>-Prohibit trawls to harvest snapper grouper species south of Cape Hatteras, NC and north of Cape Canaveral, FL</p> <p>-Defined directed fishery as vessel with trawl gear and at least 200 pounds of snapper grouper species on board</p>	Amendment 1	1/12/1989
<p>Prohibit fish traps, entanglement nets, and longline gear within 50 fathoms. Requirement to land with heads & fins attached. Permits - income requirement & required to exceed bag limits. Established 5 grouper aggregate.</p>	Amendment 4	1/1/92
<p>-Establish Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for golden tilefish and adjust the annual TAC downward by reserving a portion based on bycatch. Phase-in reduction over 3 years; year 1=1994 fishing year (calendar year). Logbook 1992 landings 1,777,772 lbs) used as base year: 1994 = 1,475,795 lbs gw 1995 = 1,238,818 lbs gw 1996 = 1,001,663 lbs gw</p> <p>-Establish a 5,000 pound (gutted weight) golden tilefish trip limit while the directed golden tilefish quota is open, then reduce to 300 pounds</p> <p>-Include all tilefish species in the current 5 grouper aggregate bag limit</p> <p>-Prohibited transfer at sea for snowy grouper and golden tilefish regardless of where the fish were caught (i.e., state vs. federal waters).</p> <p>-100% logbook coverage upon renewal of permit</p> <p>-Creation of the <i>Oculina</i> Experimental Closed Area</p> <p>-Data collection needs specified for evaluation of possible IFQ system</p>	Amendment 6	6/27/94 trip limit effective 6/6/94
<p>-Prohibit engaging in a directed fishery for tilefish in the EEZ north of Cape Canaveral, Florida, aboard a vessel that does not have a permit for snapper grouper</p> <p>-Bottom longline gear is allowed only north of St. Lucie Inlet, FL (27°10'N. latitude)</p>	Amendment 7	1/23/95

-Limited entry program: transferable permits and 225-lb non-transferable permits.	Amendment 8	8/17/98
-Vessels with longline gear aboard may only possess snowy, warsaw, yellowedge, and misty grouper, and golden, blueline and sand tilefish. -Specify that within the 5-fish aggregate grouper bag limit (which currently includes tilefish and excludes goliath grouper and Nassau grouper), no more than 2 fish may be gag or black grouper (individually or in combination).	Amendment 9	2/24/99
-Maximum sustainable yield (MSY) proxy for sg species (other than Nassau and goliath) = 30% static SPR -OY: hermaphroditic groupers = 45% static SPR; all other species = 40% static SPR -Overfished/overfishing evaluations: Golden tilefish: overfished (couldn't update existing static SPR of 21% SPR). Council concluded measures in Amendments 7, 8 and 9 were sufficient to rebuild golden tilefish above the overfished level. -Defined overfishing level for sg species other than Nassau and goliath as $F > F_{30\% \text{ static SPR}}$ $MSST = [(1-M) \text{ or } 0.5 \text{ whichever is greater}] * B_{MSY}$ $MFMT = F_{MSY}$	Amendment 11	12/2/99
-Extended prohibition on bottom fishing for snapper grouper species in the Oculina Experimental Closed Area and on retaining such species in or from the area	Amendment 13A	4/26/04
-commercial quota for golden tilefish = 295,000 lbs gw -commercial trip limit for golden tilefish of 4,000 lbs gw until 75% of quota is taken then reduce to 300 lbs; do not adjust trip limit downwards unless 75% of quota is landed on or before September 1 -recreational bag limit of 1 golden tilefish/person/day and included within 5 grouper aggregate bag limit	Amendment 13C	10/23/06

-established eight deepwater marine protected areas (MPA) in which fishing for or possession of South Atlantic snapper grouper are prohibited	Amendment 14	2/12/09
1) -prohibited sale of bag-limit caught snapper grouper species, 2) reduced the effects of incidental hooking on sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish, 3) changed the commercial permit renewal period and transferability requirements, 4) implemented a plan to monitor and address bycatch, and 5) established management reference points, such as MSY and OY for golden tilefish. MSY equals the yield produced by FMSY. MSY and FMSY are defined by the most recent SEDAR. $FMSY = 0.043 = 336,425$ lbs whole weight. If a stock is overfished, FOY equals the fishing mortality rate specified by the rebuilding plan designed to rebuild the stock to SSBMSY within the approved schedule. After the stock is rebuilt, $FOY = \text{a fraction of FMSY}$. Golden tilefish is not overfished. Therefore, $FOY = 75\% FMSY = 326,554$ lbs whole weight. $MSST \text{ equals } SSBMSY(0.75) =$	Amendment 15B	12/16/09
-Reduced grouper aggregate (including tilefishes) from 5 to 3. -Required possession of dehooking tools when catching snapper grouper species to reduce recreational and commercial bycatch mortality.	Amendment 16	7/29/09
-Required use of non-stainless steel circle hooks when fishing for snapper grouper species with hook-and-line gear and natural bait north of 28 deg. N latitude in the South Atlantic EEZ	Amendment #17A	3/3/2011

<p>1) Defined allocations for golden tilefish based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on the following formula for each sector: Sector apportionment = (50% * average of long catch range (lbs) 1986-2008) + (50% * average of recent catch trend (lbs) 2006-2008). 97% com/3% rec.</p> <p>2) Established the ACL at the F_{0Y} level (Total ACL = 326,554 lbs whole weight or 291,566 lbs gutted weight).</p> <p>3) The commercial ACL (282,819 lbs gutted weight) is based on the allocation alternative selected (97% commercial: 3% recreational).</p> <p>4) The commercial AM for this stock is to prohibit harvest, possession, and retention when the quota is projected to be met. All purchase and sale is prohibited when the quota is projected to be met.</p> <p>5) Specified a recreational ACL in numbers of fish (1,578 fish) based upon the allocation decision</p> <p>6) Implemented accountability measures (AMs) for the recreational sector for golden tilefish. If the ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACL for the following fishing season. Compare the recreational ACL with projected recreational landings over a range of years. For 2010, use only 2010 landings. For 2011, use the average landings of 2010 and 2011. For 2012 and beyond, use the most recent three-year running average.</p> <p>7) Implemented a closure to commercial and recreational harvest of 6 deepwater species (snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper) seaward of 240 feet (73 m) to curb bycatch of speckled hind and warsaw grouper</p>	Amendment 17B	1/31/11
<p>-Established a longline endorsement for the commercial component of the golden tilefish fishery, including eligibility and transferability requirements and appeals process</p> <p>-Allocated commercial ACL between gear groups: 75% to longline and 25% to hook-and-line</p> <p>-Established a commercial trip limit of 4,000 for longlines and 500 pounds for hook and line (longliners not eligible to fish under hook-and-line trip limit after</p>	Amendment 18B	5/23/13

-Modified AMs for snapper grouper species, including golden tilefish	Amendment 34 (Generic Accountability Measures and Dolphin Allocation Amendment)	2/22/16
-Clarified regulations governing the use of Golden Tilefish Longline Endorsements.	Amendment 35	6/22/16

SAFMC Regulatory Amendments affecting golden tilefish

Description of Action	Regulatory Amendment	Effective Date
-Removed closure for deep water species (snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper) beyond 240 ft (73 m) implemented through Amendment 17B	Regulatory Amendment 11	5/10/12
<p>-Revised ABC based on projections from SEFSC (January 27, 2012)</p> <p>-Established ACL = yield at 75%Fmsy when stock is at equilibrium = 625,000 lbs ww (558,036 lbs gw)</p> <p>-Revised commercial and recreational ACLs based on existing allocations:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Commercial ACL = 606,250 lbs ww (541,295 lbs gw)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Recreational ACL = 3,019 fish</p> <p>-Revised rec ACT and AMs</p> <p>-Reopened commercial harvest under 300 lbs trip limit for 2012 fishing year</p>	Regulatory Amendment 12	10/9/12
--Ended overfishing of golden tilefish by reducing the ACL based on the most recent stock assessment.	Regulatory Amendment 28	1/4/2019

2.2 Emergency and Interim Rules

April 2021

South Atlantic Tilefish

Golden tilefish Interim Rule – effective 1/2/2018 through 7/1/2018 and 7/2/2018 through 1/3/2019 --

Reduced the golden tilefish total ACL, the commercial and recreational sector ACLs, and the quotas for the hook-and-line and longline components of the commercial sector.

2.3 Secretarial Amendments

SAFMC None.

2.4 Control Date Notices

1. Notice of Control Date (07/30/91 56 FR 36052) - Anyone entering **federal snapper grouper fishery (other than for wreckfish)** in the EEZ off S. Atlantic States after 07/30/91 was not assured of future access if limited entry program developed.
2. Notice of Control Date (10/14/05 70 FR 60058) - Anyone entering **federal snapper grouper fishery** off S. Atlantic states after 10/14/05 was not assured of future access if limited entry program developed.
3. Notice of Control Date (2/20/09 74 FR 7849) - Anyone entering **federal golden tilefish segment of the snapper grouper fishery** off S. Atlantic states after 12/4/08 was not assured of future access if limited entry program developed.
4. Notice of Control Date (01/31/11 76 FR 5325) - Anyone **entering federal snapper grouper fishery** off S. Atlantic states after 09/17/10 was not assured of future access if limited entry program developed.
5. Notice of Control Date (6/15/16 76 FR 66244) - Fishermen entering the **federal for-hire recreational sector for the Snapper Grouper fishery** after June 15, 2016, will not be assured of future access should a management regime that limits participation in the sector be prepared and implemented.

The net effect of these various control dates is that there are two control dates:

1. Federal Snapper Grouper Fishery – 1/31/2011
2. Federal Golden Tilefish Segment of the Snapper Grouper Fishery – 2/20/2009

2.5 Management Program Specifications

Table 2.5.1. General Management Information

South Atlantic

Species	Golden Tilefish
Management Unit	Southeastern US
Management Unit Definition	All waters within South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Boundaries (VA/NC boundary south to the SAMFC/GMFC boundary)
Management Entity	South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Management Contacts Council/SERO	Myra Brouwer / Rick DeVictor
Current stock exploitation status	Not Overfishing
Current stock biomass status	Not overfished

Table 2.5.2. Specific Management Criteria

Estimated status indicators, benchmarks, and related quantities from the Beaufort catch-age model, conditional on estimated current selectivities averaged across fisheries. Rate estimates (F) are in units of y^{-1} ; status indicators are dimensionless; and biomass estimates are in units of metric tons or pounds, as indicated. Spawning stock biomass (SSB) and minimum stock size threshold (MSST) are measured by total gonad weight of mature females.

Criteria	South Atlantic – Current (SEDAR 25 Update, 2016)	
	Definition	Value
MSST (metric tons)	$75\% SSB_{MSY}$	16.45
MFMT (per year)	F_{MSY}	0.24
MSY (1000 pounds)	Yield at F_{MSY}	560
F_{MSY} (per year)	F_{MSY}	0.24
OY (1000 pounds)	Yield at F_{OY}	OY ($65\% F_{MSY}$)= 540 OY ($75\% F_{MSY}$)= 551 OY ($85\% F_{MSY}$)= 557
R_{MSY}	1000 age-1 fish	327
Yield at F_{TARGET} (equilibrium)	Landings and discards, pounds and numbers	
F_{OY}	$F_{OY} = 65\%, 75\%, 85\% F_{MSY}$	$65\% F_{MSY} = 0.15$ $75\% F_{MSY} = 0.18$ $85\% F_{MSY} = 0.20$
M	Scalar of Lorenzen M	0.10
Terminal F	Exploitation (per year)	0.36
Terminal Biomass ¹	Biomass (metric tons)	18.65
Exploitation Status	$F_{CURRENT}/F_{MSY}$	1.22
Biomass Status ¹	$SSB_{2014}/MSST^2$	1.13

Table 2.5.2. Continued Specific Management Criteria

Criteria	South Atlantic – Proposed (Values from SEDAR 66)		
	Definition	Base Run Values	Median of Base Run MCBs
MSST ¹	75% SSB _{MSY}		
MFMT	F _{MSY}		
MSY	Yield at F _{MSY}		
F _{MSY}	F _{MSY}		
OY	Yield at F _{OY}		
R _{MSY}	Recruits as MSY		
F Target			
Yield at F _{TARGET} (equilibrium)	Landings and discards, pounds and numbers		
F _{OY}	F _{OY} = 65%, 75%, 85% F _{MSY}		
M	M		
Terminal F	Exploitation		
Terminal Biomass ¹	Biomass		
Exploitation Status	F/MFMT		
Biomass Status ¹	SSB/MSST SSB/SSB _{MSY}		
Generation Time			
T _{REBUILD} (if appropriate)			

1. Biomass values reported for management parameters and status determinations should be based on the biomass metric recommended through the assessment process and Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC). This may be total, spawning stock or some measure thereof, and should be applied consistently in this table.

2. The SAFMC's definition of MSST for golden tilefish is $(0.75 * SSB_{msy})$ which was established in Snapper Grouper Amendment 15B. The MSST value used in SEDAR 25 and the subsequent management actions was $(1-M) * SSB_{msy}$. Calculations for MSST in the 2015 update assessment used $0.75 * SSB_{msy}$.

NOTE: "Proposed" columns are for indicating any definitions that may exist in FMPs or amendments that are currently under development and should therefore be evaluated in the current assessment. Please clarify whether landings parameters are 'landings' or 'catch' (Landings + Discard). If 'landings', please indicate how discards are addressed.

Table 2.5.3. Stock Rebuilding Information

N/A

Table 2.5.4. Stock projection information*South Atlantic*

Requested Information	Value
First Year of Management	Assume management begins in 2022. However, if stock neither overfished or overfishing, a projection with the revised ABC and OFL should be provided assuming that landings limits are changed in the 2021 fishing year.
Interim basis	ACL, if landings are within 10% of the ACL; average landings otherwise.
Projection Outputs	
Landings	Pounds and numbers
Discards	Pounds and numbers
Exploitation	F & Probability $F > MFMT$
Biomass (total or SSB, as appropriate)	B & Probability $B > MSST$ (and Prob. $B > B_{MSY}$ if under rebuilding plan)
Recruits	Number

Table 2.5.5. Base Run Projections Specifications. Long Term and Equilibrium conditions.

Criteria	Definition	If overfished	If overfishing	Neither overfished nor overfishing
Projection Span	Years	$T_{REBUILD}$	10	10
Projection Values	$F_{CURRENT}$	X	X	X
	F_{MSY}	X	X	X
	75% F_{MSY}	X	X	X
	$F_{REBUILD}$	X		
	$F=0$	X		

NOTE: Exploitation rates for projections may be based upon point estimates from the base run (current process) or upon the median of such values from the MCBs evaluation of uncertainty. The critical point is that the projections be based on the same criteria as the management specifications.

Table 2.5.6. P-star projections. Short term specifications for OFL and ABC recommendations. Additional P-star projections may be requested by the SSC once the ABC control rule is applied.

Criteria		Overfished	Not overfished
Projection Span	Years	Interim + 5	Interim + 5
Probability Values	50%	Probability of stock rebuild	Probability of overfishing
	30%	Probability of stock rebuild	Probability of overfishing

Table 2.5.5. Quota Calculation Details

If the stock is managed by quota, please provide the following information

	Commercial ACL	Recreational ACL	Total ACL
Current Quota Value	331,740 lbs gw	2,316 fish	342,000 lbs gw)
Next Scheduled Quota Change	NA	NA	NA
Annual or averaged quota?	annual	annual	annual
If averaged, number of years to average	NA	NA	NA
Does the quota account for bycatch/discard?	No	No	No

How is the quota calculated - conditioned upon exploitation or average landings? Commercial ACL (331,740 lbs gutted weight) and Recreational ACL (2,316 fish) is based on yield at F_{OY} and assumes population biomass at equilibrium. Yield at F_{OY} is allocated to commercial and recreation sectors based on the following formula for each sector: Sector apportionment = $(50\% * \text{average of long catch range (lbs) 1986-2008}) + (50\% * \text{average of recent catch trend (lbs) 2006-2008})$. The allocation is 97% commercial and 3% recreational. This allocation was established in Amendment 17B (effective 1/31/11).

Does the quota include bycatch/discard estimates? If so, what is the source of the bycatch/discard values? What are the bycatch/discard allowances?

Commercial and Recreational ACLs do not require monitoring of discards and are based on landed catch. Assessment takes into consideration bycatch and provides estimates of yield at F_{MSY} and F_{OY} as landed catch rather than landed catch plus dead discards.

Are there additional details of which the analysts should be aware to properly determine quotas for this stock?

No.

2.6 Management and Regulatory Timeline

The following tables provide a timeline of Federal management actions by fishery.

Table 2.6.1 South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Recreational Regulatory History prepared by: Myra Brouwer

Year	Quota (# fish)	ACL (# fish)	Days Open	fishing season	reason for closure	season start date (first day implemented)	season end date (last day effective)	Size limit	size limit start date	size limit end date	Retention Limit (# fish)	Retention Limit Start Date	Retention Limit End Date	Aggregate Retention Limit ¹ (# fish)	Aggregate Retention Limit Start Date	Aggregate Retention Limit End Date
1994	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^A	27-Jun	31-Dec	5/person/day ^A	27-Jun	31-Dec
1995	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec
1996	NA	NA	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec
1997	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec
1998	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^A	1-Jan	31-Dec
1999	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2000	NA	NA	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2001	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2002	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2003	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2004	NA	NA	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2005	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2006	NA	NA	295	open		1-Jan	22-Oct	None		NA	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	22-Oct	5/person/day ^{A, B}	1-Jan	22-Oct
			70	open		23-Oct	31-Dec				1/person/day ^{C, B}	23-Oct	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{C, B}	23-Oct	31-Dec
2007	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2008	NA	NA	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec	5/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2009 ^D	NA	NA	1670	open		1-Jan	28-Jul	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	28-Jul	5/person/day ^{C, B}	1-Jan	28-Jul
			156	open		29-Jul	31-Dec				1/person/day ^E	29-Jul	31-Dec	3/person/day ^E	29-Jul	31-Dec
2010 ^D	NA	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	31-Dec	3/person/day ^E	1-Jan	31-Dec
2011 ^{D, F, I}	See ACL	1,578 fish	278	open		1-Jan	5-Oct	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	5-Oct	3/person/day ^{E, H}	1-Jan	5-Oct
			87	closed	quota met	6-Oct	31-Dec									
2012 ^{D, G, I, J}	See ACL	3,019 fish	159	open		1-Jan	7-Jun	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	7-Jun	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	7-Jun
			207	closed	quota met	8-Jun	31-Dec									
2013 ^{D, I}	See ACL	3,019 fish	153	open		1-Jan	2-Jun	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	2-Jun	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	2-Jun
			212	closed	quota met	3-Jun	31-Dec									
2014 ^{D, I, L}	See ACL	3,019 fish	157	open		1-Jan	6-Jun	None	NA	NA	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	6-Jun	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	6-Jun
			208	closed	quota met	7-Jun	31-Dec									
2015	See ACL	3,019 fish	222	open		1-Jan	10-Aug	None	N/A	N/A	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	10-Aug	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	10-Aug
			143	closed	quota met	11-Aug	31-Dec									
2016	See ACL	3,019 fish	239	open		1-Jan	26-Aug	None	N/A	N/A	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	26-Aug	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	26-Aug
			127	closed	quota met	27-Aug	31-Dec									
2017	See ACL	3,019 fish	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	N/A	N/A	1/person/day ^E	1-Jan	31-Dec	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	1-Jan	31-Dec
2018	See ACL	2,187 fish ^M	238	open		2-Jan	27-Aug	None	N/A	N/A	1/person/day ^E	2-Jan	27-Aug	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	2-Jan	27-Aug
			126	closed	quota met	28-Aug	31-Dec									
2019	See ACL	2,316 fish ^N	164	open		4-Jan	16-Jun	None	N/A	N/A	1/person/day ^E	4-Jan	16-Jun	3/person/day ^{E, H, K}	4-Jan	16-Jun
			198	closed	quota met	17-Jun	31-Dec									

Fishing year = Calendar Year
1 = Starting in 1994, the aggregate grouper bag limit included gag, scamp, red grouper, black grouper, speckled hind, snowy grouper, warsaw grouper, rock hind, red hind, coney, graysby, misty grouper, yellowedge grouper, yellowmouth grouper, yellowfin grouper, tiger grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, and sand tilefish. Unless otherwise noted below (see H and K) these species remain in the aggregate bag limit throughout the time series.
A = Aggregate grouper bag limit (includes gag, scamp, red grouper, black grouper, speckled hind, snowy grouper, warsaw grouper, rock hind, red hind, coney, graysby, misty grouper, yellowedge grouper, yellowmouth grouper, yellowfin grouper, tiger grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, and sand tilefish) of 5/person/day; specifies 1 speckled hind and 1 warsaw grouper in 5 grouper aggregate (Amendment 6; effective date 6/27/1994).
B = Aggregate grouper bag limit specifies no more than 2 can be gag or black grouper (Amendment 9; effective date 2/24/1999)
C = Limit possession to 1 golden tilefish in aggregate grouper bag limit of 5/person/day (Amendment 13C; effective date 10/23/2006)
D = Prohibited sale of bag-limit caught snapper grouper species, including golden tilefish (Amendment 15B; effective date:12/16/2009).
E = Limit possession to 1 golden tilefish in aggregate grouper bag limit of 3/person/day; no more than one fish in aggregate bag may be gag or black grouper; captain and crew may not retain bag limit (Amendment 16; effective date 07/29/2009)
F = Recreational ACL in numbers of fish (1,578 fish); Accountability Measure is if exceeded, Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing season to ensure ACL is not exceeded.
G = Prohibits harvest of 6 deepwater species seaward of 240' (yellow edge grouper, misty grouper, snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, queen snapper, silk snapper; Amendment 17B; effective date: 1/31/11)
H = Harvest of speckled hind and warsaw grouper prohibited (e.g. removed from grouper aggregate bag limit; Amendment 17B; effective date: 1/31/11)
I = Recreational ACL in numbers of fish (3,019 fish); In-season closure if recreational ACL is met or projected to be met; if exceeded, monitor for persistence of increased landings and, if necessary, Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing season to ensure ACL is not exceeded.
J = Deepwater closure eliminated (Regulatory Amendment 11; effective date 5/10/2012)
K = Tiger grouper removed from FMU (and therefore removed from aggregate bag limit; Comprehensive ACL Amendment; effective date 4/16/2012)
L = Captain and crew on for-hire trips can retain bag limit of snapper grouper species (Amendment 27; effective date 1/27/2014)
M= interim rule adjstuted fishing levels temporarily. Was effective on 1/2/2018 and extended through 1/3/2019
N= Regulatory Amendment 28 implemented adjusted catch levels on 1/4/2019

Table 2.6.2 South Atlantic Golden Tilefish Commercial Regulatory History prepared by: Myra Brouwer & Julia Byrd

Year	Quota (units)	ACL (units)	Days Open	fishing season	reason for closure	season start date (first day implemented)	season end date (last day effective)	Size limit (units and length type, indicate maximum or natural length)	size limit start date	size limit end date	Retention Limit (units)	Retention Limit Start Date	Retention Limit End Date	Aggregate Retention Limit (units)	Aggregate Retention Limit Start Date	Aggregate Retention Limit End Date
1994	1,475,795 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	6-Jun	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
1995	1,238,818 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open	None	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
1996	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
1997	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open	None	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
1998	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
1999	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2000	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	366	open	None	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2001	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2002	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open	None	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2003	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2004	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	366	open	None	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2005	1,001,663 (lbs gw)	NA	365	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	NA	NA
2006	295,000 (lbs gw)	NA	295	open		1-Jan	22-Oct	None	NA	NA	5,000 (lb gw) trip limit; allow retention of no more than 300 lbs when quota filled	1-Jan	22-Oct	None	NA	NA
				open							4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	23-Oct	31-Dec			
			70	closed	quota met	23-Oct	31-Dec									
2007	295,000 (lbs gw)	NA	136	open		1-Jan	16-May	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	16-May	None	NA	NA
			139	open		17-May	2-Oct				300 (lbs gw) ^A	17-May	2-Oct			
			90	closed	quota met	3-Oct	31-Dec									
2008	295,000 (lbs gw)	NA	148	open		1-Jan	27-May	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	27-May	None	NA	NA
			81	open		28-May	16-Aug				300 (lbs gw) ^A	28-May	16-Aug			
			137	closed	quota met	17-Aug	31-Dec									
2009	295,000 (lbs gw)	NA	110	open		1-Jan	20-Apr	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	20-Apr	None	NA	NA
			85	open		21-Apr	14-Jul				300 (lbs gw) ^A	21-Apr	14-Jul			
			170	closed	quota met	15-Jul	31-Dec									
2010	295,000 (lbs gw)	NA	76	open		1-Jan	17-Mar	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	17-Mar	None	NA	NA
			26	open		18-Mar	12-Apr				300 (lbs gw) ^A	18-Mar	12-Apr			
			264	closed	quota met	12-Apr	31-Dec									
2011	282,819 (lbs gw)	NA	67	open		1-Jan	8-Mar	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	8-Mar	None	NA	NA
			298	closed	quota met	9-Mar	31-Dec									
2012	282,819 (lbs gw)	NA	47	open		1-Jan	16-Feb	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	16-Feb	None	NA	NA
			235	closed	quota met	17-Feb	8-Oct									
	541,295 (lbs gw)	ACL = quota	84	open		9-Oct	31-Dec				300 (lbs gw) ^B	9-Oct	31-Dec			
2013	541,295 (lbs gw) ^C	ACL = quota	48	open		1-Jan	17-Feb	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	1-Jan	17-Feb	None	NA	NA
			23	open		18-Feb	12-Mar				300 (lbs gw) ^A	18-Feb	12-Mar			
			9	open		13-Mar	21-Mar				4,000 (lbs gw) ^A	13-Mar	21-Mar			
			44	open		22-Mar	4-May				300 (lbs gw) ^A	22-Mar	4-May			
			241	closed	quota met	5-May	31-Dec									
2014	405,971 (lbs gw) ^{D,E}	ACL = quota	63	open		1-Jan	4-Mar	None	NA	NA	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	4-Mar	None	NA	NA
			302	closed	quota met	5-Mar	31-Dec									
	135,324 (lbs gw) ^{E,C}		240	open		1-Jan	28-Aug				500 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	28-Aug	None	NA	NA
			125	closed	quota met	29-Aug	31-Dec									
2015	405,971 (lbs gw) ^{C,D}	ACL=quota	49	open		1-Jan	18-Feb	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	18-Feb	None	N/A	N/A
			316	closed	quota met	19-Feb	31-Dec									
	135,324 (lbs gw) ^{E,C}	ACL=quota	341	open		1-Jan	7-Dec	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	7-Dec	None	N/A	N/A
			24	closed	quota met	8-Dec	31-Dec									
2016	405,971 (lbs gw) ^{C,D}	ACL=quota	74	open		1-Jan	14-Mar	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	14-Mar	None	N/A	N/A
			292	closed	quota met	15-Mar	31-Dec									
	135,324 (lbs gw) ^{E,C}	ACL=quota	366	open		1-Jan	31-Dec	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	31-Dec	None	N/A	N/A
2017	405,971 (lbs gw) ^{C,D}	ACL=quota	128	open		1-Jan	8-May	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	8-May	None	N/A	N/A
			237	closed	quota met	9-May	31-Dec									
	135,324 (lbs gw) ^{E,C}	ACL=quota	332	open		1-Jan	28-Nov	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	28-Nov	None	None	N/A
			33	closed	quota met	29-Nov	31-Dec					29-Nov	31-Dec			
2018	234,982 (lbs gw) ^{D,F}	ACL=quota	82	open		2-Jan	24-Mar	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	2-Jan	24-Mar	None	None	N/A
			282	closed	quota met	25-Mar	31-Dec									
	78,328 (lbs gw) ^{E,F}	ACL=quota	224	open		2-Jan	13-Aug	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	2-Jan	13-Aug	None	None	N/A
			140	closed	quota met	14-Aug	31-Dec									
2019	234,982 (lbs gw) ^{C,D,F}	ACL=quota	3	open		1-Jan	3-Jan	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	3-Jan	None	None	N/A
	248,805 (lbs gw) ^{C,D,G}	ACL=quota	69	open	new regulations effective	4-Jan	13-Mar	None	N/A	N/A	4,000 (lbs gw) ^C	4-Jan	13-Mar			
			293	closed	quota met	14-Mar	31-Dec									
	78,328 (lbs gw) ^{E,F}	ACL=quota	3	open		1-Jan	3-Jan	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	1-Jan	3-Jan	None	None	N/A
	82,935 (lbs gw) ^{C,E,G}	ACL=quota	200	open		4-Jan	22-Jul	None	N/A	N/A	500 (lbs gw) ^C	3-Jan	22-Jul	None	None	N/A
			162	closed		23-Jul	31-Dec									

^B ACL increased due to results of SEDAR 25 assessment; season re-opened Oct 9, 2012 with 300 lb gw trip limit

^C Snapper Grouper Amendment 18B (effective May 23, 2013) allocated commercial ACL between gear groups: 75% to longline and 25% to hook and line;establish 4000 lb gw trip limit for longliners and 500 lb gw trip limit for hook and line; longliners not eligible to fish under hook and line trip limit after longline quota is landed

^D commercial golden tilefish longline quota

^E commercial golden tilefish hook and line quota

^F Interim rule ACL was effective on 1/2/2018 and was extended through 1/3/2019. ACL was temporarily reduced while permanent adjustments were made through

Regulatory Amendment 28

^G Fishing levels adjusted through implementation of Regulatory Amendment 28

Note: lbs = pounds; gw = gutted weight

2.7 Closures Due to Meeting Quota/ACL

Commercial:

- 2006 – October 23, 2006 through December 31, 2006.
- 2007 – October 3, 2007 through December 31, 2007.
- 2008 – August 17, 2008 through December 31, 2008.
- 2009 – July 15, 2009 through December 31, 2009.
- 2010 – April 12, 2010 through December 31, 2010.
- 2011 – March 9 2011 through December 31, 2011
- 2012 – February 17, 2012 through December 31, 2012
- 2013 – May 5, 2013 through December 31, 2013
- 2014 –
 - March 5, 2014 through December 31, 2014 – Longline
 - August 29, 2014 through December 31, 2014 – Hook-and-Line
- 2015 –
 - February 19 through December 31 – Longline
 - December 8 through December 31 – Hook-and-Line
- 2016 –
 - March 15 through December 31 – Longline
- 2017
 - May 9 through December 31 – Longline
 - November 29 through December 31 – Hook-and-Line
- 2018
 - March 25 through December 31 – Longline
 - August 14 through December 31 – Hook-and-Line

Recreational:

- 2011 – October 6, 2011 through December 31, 2011
- 2012 – June 8, 2012 through December 31, 2012
- 2013 – June 3, 2013 through December 31, 2013
- 2014 – June 7, 2014 through December 31, 2014
- 2015 – August 11 through December 31, 2015
- 2016 – August 27 through December 31, 2016
- 2017 – no closure
- 2018 – August 28 through December 31, 2018
- 2019 – June 17 through December 31, 2019

2.8 State Management Histories

2.8.1 North Carolina:

There are currently no North Carolina state-specific regulations for golden tilefish. North Carolina has complemented federal regulations for all snapper grouper species via proclamation authority since 1991. Between 1992 and 2005, species-specific regulations were added to the proclamation authority contained in rule 15A NCAC 03M .0506. Specific to golden tilefish, this rule was amended effective May 24, 1999 (following Amendment 9 to the SAFMC Snapper-Grouper FMP, eff. 2/24/99) to include the following Sub-item: (q) It is unlawful to possess any species of the Snapper-grouper complex except snowy, warsaw, yellowedge, and misty groupers; blueline, golden and sand tilefishes; while having longline gear aboard a vessel.

In 2002, North Carolina adopted its Inter-Jurisdictional Fishery Management Plan (IJ FMP), which incorporates all ASMFC and council-managed species by reference, and adopts all federal regulations as minimum standards for management. In completing the 2008 update to the IJ FMP, all species-specific regulations were removed from rule 15A NCAC 03M .0506, and proclamation authority to implement changes in management was moved to rule 15A NCAC 03M .0512. Since this time, all snapper grouper regulations have been contained in a single proclamation, which is updated anytime an opening/closing of a particular species in the complex occurs, as well as any changes in allowable gear, required permits, etc. Beginning in 2015, commercial and recreational regulations are contained in separate proclamations. The most current Snapper Grouper proclamations (and all previous versions) can be found using this link: <http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/mf/proclamations>.

15A NCAC 03M .0506 SNAPPER-GROUPER COMPLEX

(a) In the Atlantic Ocean, it is unlawful for an individual fishing under a Recreational Commercial Gear License with seines, shrimp trawls, pots, trotlines or gill nets to take any species of the Snapper-Grouper complex.

(b) The species of the snapper-grouper complex listed in the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region are hereby incorporated by reference and copies are available via the Federal Register posted on the Internet at www.safmc.net and at the Division of Marine Fisheries, P.O. Box 769, Morehead City, North Carolina 28557 at no cost.

History Note: Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-182; 113-221; 143B-289.52;

Eff. January 1, 1991;

Amended Eff. April 1, 1997; March 1, 1996; September 1, 1991;

Temporary Amendment Eff. December 23, 1996;

Amended Eff. August 1, 1998; April 1, 1997;

Temporary Amendment Eff. January 1, 2002; August 29, 2000; January 1, 2000; May 24, 1999;

Amended Eff. October 1, 2008; May 1, 2004; July 1, 2003; April 1, 2003; August 1, 2002.

15A NCAC 03M .0512 COMPLIANCE WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

(a) In order to comply with management requirements incorporated in Federal Fishery Management Council Management Plans or Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Management Plans or to

implement state management measures, the Fisheries Director may, by proclamation, take any or all of the following actions for species listed in the Interjurisdictional Fisheries Management Plan:

- (1) Specify size;
 - (2) Specify seasons;
 - (3) Specify areas;
 - (4) Specify quantity;
 - (5) Specify means and methods; and
 - (6) Require submission of statistical and biological data.
- (b) Proclamations issued under this Rule shall be subject to approval, cancellation, or modification by the Marine Fisheries Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting or an emergency meeting held pursuant to G.S. 113-221.1.

History Note: Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-182; 113-221; 113-221.1; 143B-289.4;

Eff. March 1, 1996;

Amended Eff. October 1, 2008.

2.8.2 South Carolina

Sec. 50-5-2730 of the SC Code states:

“Unless otherwise provided by law, any regulations promulgated by the federal government under the Fishery Conservation and Management Act (PL94-265) or the Atlantic Tuna Conservation Act (PL 94-70) which establishes seasons, fishing periods, gear restrictions, sales restrictions, or bag, catch, size, or possession limits on fish are declared to be the law of this State and apply statewide including in state waters.”

As such, South Carolina tilefish regulations are (and have been) pulled directly from the federal regulations as promulgated under Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. There are no known separate golden tilefish regulations that have been codified in the South Carolina Code.

2.8.3 Georgia

There are currently no Georgia state regulations for tilefish. However, the authority rests with the Georgia Board of Natural Resources to regulate this species if deemed necessary in the future.

2.8.4 Florida Regulatory History

Florida Atlantic and Monroe County Golden Tilefish Regulation History

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
1980	None	None	None		
1981	None	None	None		
1982	None	None	None		
1983	None	None	None		
1984	None	None	None		
1985	None	None	None		
1986	None	None	None		
1987	None	2 fish or 250 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1988	None	2 fish or 250 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1989	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
1990	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1991	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1992	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1993	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1994	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1995	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
1996	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1997	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1998	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
1999	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2000	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2001	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
2002	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2003	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2004	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2005	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		
2006	None	2 fish or 100 pounds per person, whichever is greater	None		

2007	None	1 per person within the 5-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters	<p>Added Golden Tilefish to the Reef Fish rule, which established allowable gears (hook and line, black sea bass trap, and spear) and landing in whole condition requirement.</p> <p>Established a recreational bag limit of one Golden Tilefish within the five-fish daily aggregate grouper bag limit.</p> <p>Allowed a two-day possession limit for reef fish for persons aboard charter and headboats on trips exceeding 24 hours, provided the vessel is equipped with a permanent berth for each passenger, and each passenger has a receipt verifying the trip length.</p> <p>Designated Golden Tilefish as a “restricted species,” requiring commercial harvesters to possess a Restricted Species endorsement on their Saltwater Products License, as well as a federal South Atlantic Snapper Grouper commercial permit.</p> <p>Set commercial trip limits in the Atlantic that are the same as federal waters.</p> <p>Prohibited commercial harvest in state waters</p>	July 1, 2007
------	------	--	------------------------	--	--------------

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
				when federal waters are closed. Prohibited commercial fishermen from harvesting or possessing the recreational bag limit on commercial trips.	
2008	None	1 per person within the 5-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		
2009	None	1 per person within the 5-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
2010	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters	<p>Reduced the recreational grouper aggregate to three fish per day in Atlantic and Monroe County state waters (retained the Golden Tilefish limit of one fish within the aggregate).</p> <p>Prohibited the captain and crew of for-hire vessels from retaining any species in the aggregate grouper bag limit.</p> <p>Required dehooking tools be aboard commercial and recreational vessels for use as needed to remove hooks from Atlantic reef fish.</p>	Jan. 19, 2010
2011	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		
2012	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		
2013	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
2014	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters	Eliminated prohibition on captain and crew of for-hire vessels from retaining recreational bag limits of Vermilion Snappers, groupers and Golden Tilefish on for-hire trips in state waters of the Atlantic (including Monroe County for grouper and Golden Tilefish).	March 13, 2014
2015	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		
2016	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters	Created an exception allowing recreational anglers to land reef fish as fillets instead of as whole fish, provided the reef fish were recreationally harvested in The Bahamas and specific conditions are met.	Sept. 13, 2016
2017	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		

<u>Year</u>	<u>Minimum Size Limit</u>	<u>Recreational Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Commercial Daily Harvest Limits</u>	<u>Regulation Changes</u>	<u>Rule Change Effective Date</u>
2018	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		
2019	None	1 per person within the 3-fish grouper aggregate bag limit	Same as federal waters		

Florida Atlantic and Monroe County Golden Tilefish Regulation Changes by Date

July 1, 2007

- Added Golden Tilefish to the Reef Fish chapter, which established the following regulations for Golden Tilefish:
 - Allowable gear: hook and line, black sea bass trap, and spear (except powerheads, bangsticks or explosive devices);
 - Commercial harvest prohibited when adjacent federal waters are closed to commercial harvest;
 - Fish must be landed in whole condition; and
 - Two-day possession limit allowed for persons aboard charter and headboats on trips exceeding 24 hours provided that the vessel is equipped with a permanent berth for each passenger aboard, and each passenger has a receipt verifying the trip length.
- Set the recreational harvest limit at one Golden Tilefish within the five-fish daily aggregate grouper bag limit for Atlantic and Monroe County state waters.
- Designated Golden Tilefish a “restricted species” and required commercial harvesters to possess a Restricted Species endorsement on their Saltwater Products License as well as a federal South Atlantic Snapper Grouper commercial permit to sell Golden Tilefish or harvest Golden Tilefish in excess of the recreational bag limit.
- Set commercial trip limits in the Atlantic that are the same as trip limits in adjacent federal waters.
- Prohibited commercial fishermen from harvesting or possessing the recreational bag limit of reef fish species on commercial trips.

January 19, 2010

- Reduced recreational aggregate grouper bag limit to 3 fish per person per day in all Atlantic and Monroe County state waters.
- Prohibited the captain and crew of for-hire vessels from retaining any species in the aggregate grouper bag limit.
- Required dehooking tools to be aboard commercial and recreational vessels for anglers to use as needed to remove hooks from Atlantic reef fish.

March 13, 2014

- Eliminated prohibition on captain and crew of for-hire vessels from retaining recreational bag limits of Vermilion Snappers, groupers and Golden Tilefish on for-hire trips in state waters of the Atlantic (including Monroe County for grouper and Golden Tilefish).

September 13, 2016

- Created an exception allowing recreational anglers to land reef fish as fillets instead of as whole fish, provided the reef fish were recreationally harvested in The Bahamas and specific conditions are met.

3. Assessment History

The benchmark assessment for Tilefish, SEDAR 04, was completed in 2004 with an assessment period 1961-2002 (SEDAR 04 2004). SEDAR 25 was a standard assessment completed in 2011 with an assessment period spanning 1962-2010 (SEDAR 25 2011). Several important changes were made during SEDAR 25 (e.g. M , h , SSB units) that make it somewhat difficult to compare SEDAR 04 with later assessments. Current management of South Atlantic Tilefish is based on an update assessment completed in 2016 with an assessment period of 1962-2014 (SEDAR 25 2016).

As of 2002, the stock was not overfished ($SSB_{2002}/MSST = 1.27$), but overfishing was occurring ($F_{2002}/F_{MSY} = 1.53$; SEDAR 04 2004). Terminal status estimates in SEDAR 25 found that the Tilefish stock was not overfished ($SSB_{2010}/MSST = 2.42$), and it was also not undergoing overfishing ($F_{2008-2010}/F_{MSY} = 0.36$; SEDAR 25 2011). Terminal status estimates in the SEDAR 25 showed the stock was not overfished ($SSB_{2014}/MSST = 1.13$), but overfishing was occurring ($F_{2008-2010}/F_{MSY} = 1.22$; SEDAR 25 2016).


Values from the current SEDAR 66 assessment contrast with the stock status designation from SEDAR 04 ($SSB_{2002}/MSST = 0.96$) but concur with the unfished status from SEDAR 25 ($SSB_{2010}/MSST = 1.69$) and the SEDAR 25 ($SSB_{2014}/MSST = 1.49$). However, the current assessment results suggest that overfishing was not occurring at the ends of any of the previous South Atlantic Tilefish assessments ($F_{2002}/F_{MSY} = 0.7$, $F_{2008-2010}/F_{MSY} = 0.47$, $F_{2012-2014}/F_{MSY} = 0.78$).

The general pattern in time series of SSB/MSST in SEDAR 66 was similar to the SEDAR 25, but was shifted upward so that it appears higher in all years. The trend and magnitude of SSB/MSST in SEDAR 25 were also similar up to 2003, but from 2004 to 2010 increased much more rapidly than what is reflected in the later assessments. The general pattern in the time series of F/F_{MSY} in SEDAR 66 was also similar to the SEDAR 25, but was shifted downward so that it appears lower in all years. This is particularly true of the period from approximately 1990-2005. The trend and magnitude of F/F_{MSY} in SEDAR 25 were quite similar to SEDAR 66.

Input values of constant M have been similar over the four Tilefish assessments (terminal years: 2002, 2010, 2014, 2018; M : 0.07, 0.1083, 0.1083, 0.1038), though M in SEDAR 04 was a little lower and was not used to scale age-varying M . Steepness has been fixed at similar values in all assessments (h : 0.72, 0.84, 0.84, 0.84) though again the value from SEDAR 04 was a little lower. The estimate of F_{MSY} in SEDAR 04 was considerably lower than in later assessments (F_{MSY} : 0.043, 0.185, 0.236, 0.3). The estimate of MSY was also much lower in SEDAR 04 than in later assessments (MSY, klb: 335, 638, 560, 518). In SEDAR 04 SSB was measured in units of female biomass (MSST, mt: 659) and thus was not comparable to later assessments which were in units of gonad weight (MSST, mt W_{gonad} : 19.0, 16.4, 14).

4. Regional Maps


Figure 3.1: South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and EEZ boundaries.



5. Abbreviations

APAIS	Access Point Angler Intercept Survey
ABC	Allowable Biological Catch
ACCSP	Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
ADMB	AD Model Builder software program
ALS	Accumulated Landings System; SEFSC fisheries data collection program
AMRD	Alabama Marine Resources Division
ASMFC	Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
ASPIC	a stock production model incorporating covariates
ASPM	age-structured production model
B	stock biomass level
BAM	Beaufort Assessment Model
BMSY	value of B capable of producing MSY on a continuing basis
CFMC	Caribbean Fishery Management Council
CIE	Center for Independent Experts
CPUE	catch per unit of effort
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
F	fishing mortality (instantaneous)
FMSY	fishing mortality to produce MSY under equilibrium conditions
FOY	fishing mortality rate to produce Optimum Yield under equilibrium
FXX% SPR	fishing mortality rate that will result in retaining XX% of the maximum spawning production under equilibrium conditions
FMAX	fishing mortality that maximizes the average weight yield per fish recruited to the fishery
F0	a fishing mortality close to, but slightly less than, Fmax
FL FWCC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
FWRI	(State of) Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute
GA DNR	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
GLM	general linear model
GMFMC	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
GSMFC	Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
GULF FIN	GSMFC Fisheries Information Network
HMS	Highly Migratory Species

LDWF	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
M	natural mortality (instantaneous)
MAFMC	Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
MARMAP	Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction
MDMR	Mississippi Department of Marine Resources
MFMT	maximum fishing mortality threshold, a value of F above which overfishing is deemed to be occurring
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey; combines a telephone survey of households to estimate number of trips with creel surveys to estimate catch and effort per trip
MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program
MSST	minimum stock size threshold, a value of B below which the stock is deemed to be overfished
MSY	maximum sustainable yield
NC DMF	North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
OY	optimum yield
SAFMC	South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
SAS	Statistical Analysis Software, SAS Corporation
SC DNR	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
SEAMAP	Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program
SEDAR	Southeast Data, Assessment and Review
SEFIS	Southeast Fishery-Independent Survey
SEFSC	Fisheries Southeast Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service
SERO	Fisheries Southeast Regional Office, National Marine Fisheries Service
SPR	spawning potential ratio, stock biomass relative to an unfished state of the stock
SSB	Spawning Stock Biomass
SSC	Science and Statistics Committee
TIP	Trip Incident Program; biological data collection program of the SEFSC and Southeast States.
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Z	total mortality, the sum of M and F



SEDAR

Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review

SEDAR 66

South Atlantic Tilefish

Section II: Assessment Report

April 2021

Revised May 6, 2021

Revised May 14, 2021

SEDAR
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201 North Charleston, SC 29405

Document History

April, 2021 Original release

May 6, 2021 Revision

- Typos associated with values of constant natural mortality were corrected in the text.
 - * The text “0.0183” was replaced with “0.1083”.
 - * The text “0.0138” was replaced with “0.1038”.
 - * Note that these corrections had no affect on the assessment and were limited to the report.
- Projections were revised to fix a typographical coding error, generated during this assessment, that affected stochastic recruitment.
 - * Projection code used in the original release of this report contained a typographical error that caused recruitment in the first year of the stochastic projections to be zero. This error did not affect deterministic projections, nor any other part of the assessment.
 - * The revised results were then incorporated into the revised report. The correction affects Figures 36, 37, 38, and 39, and Tables 20, 21, 22, and 23.

May 14, 2021 Revision

- The analytical team identified that in earlier runs of the assessment, recreational landings data were incorrectly input in numbers of fish instead of weight. In this revision, the recreational landings data were obtained in whole pounds, converted to thousand pounds gutted weight, and used in the assessment model (Table 17). This correction affects results of the base model, sensitivity analysis, retrospective analysis, Monte Carlo Bootstrap Ensemble Analysis, and projections. All analyses, and related text, have been updated for this revision. The effects of this correction were widespread but minor.

Contents

1	Introduction	7
1.1	Executive Summary	7
1.2	Workshop Time and Place	8
1.3	Terms of Reference	8
1.4	List of Participants	9
1.5	Document List	11
1.6	Statements Addressing Each Term of Reference	12
2	Data Review and Update	14
2.1	Data Review	14
2.2	Data Update	15
2.2.1	Life History	15
2.2.2	Landings	15
2.3	Discards	16
2.4	Indices of abundance	16
2.5	Length Composition	16
2.6	Age Composition	16
3	Stock Assessment Methods	16
3.1	Overview	17
3.2	Data Sources	17
3.3	Model Configuration and Equations	17
3.4	Sensitivity Analysis	21
3.5	Retrospective Analysis	21
3.6	Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analysis	22
3.7	Benchmarks and Reference Points	22
3.8	Comparison to Previous Assessments	23
3.9	Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE) Analysis	23
3.9.1	Bootstrapping of Observed Data	24
3.9.2	Monte Carlo Sampling	24
3.10	Projection Analysis	25
3.10.1	Initialization of Projections	25
3.10.2	Uncertainty of Projections	25
3.10.3	Projection Scenarios	26

4	Stock Assessment Results	26
4.1	Measures of Overall Model Fit	26
4.2	Parameter Estimates	26
4.3	Total Abundance, Spawning Biomass and Recruitment	26
4.4	Selectivity	27
4.5	Landings, Fishing Mortality, Quotas, and Biomass	27
4.6	Spawner-Recruitment Parameters	27
4.7	Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analyses	28
4.8	Benchmarks / Reference Points	28
4.9	Status of the Stock and Fishery	28
4.10	Comparison to Previous Assessments	29
4.11	Sensitivity Analyses	30
4.12	Retrospective Analyses	30
4.13	Projections	30
5	Discussion	30
5.1	Comments on Assessment Results	30
5.2	Comments on Projections	31
6	Research Recommendations	31
7	References	33
8	Tables	36
9	Figures	60
	Appendices	103
A	ADMB Parameter Estimates	103
B	Abbreviations and Symbols	108

List of Tables

1	Observed time series of landings.	37
2	Observed time series of CVs used in Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE) for landings.	38
3	Sample sizes of length and age compositions (numbers of fish).	39
4	Sample sizes of length and age compositions (numbers of fish).	40
5	Observed time series of indices of abundance.	41
6	Life history at age.	42
7	Estimated total abundance at age (1000 fish)	43
8	Estimated total abundance at age (mt)	44
9	Estimated total abundance at age (1000 lb)	45
10	Estimated time series of status indicators, fishing mortality, biomass, and recruitment.	46
11	Selectivities by survey or fleet	47
12	Estimated time series of fully selected fishing mortality rates by fleet.	48
13	Estimated instantaneous fishing mortality rate.	49
14	Estimated total landings at age in numbers (1000 fish)	50
15	Estimated total landings at age in gutted weight (1000 lb)	51
16	Estimated time series of landings in numbers (1000 fish) by fleet.	52
17	Estimated time series of landings in weight (1000 lb) by fleet.	53
18	Estimated status indicators and benchmarks	54
19	Results from sensitivity runs.	55
20	Projection results for $F = F_{P_{50\%}^*}$	56
21	Projection results for $F = F_{MSY}$	57
22	Projection results for $F = F_{P_{30\%}^*}$	58
23	Projection results for $F = 0.75F_{MSY}$	59
24	Parameter estimates from the BAM base run	103
25	Abbreviations and symbols	108

List of Figures

1	Data timeline	61
2	Length, female maturity, and reproductive output at age.	62
3	Observed and estimated annual age and length compositions by fleet	63
4	Observed and estimated landings: commercial handline	67
5	Observed and estimated landings: commercial longline	68
6	Observed and estimated landings: recreational	69
7	Observed and estimated index of abundance: commercial longline	70
8	Observed and estimated index of abundance: MARMAP longline survey	71
9	Estimated annual abundance (numbers) at age	72
10	Estimated annual biomass (weight) at age	73
11	Estimated recruitment time series	74
12	Estimated total and spawning stock biomass time series	75
13	Selectivity by fleet: MARMAP longline index	76
14	Selectivity by fleet: commercial landings	77
15	Selectivity by fleet: recreational landings	78
16	Average selectivity from the terminal assessment year	79
17	Estimated fully selected fishing mortality rates by fleet	80
18	Estimated landings in numbers by fleet	81
19	Estimated landings in weight by fleet	82
20	Spawner recruit curve	83
21	Probability densities of spawner-recruit quantities	84
22	Yield per recruit and spawning potential ratio at F	85
23	Equilibrium removals and spawning stock at F	86
24	Probability densities of MSY-related benchmarks from MCBE analysis	87
25	Estimated time series of SSB and F relative to benchmarks	88
26	Probability densities of terminal status estimates from MCBE analysis	89
27	Phase plot of terminal status estimates from MCBE analysis	90
28	Estimated age structure from a series of individual years during the assessment, relative to the equilibrium expected at F_{MSY}	91
29	Sensitivity to natural mortality (S1-S2)	92
30	Sensitivity to steepness (S3-S4)	93

31	Sensitivity to F_{init} (S5-S6)	94
32	Sensitivity to weight of MARMAP longline index (S7-S8)	95
33	Sensitivity to recent estimates of recruitment (S9)	96
34	Sensitivity status phase plots (S1-S10)	97
35	Retrospective plots	98
36	Projections with fishing mortality rate at fixed F that provides $P^* = 0.50$	99
37	Projections with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = F_{MSY}$	100
38	Projections with fishing mortality rate at fixed F that provides $P^* = 0.30$	101
39	Projections with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = 75\%F_{MSY}$	102

1 Introduction

1.1 Executive Summary

This operational assessment evaluated the status of Tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*; a.k.a. Golden Tilefish, Great Northern Tilefish) off the Southeastern United States (i.e. the US South Atlantic stock). The primary objectives of this assessment were to build on previous assessments [SEDAR 04, SEDAR 25, and the SEDAR 25 2016 Update (hereafter 2016 Update)] to provide recent estimates of benchmarks and conduct updated stock projections.

Data compilation and assessment methods were guided by methods used in previous Tilefish assessments and other recent SEDAR assessments. The benchmark assessment for Tilefish was completed in 2004 with an assessment period 1961-2002 (SEDAR 04 2004). SEDAR 25 was a standard assessment completed in 2011 with an assessment period spanning 1962-2010 (SEDAR 25 2011). Current management of South Atlantic Tilefish is based on an update assessment completed in 2016 with an assessment period of 1962-2014 (SEDAR 25 2016). This assessment was conducted by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in cooperation with regional data providers, for the time period 1972-2018.

Available data on this stock included indices of abundance, landings, and samples of annual length compositions and age compositions from fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sources. Two indices of abundance were developed during the SEDAR process and fitted by the model: one fishery dependent index based on the commercial longline fleet logbooks and one fishery independent index based on the Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction program 'long' bottom longline survey (MARMAP longline). Landings data were available from all significant recreational and commercial sources.

The model used in all previous assessments of this stock—and updated here—was the Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM), an integrated statistical catch-age formulation (Williams and Shertzer 2015). A base run of BAM was configured to provide estimates of key management quantities, such as stock and fishery status. Uncertainty in estimates from the base run was evaluated through a mixed Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE) analysis.

Estimated time series of stock status (SSB/MSST) showed a rapid decline during the 1980s and a slower decline during the 1990s, to a minimum value in 1995. From 1995 to 2011 stock status improved, but has been in decline again since 2012.

Current stock status was estimated in the base run to be $SSB_{2018}/MSST = 1.235$, indicating that the stock is not overfished. Through its history, SSB has only dropped below MSST in a few years during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Results from the MCBE suggested that the estimate of SSB relative to SSB_{MSY} and the status relative to MSST is highly uncertain (Figures 26, 27). Only 54.2% of MCBE runs agreed with the stock status result from the assessment model.

The estimated time series of F/F_{MSY} from the assessment model suggests that although F has exceeded F_{MSY} sporadically for individual years during the assessment period, it has not been a consistent problem since the run of years of overfishing during 1990-1995. However, there is considerable uncertainty in F/F_{MSY} as demonstrated by the MCBE, especially toward the end of the assessment period. Current fishery status in the terminal year, with current F represented by the geometric mean from 2016 – 2018 ($F_{current} = F_{2016-2018} = 0.2671$), was estimated by the base run to be $F_{2016-2018}/F_{MSY} = 0.95$. Thus, at the end of the assessment Tilefish was not undergoing overfishing. However, results from the MCBE show that there is a lot of uncertainty in the status of the fishery. Only 43.8% of MCBE runs agreed with the fishing status result from the model, and the median value of $F_{2016-2018}/F_{MSY}$ from the MCBE runs (1.122) suggests overfishing.

Compared to 2016 Update, stock status has improved and the stock is no longer undergoing overfishing as of 2018. The estimated trends from this operational assessment are similar to those from the SEDAR 04, SEDAR 25, and 2016 Update. However, this assessment did show some differences from previous assessments, which was not surprising, given modifications made to both the data and model (described throughout the report).

1.2 Workshop Time and Place

The SEDAR 66 South Atlantic Tilefish assessment took place over a series of webinars and a webinar workshop held from April, 2020 to February, 2021. Due to the 2020 Pandemic the in-person workshop that was originally scheduled for November 17-19 in Beaufort, NC was rescheduled to be four 5 hour long webinars held November 16-19.

1.3 Terms of Reference

1. Prepare a standard assessment, based on the approved 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment with data through 2018. Provide commercial and recreational landings and discards in pounds and numbers.
2. Evaluate and document the following specific changes in input data or deviations from the update model. (List below each topic or new dataset that will be considered in this assessment.)
 - Incorporate the latest BAM model configurations and updates to data calculation methodologies, detailing the changes made between the 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment model and the proposed SEDAR 66 model.
 - Examine evidence for changing selectivity in input data sources and consider implementing time blocks if warranted.
 - Re-consider error distributions for fitting age and length composition data.
 - Investigate the potential use of the following new data sources
 - CRP Cooperative Bottom Longline Survey to Augment Fishery Independent Reef Fish Data Collection in Deepwater Snapper Grouper
 - G. Nessler FATE project
3. Document any changes or corrections made to the model and input datasets and provide updated input data tables. Fully document and describe the impacts (on population parameters and management benchmarks) of any changes to the model structure, methods, application or fitting procedures made between this assessment and the 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment.
4. Update model parameter estimates and their variances, model uncertainties, and estimates of stock status and management benchmarks. Compare population parameter trends and management benchmarks estimated in this assessment with values from the previous assessment, and comment on the impacts of changes in data, assumptions or assessment methods on estimated population conditions and benchmarks.
5. Provide stock projections, including a probability density function (PDF) for biological reference point estimates and yield separated for landings and discards reported in pounds and numbers. Projection results are requested for 5 years from the start of the alternative fishing mortality levels. (The specific years for projections will be determined once the terminal year and schedule are known). The panel shall provide guidance on appropriate assumptions to address harvest and mortality levels in the interim years between the assessment terminal year (2018) and the first year of management (2020). Projection criteria:
 - To determine OFL: (1) $P^* = 50\%$; (2) F_{MSY}
 - To determine ABC: (1) $P^* = 30\%$; (2) $75\%F_{MSY}$
6. Review, evaluate, and report on the status and progress of all research recommendations listed in the last assessment, peer review reports, and SSC report concerning this stock.
7. Develop a stock assessment update report to address these TORS and fully document the input data, methods, and results of the stock assessment update.

1.4 List of Participants

Appointee	Function	Affiliation
ANALYTICAL TEAM		
Nikolai Klibansky	Lead Analyst	SEFSC Beaufort
Eric Fitzpatrick	Data Compiler	SEFSC Beaufort
Kyle Shertzer	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
Erik Williams	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
PANEL		
Ken Brennan	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
Wally Bubley	Panelist	SCDNR
Julie DeFilippi-Simpson	Panelist	ACCSP
Kelly Fitzpatrick	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
Churchill Grimes	Panelist	SAFMC SSC
Kevin Kolmos	Panelist	SCDNR
Vivian Matter	Assessment Team	SEFSC Miami
Genny Nessler	Panelist	SAFMC SSC
Jennifer Potts	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
Walt Rogers	Assessment Team	SEFSC Beaufort
George Sedberry	Panelist	SAFMC SSC
Kevin Spanik	Panelist	SCDNR
Amanda Tong	Panelist	NCDMF
Beth Wrege	Assessment Team	SEFSC Miami
APPOINTED OBSERVERS		
Vincent Bonura	Fisherman	Snapper Grouper AP
Jim Freeman	Fisherman	Snapper Grouper AP
Rusty Hudson	Fisherman	Snapper Grouper AP
Andy Piland	Fisherman	Snapper Grouper AP
NON-PANEL DATA PROVIDERS		
Larry Beerkircher	Observer	SEFSC Miami
Steve Brown	Observer	FLFWCC
Julie Califf	Observer	GADNR
Andrew Cathey	Observer	NCDMF
Amy Dukes	Observer	SCDNR
Eric Hiltz	Observer	SCDNR
Dominique Lazarre	Observer	FLFWCC
Kevin McCarthy	Observer	SEFSC Miami
Refik Orhun	Observer	SEFSC Miami
STAFF		
Mike Errigo	SAFMC Lead	SAFMC
Kathleen Howington	Coordinator	SEDAR
Steve Poland	SAFMC Representative	SAFMC
Jeff Pulver	Observer	SERO

Appointee	Function	Affiliation
OTHER		
Nate Bacheler	Observer	SEFSC Beaufort
Julia Byrd	Observer	SAFMC
Rob Cheshire	Observer	SEFSC Beaufort
Chip Collier	Observer	SAFMC
Margaret Finch	Observer	SCDNR
Keilin Gamboa-Salazar	Observer	SCDNR
Dawn Glasgow	Observer	SCDNR
Homer Hiers	Observer	SCDNR
Ryan Lindh	Observer	Fisherman
Stephen Long	Observer	SCDNR
Alan Lowther	Observer	NMFS
Matthew Nuttall	Observer	NMFS
Andy Ostrowski	Observer	SEFSC Beaufort
Mike Rinaldi	Observer	ACCSP
Mike Schmidtke	Observer	SAFMC
McLean Seward	Observer	NCDENR
Wiley Sinkus	Observer	SCDNR
Tracy Smart	Observer	SCDNR
Laurie Stevens	Observer	SFA
Michelle Willis	Observer	SCDNR

1.5 Document List

Document number	Title	Authors	Date Received
Documents Prepared for SEDAR 66			
SEDAR66-WP01	General Recreational Survey Data for Tilefish in the South Atlantic	Nuttall and Mat-ter 2020	9/16/2020
SEDAR66-WP02	Golden Tilefish Fishery-Independent Index of Abundance in US South Atlantic Waters Based on a SCDNR Bottom Longline Survey (1996- 2016)	Bubley and Smart 2020	9/22/2020
SEDAR66-WP03	Standardized catch rates of tilefish (<i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>) in the southeast U.S. from commercial logbook data	Fitzpatrick 2020	12/4/2020
Final Assessment Report			
SEDAR66-SAR1	SEDAR 66 Stock Assessment Report (<i>current document</i>)	Prepared by the SEDAR 66 panel	4/6/2021
Reference Documents			
SEDAR66-RD01	Cooperative Bottom Longline Survey to Augment Fisheries Independent Reef Fish Data Collection in the Deep-Water Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic United States	Helies et al. 2016	5/5/2020
SEDAR66-RD02	Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel Golden Tilefish Fishery Performance Report	Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel 2018	7/17/2020

1.6 Statements Addressing Each Term of Reference

Note: Original ToRs are in normal font. Statements addressing ToRs are in italics and preceded by a dash (–).

1. Prepare a standard assessment, based on the approved 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment with data through 2018. Provide commercial and recreational landings and discards in pounds and numbers.
 - *This report documents the preparation of an operational assessment, based on the approved 2016 Update assessment (SEDAR 25 2016) with data through 2018. Observed time series of landings are presented in Table 1, with associated CVs in Table 2. Estimated time series of landings are presented in numbers (Tables 16) and pounds (Table 17). Data providers have indicated that discarding has been negligible for this stock, thus discards have not been modeled in this past SEDAR assessments of South Atlantic Tilefish. We conferred with data providers for the current assessment and they confirmed that discarding remains minimal in recent years. Thus, discards have not been modeled in SEDAR 66 and are not provided in this report.*
2. Evaluate and document the following specific changes in input data or deviations from the update model. (List below each topic or new dataset that will be considered in this assessment.)
 - Incorporate the latest BAM model configurations and updates to data calculation methodologies, detailing the changes made between the 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment model and the proposed SEDAR 66 model.
 - *The latest BAM model configurations and updates to data calculation methodologies have been considered and included in the SEDAR 66 base model.*
 - Examine evidence for changing selectivity in input data sources and consider implementing time blocks if warranted.
 - *Evidence for changing selectivity has been examined and discussed by the SEDAR 66 panel. Although past assessments for Tilefish did not include multiple time blocks for selectivity, the panel determined that both the commercial handline and commercial longline fleets should be modeled with two time blocks based on age composition data, due to the implementation of commercial fish seasons beginning in 2006 (see §I. Table 2.6.2). See Figs 13, 15 and 14 and Table 11 for estimated selectivities.*
 - Re-consider error distributions for fitting age and length composition data.
 - *Error distributions for fitting age and length composition data have been reconsidered. As in recent SEDAR assessments of other species (e.g. SEDAR 2017, SEDAR 60 2020) Dirichlet-Multinomial likelihoods were used for fitting age and length composition data for the SEDAR 66 assessment (Figure 3).*
 - Investigate the potential use of the following new data sources
 - CRP Cooperative Bottom Longline Survey to Augment Fishery Independent Reef Fish Data Collection in Deepwater Snapper Grouper
 - *We considered this early on in the assessment process and determined from speaking with the members of this project that these data were not appropriate for inclusion in SEDAR 66. This was due to the data collection of the survey occurring in 2019, as originally scheduled, but the terminal year of the assessment being 2018.*
 - G. Nessler FATE project
 - *We considered this early on in the assessment process and determined from speaking with members of this project that new data sets would not be generated for use in this assessment.*
3. Document any changes or corrections made to the model and input datasets and provide updated input data tables. Fully document and describe the impacts (on population parameters and management benchmarks) of any changes to the model structure, methods, application or fitting procedures made between this assessment and the 2016 SEDAR 25 South Atlantic Tilefish Update assessment.

- *Changes made to the model and input datasets are documented throughout this report. Direct comparisons between the SEDAR 66 and the 2016 Update models are described in in §3.8 and 4.10*
- 4. Update model parameter estimates and their variances, model uncertainties, and estimates of stock status and management benchmarks. Compare population parameter trends and management benchmarks estimated in this assessment with values from the previous assessment, and comment on the impacts of changes in data, assumptions or assessment methods on estimated population conditions and benchmarks.
- *Estimates of all model parameters are presented in Appendix A. Estimates of stock status and management benchmarks are presented in Table 18. Direct comparisons between the SEDAR 66 and the 2016 Update models are described in in §3.8 and 4.10*
- 5. Provide stock projections, including a probability density function (PDF) for biological reference point estimates and yield separated for landings and discards reported in pounds and numbers. Projection results are requested for 5 years from the start of the alternative fishing mortality levels. (The specific years for projections will be determined once the terminal year and schedule are known). The panel shall provide guidance on appropriate assumptions to address harvest and mortality levels in the interim years between the assessment terminal year (2018) and the first year of management (2020). Projection criteria:
 - To determine OFL: (1) $P^* = 50\%$; (2) F_{MSY}
 - To determine ABC: (1) $P^* = 30\%$; (2) $75\%F_{MSY}$
- *Projection results are described in §4.13. Relevant figures and tables are cited therein.*
- 6. Review, evaluate, and report on the status and progress of all research recommendations listed in the last assessment, peer review reports, and SSC report concerning this stock.
- *No research recommendations were made in the assessment report for the previous assessment (2016 Update; SEDAR 25 2016). This report did, however, contain a section (§5.2) entitled "Recommendations for the Next Benchmark Assessment". Note that SEDAR 66 is an operational assessment rather than a benchmark or research track assessment. I am not aware of research recommendations made in peer review reports or the SSC report associated with the 2016 Update.*
- 7. Develop a stock assessment update report to address these TORS and fully document the input data, methods, and results of the stock assessment update.
- *This SEDAR 66 Operational Assessment Report satisfies this ToR.*

2 Data Review and Update

The benchmark assessment for Tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*) off the Southeastern United States (i.e. the US South Atlantic stock), SEDAR 04, was completed in 2004 with an assessment period 1961-2002 (SEDAR 04 2004). SEDAR 25 was a standard assessment completed in 2011 with an assessment period spanning 1962-2010 (SEDAR 25 2011). Current management of South Atlantic Tilefish is based on an update assessment completed in 2016 with an assessment period of 1962-2014 (SEDAR 25 2016).

In the current SEDAR 66 assessment, data through 2018 were considered. For some data sources, the data were simply updated with the additional years of data (2015-2018) using the same methods as in the prior assessments. However, for some sources, it was necessary to update data prior to 2015 as well. The input data for this assessment are described below, with emphasis on the data that required modification beyond just the addition of years. A summary timeline of data sources fit to in this assessment is plotted in Fig. 1.

2.1 Data Review

In this operational assessment, the Beaufort assessment model (BAM) was fitted to many of the same data sources as in SEDAR 04 and the SEDAR 25 2016 Update (hereafter the 2016 Update).

- Landings: commercial handline, commercial longline, and general recreational
- Indices of abundance: commercial longline and Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment, and Prediction program 'long' bottom longline survey (MARMAP longline)
- Length compositions of landings: general recreational
- Age compositions of landings: commercial handline, commercial longline, and MARMAP longline survey.

Contrasts to data used in the 2016 Update assessment include:

- The SEDAR 66 model time period was 1972-2018 in contrast to 1962-2014 for the 2016 Update. Thus, data during 1962-1971 were dropped in SEDAR 66 while data for the period 2015-2018 were added.
- The commercial longline index, redeveloped for SEDAR 66, included the period 1993-2006. By contrast, in the SEDAR 25, this index included the period 1993-2014. Years after 2006 were not included in SEDAR 66 based on the realization that reduced fishing seasons starting in 2006 and becoming shorter over subsequent years caused shifts in fleet behavior. Development of this index is detailed by Fitzpatrick (2020).
- The MARMAP longline index was also redeveloped for SEDAR 66 and includes individual discontinuous years in the period 1996-2016 (i.e. 1996-2001, 2007, 2009-2011, 2015-2016). By contrast, in the SEDAR 25, this index included data from the period 1985-2010, averaged over five-year blocks and modeled at the midpoint of each of those blocks (i.e. 1985, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2010). Development of this index is detailed by Bubley and Smart (2020).
- While the SEDAR 25 had included ages 1-25 yr for all age compositions, the SEDAR 66 model included ages 1-20 yr for commercial and ages 1-16 yr for MARMAP longline survey age compositions. Few ages were available for the age classes that were excluded.
- Commercial handline and commercial longline length composition data were not used in SEDAR 66

2.2 Data Update

2.2.1 Life History

Life-history inputs from SEDAR 04 and subsequently the SEDAR 25 remained largely the same in SEDAR 66. All conversion equations (e.g. conversion from gutted weight to whole weight), time of peak spawning, growth model parameters, proportions female-at-age and maturity-at-age, were all identical to SEDAR 04. The exception being vectors-at-age were truncated to match the range of ages modeled in SEDAR 66 (1-20). Primary life-history information is summarized in Table 6. Maximum age (t_{max}) remained age $t_{max} = 40$, and constant natural mortality (M) used for scaling age-varying natural mortality (M_a) was still computed from the equation from Hoenig (1983, ; $M = \exp(1.46 - 1.01 \log t_{max})$) such that $M = 0.1038$. However, in SEDAR 04 and the SEDAR 25 the value of M was slightly different from this value at 0.1083, probably due to a typographical error where digits 3 and 8 were transposed during SEDAR 04. Thus, M_a was rescaled to reflect this change.

In addition, the upper and lower bounds of M used in the MCBE analysis were recomputed by applying the Hoenig (1983) equation to lower and upper estimates of $t_{max} = 50, 30$ resulting in a range of M from 0.08 to 0.14. This method is similar to the approach used in other recent assessments (SEDAR 50 2017; SEDAR 60 2020) and was preferred by the SEDAR 66 panel. The SEDAR 04 had computed range of 0.03-0.21 based on 13 estimates of M using 12 different meta-analysis regression methods. However, most of the estimates included in the SEDAR 04 approach are no longer considered for use in recent SEDAR assessments, and the resulting range seemed unreasonably wide and used estimates that are not considered realistic. The approach of using the range from multiple M estimates was in fact used in assessments as recent as SEDAR 60 (2020) which used a range from six M values based on two methods and three estimates of t_{max} . However, it is not helpful to include estimates that are not considered realistic for the stock.

2.2.2 Landings

Landings estimates were combined into three fleets: commercial handline, commercial longline, and general recreational (Table 1). Commercial landings of Tilefish were compiled from 1950 through 2018 for the entire U.S. Atlantic Coast, in gutted weight (GW). Only landings from 1972 to 2018 were included in this assessment as landings prior to 1972 were minimal. Sources for landings in the U.S. South Atlantic (Florida through North Carolina) included the Florida Trip Ticket program (FTT), South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR), North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF), and the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP). Commercial handline landings included gear types such as hook and line, bandit reels, and similar hook gear. Landings from gear types other than handline and longline were negligible and were not included in the assessment. Commercial landings include data from the North Carolina-Virginia border to the Florida Keys in Monroe County, Florida along US Highway 1. Landings in Monroe County were apportioned by data providers to exclude landings north of the Florida Keys, which are considered part of the Gulf of Mexico.

For this assessment, estimates of recreational landings from the private and charter modes were based on current Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) methodology. This included landings from 1981 to 2019, from North Carolina to Florida, including the Florida Keys. The inclusion of the Keys is a slight deviation from methods used in SEDAR 04. Estimates account for changes in the Fishing Effort Survey, the redesigned Access Point Angler Intercept Survey, and the For Hire Survey. A large value of recreational landings in 1981 (814 klb GW) was associated with one trip which reported 12 Tilefish (Nuttall and Matter 2020). In contrast with previous Tilefish assessments, the 2005 estimate was not replaced with an average of values from other years (SEDAR 25 2016), since it is not anomalous in the current time series of recreational landings.

The Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS) also provided landings, but they were negligible and were not included in the recreational landings (E. Fitzpatrick, pers. comm.). Recreational landings were provided in whole

weight (WW) but were converted to GW outside of the assessment using Eq. 3 so that all landings would be in the same units (Table 1).

In years where no recreational landings were estimated (1982, 1989, 1993, and 1995), these zeros were replaced with the minimum non-zero value from the recreational landings time series (0.25 klb GW from 2008) by the lead analyst. This is similar to what was done in SEDAR 04, where zeroes were replaced with a small value of 0.02 klb WW (SEDAR 25 2016).

2.3 Discards

As in the SEDAR 04, SEDAR 25, and the SEDAR 25, no discard estimates were included in the model as discards appear to be negligible in all sectors of the Tilefish fishery. For SEDAR 66, discards for recent years were shown to be minimal for commercial fisheries (Kevin McCarthy, unpublished data), the recreational headboat fishery (Dominique Lazarre, pers. comm.), and from the recreational private and charter fisheries (Nuttall and Matter 2020).

2.4 Indices of abundance

The indices of abundance used in SEDAR 25 included the fishery-independent MARMAP longline index and the fishery dependent longline logbook index (Table 5). Both indices were updated for this assessment. See Bubley and Smart (2020) and Fitzpatrick (2020) for detailed descriptions of index development

2.5 Length Composition

Length compositions were developed from the commercial handline, commercial longline, and recreational sampling data. Sample sizes by year and fleet are reported in Tables 3 (trips) and 4. Following the methodology of SEDAR 25, the contribution of each length was weighted by the landings associated by state, gear, and year.

2.6 Age Composition

Age data were available from the commercial handline, commercial longline, and MARMAP longline sampling programs. For commercial data, ages greater than 20 yr were pooled to age-20 creating a plus group. For the MARMAP age compositions, there were few ages > 16 yr, so ages ≥ 16 yr were pooled as a plus group. Sample sizes by year and fleet are reported in Tables 3 (trips) and 4.

3 Stock Assessment Methods

This assessment updates the primary model applied during the SEDAR 04 and the 2016 Update for Tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*) off the Southeastern United States (hereafter South Atlantic Tilefish). The methods are reviewed below, and any changes since the 2016 Update are emphasized.

3.1 Overview

The primary model in this assessment was the Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM), which applies a statistical catch-age formulation (Williams and Shertzer 2015). The model was implemented with the AD Model Builder software (Fournier et al. 2012). In essence, the model simulates a population forward in time while including fishing processes (Quinn and Deriso 1999; Shertzer et al. 2008). 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 Virtual Population Analysis (VPA).

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, among many applications, used by Fournier and Archibald (1982), by Deriso et al. (1985) in their CAGEAN model, and by 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 model have been used in previous SEDAR assessments in the U.S. South Atlantic, including those for Tilefish (SEDAR 04 2004; SEDAR 25 2011; 2016) and other reef fishes such as Vermilion Snapper, Black Sea Bass, Snowy Grouper, Gag Grouper, Greater Amberjack, Spanish Mackerel, Red Grouper, and Red Snapper.

3.2 Data Sources

The catch-age model included data from the fishery dependent SRHS survey, the fishery independent MARMAP longline survey, and three fleets that caught South Atlantic Tilefish: commercial handline, commercial longline, and the recreational fishery. The model was fitted to annual landings (GW; Table 1). Data providers also provided coefficients of variation (CVs) associated with landings (Table 2), which were used to generate bootstrap data sets during the MCBE model analysis. The model was also fitted to annual length compositions of recreational landings and annual age compositions from commercial handline and commercial longline landings and from the MARMAP longline survey. Samples sizes associated with composition data are provided in numbers of trips (Table 3) and numbers of fish (Table 4). The model was also fitted to the fishery dependent SRHS survey and the fishery independent MARMAP longline survey index of abundance (Table 5). Data used in the model are described in §2 of this report and in previous reports of South Atlantic Tilefish.

3.3 Model Configuration and Equations

Model structure and equations of the BAM are detailed in Williams and Shertzer (2015). The assessment time period for this assessment was 1972-2018. A general description of the assessment model follows.

Stock dynamics In the assessment model, new biomass was acquired through growth and recruitment, while abundance of existing cohorts experienced mortality from fishing and natural sources. 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).

Initialization Initial (1972) abundance at age was estimated in the model as follows. The equilibrium age structure was computed for ages 1–20 based on natural and fishing mortality (F_{init}), where F_{init} was set equal to a value that resulted in the 1972 biomass level equaling 90% of the unfished level. This was done in SEDAR 25 and the SEDAR 25 based on the assumption by the SEDAR 25 workshop panel that the stock was lightly exploited prior to the 1960's. In SEDAR 66, landings data showed minimal exploitation prior to 1972, and the same method was followed. Lognormal deviations around that equilibrium age structure were found not to deviate from zero during model development and thus were fixed at zero.

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). As in previous SEDAR assessments, the

age-dependent estimates of M_a were rescaled to provide the same fraction of fish surviving from age-1 through the oldest observed age (40 yr) as would occur with constant $M = 0.1038$. This approach using cumulative mortality is consistent with the findings of [Hoenig \(1983\)](#) and [Hewitt and Hoenig \(2005\)](#). For the MCBE analysis, M was randomly drawn from a uniform distribution from 0.08 – 0.14.

Growth Mean length in the population [l_a ; total length (TL) in millimeters, (mm)] was modeled with the von Bertalanffy function of age (a)

$$l_a = L_\infty(1 - \exp[-K(a - t_0 + \tau)]) \quad (1)$$

where $L_\infty = 825.1$, $K = 0.189$, and $t_0 = -0.47$, are parameters estimated external to the assessment model during the SEDAR 25 process and $\tau = 0.5$, representing a fraction of the year. Here, l_a is being computed at midyear. All parameters in Eq. 1 were treated as fixed input to the assessment model. For fitting length composition data, the distribution of size at age was assumed normal with coefficient of variation estimated by the assessment model ($CV_l = 0.1444$). A constant CV, rather than constant standard deviation, was suggested by the size at age data.

Weight at age [w_a ; WW in kilograms (kg)] was modeled as a power function of l_a

$$w_a = \theta_1 l_a^{\theta_2} \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_1 = 4.04e - 12$ and $\theta_2 = 3.155$ are parameters estimated external to the assessment model during the SEDAR 25 process and treated as fixed input to the assessment model (Table 6, Figure 2). Where necessary (e.g. converting recreational landings to GW), WW was converted to gutted weight (GW) with the equation

$$GW = \frac{WW}{a} \quad (3)$$

where $a = 1.05893$.

Spawning stock Spawning stock was modeled using mature female gonad weight measured at the time of peak spawning. In cases when reliable estimates of fecundity are unavailable, spawning biomass, and in this case, female gonad weight, is commonly used as a proxy for population fecundity. For Tilefish, peak spawning was considered to occur at the end of May (May 31st; *spawn.time.frac* = 5/12 = 0.42. Gonad weight (W_{gonad} ; g) was computed from whole fish weight (WW; g) with the equation

$$W_{\text{gonad}} = aWW^b \quad (4)$$

where $a = -9.16802$, $b = 1.70498$, and weights are in grams (g).

Recruitment Expected annual recruitment (\bar{R}_y) of age-1 fish (i.e. recruits) was predicted from spawning stock in year y (S_y) using the Beverton–Holt spawner-recruit model

$$\bar{R}_{y+1} = \frac{0.8R_0hS_y}{0.2R_0\phi_0(1-h) + S_y(h-0.2)} \quad (5)$$

where R_0 is virgin recruitment, h is steepness, and ϕ_0 is the unfished spawners per recruit (Williams and Shertzer 2015). In SEDAR 66, R_0 was estimated while h was fixed at 0.84 from a meta-analysis by Shertzer and Conn 2012, as in SEDAR 25 and the SEDAR 25. When attempts were made to estimate h during the assessment process, it tended toward the upper bound. Likelihood profiles for h showed that most data sources favored maximizing steepness, which also supported fixing it. For years where data were considered useful for providing information on year-class strength, annual recruitment deviations (r_y) were estimated, assuming a lognormal distribution with standard deviation (σ_R)

$$N_{1,y} = \bar{R}_y \exp(r_y) \quad (6)$$

In early runs of the model, σ_R had a tendency to be estimated at the lower bound and thus was fixed at a value of 0.6 from a meta-analysis.

Annual variation in recruitment was assumed to occur with lognormal deviations for years 1982 – 2011 only. The start of recruitment residuals in 1982 was based on examination of a series of different starting years and the start of the age composition data that have information on year class strength. The first year of age composition data was 1992 from the commercial longline landings. In those early age compositions, the number of fish diminishes beyond age-10 (Fig. 3) which is the approximate age at full selection (Fig. 14). Thus, 1982 seemed to be about the earliest year that the composition data could reliably provide information on year class strength (i.e. estimate a recruitment residual). The ending year of estimated recruitment residuals (2011) was based on commercial longline age composition data, which had large sample sizes up until 2018 (Tables 3 and 4). The age at 50% selection for commercial longline toward the end of the assessment was at approximately age-8, so 2011 was the latest year for which recruitment could be informed by the age composition data. Tilefish from the 2011 year class are represented in commercial longline age composition data from 2015 to 2018, though are in fairly small numbers during 2015 and 2016.

Landings The model included time series of landings from three fleets: commercial longlines (1972 – 2018), commercial handlines (1972 – 2018), and general recreational (1981 – 2018). Landings were modeled with the Baranov catch equation (Baranov 1918) and were fitted in units of weight (1000 lb WW).

Discards As noted above, observed discards are negligible for South Atlantic Tilefish, thus discards were not modeled in this assessment.

Fishing Mortality For each time series of landings, the assessment model estimated a separate full fishing mortality rate (F). 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 As in the SEDAR 25, selectivity at age was estimated using a two-parameter, flat-topped, logistic model in all cases. This parametric approach reduces the number of estimated parameters and imposes theoretical structure on selectivity. Age and size composition data are critical for estimating selectivity functions.

As in the SEDAR 25, separate selectivity functions were estimated for commercial handline, commercial longline, and general recreational fleets, as well as for the MARMAP longline index. But in contrast to the SEDAR 25, selectivity functions for both the commercial handline and commercial longline fleets were estimated for two time blocks (1972-2008, 2009-2018). Though there have been no size-limits on South Atlantic Tilefish, decreases in the fishing season began taking place in 2006 and have continued in the years since. Age composition data for the commercial longline fleet suggest a shift in selectivity beginning in 2009. During the SEDAR 66 workshop multiple fishermen (appointed observers) confirmed that decreases in the fishing season affected behavior of the commercial fleet in ways that might cause a change in selectivity.

No selectivity parameters are fixed in SEDAR 66, but a normal prior distribution was applied to the slope parameter for the general recreational fleet selectivity which was not well estimated. Likelihood profiling showed that this

parameter was poorly informed by the data. Thus, the mean value of the prior was set at the minimum of the likelihood profile, and the prior CV was set fairly tightly at -0.15.

During the SEDAR 66 process, dome-shaped (i.e. double-logistic) selectivity was investigated for the commercial handline and recreational fleets. However, likelihood profiling showed that the data contained little information for estimating parameters of the descending limb of a double-logistic function. When attempting to estimate dome-shaped selectivity for these fleets within the assessment model, the function tended toward a logistic (i.e. flat-top) shape. Thus, selectivity for these fleets remained logistic in the base model.

Indices of abundance The model was fit to two indices of relative abundance: commercial longline (1993-2006) and MARMAP longline survey (discontinuous years from 1996 to 2016; Table 5). Predicted indices were conditional on selectivity of the corresponding fleet or survey and were computed from abundance (MARMAP) or biomass (commercial) at the midpoint of the year.

In this assessment, commercial CPUE units within the model code were converted from GW to WW to better match the population units of WW. This conversion does not affect model results, as the predicted index is ultimately scaled by the catchability parameter.

Catchability In the BAM, catchability scales indices of relative abundance to the estimated vulnerable population at large. As in prior assessments, catchability coefficients of both indices were assumed constant through time.

Fitting criterion The fitting criterion was a penalized likelihood approach in which observed landings were fit closely, and observed composition data and abundance indices were fit to the degree that they were compatible. Landings and index data were fitted using lognormal likelihoods. Length and age composition data were fit using the Dirichlet-multinomial distribution, with sample size represented by the annual number of trips (Table 5), adjusted by an estimated variance inflation factor (i.e. one additional parameter for each fleet's composition data).

The 2016 Update fit composition data using the robust multinomial with iterative re-weighting (Francis 2011). Since Francis (2011), additional work on this topic has questioned the use of the multinomial distribution in stock assessment models (Francis 2014), and has recommended the Dirichlet-multinomial as an alternative (Francis 2017; Thorson et al. 2017). A chief advantage of the Dirichlet-multinomial is that it is self-weighting through estimation of an additional variance inflation parameter for each composition component, making iterative re-weighting unnecessary. Another advantage is that it can better account for overdispersion, or, larger variance in the data than would be expected by the multinomial. Overdispersion can result from intra-haul correlation, which results when fish caught in the same set are more alike in length or age than fish caught in a different set (Pennington and Volstad 1994). The Dirichlet-multinomial has been implemented in Stock Synthesis (Methot and Wetzel 2013; Thorson et al. 2017) and in the BAM, and since the 2016 Update has become the standard likelihood for fitting composition data in assessments of South Atlantic reef fishes.

The model includes the capability for each component of the likelihood to be weighted by user-supplied values. When applied to landings and indices, these weights modify the effect of the input CVs. In this application to Tilefish, CVs of landings (in arithmetic space) were assumed equal to 0.05 to achieve a close fit to these data while allowing some imprecision. In practice, the small CVs are a matter of computational convenience, as they help achieve a close fit to the landings, while avoiding having to solve the Baranov equation iteratively (which is complex when there are multiple fisheries). In contrast to the SEDAR 25, iterative re-weighting was not conducted here, in part because the composition likelihoods were self-weighting. Thus, data weights were all equal in the base model.

In addition, the compound objective function included several prior distributions, applied to the Dirichlet-multinomial variance inflation factor parameters associated with each set of composition data and the slope parameter for the selectivity function of the general recreational fleet. Priors 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 which can result in a non-positive definite Hessian matrix (an indication of incomplete or incorrect parameter solutions).

Parameters Estimated The model estimated a total of 185 parameters including average fishing mortality rates (3 parameters) and annual fishing mortality rates (132 parameters) for each fleet, selectivity parameters (12 parameters), Dirichlet-multinomial variance inflation factors (4 parameters), a catchability coefficient associated with each index (2 parameters), coefficient of variation of length at age (CV_L ; 1 parameter), virgin recruitment (R_0 ; 1 parameter), and annual recruitment deviations (30 parameters).

Biological reference points Biological reference points (benchmarks) were calculated based on maximum sustainable yield (MSY) estimates in gutted pounds from the Beverton–Holt spawner-recruit model with bias correction (expected values in arithmetic space). Computed benchmarks included MSY, fishing mortality rate at MSY (F_{MSY}), and spawning stock at MSY (SSB_{MSY}) by the method of [Shepherd \(1982\)](#). In this assessment spawning stock measures total gonad weight of mature females. These benchmarks are conditional on the estimated selectivity functions and the relative contributions of each fleet’s fishing mortality. The selectivity pattern used here was the effort-weighted selectivities at age, with effort from each fishery estimated as the full F averaged over the last three years of the assessment (2016-2018).

Configuration of base run The base run was configured as described above. However, the base run configuration was not considered to represent all uncertainty. Sensitivity analyses, retrospective analyses, and ensemble modeling was conducted to better characterize the uncertainty in base run point estimates.

3.4 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity of results to some key model inputs and assumptions was examined through sensitivity analyses. Sensitivity runs were chosen to address specific questions that arose during the SEDAR 66 assessment process. They were intended to demonstrate directionality of results with changes in inputs or simply to explore model behavior. These model runs vary from the base run as follows.

- S1-S2: Low/high values of natural mortality ($M = 0.08, 0.14$)
- S3-S4: Low/high values of steepness ($h = 0.74, 0.94$)
- S5-S6: Higher values of initial F ($F_{init} = 0.0395, 0.079$). Values associated with minimum of likelihood profile (lkmin) and half that value (0.5lkmin).
- S7-S8: Down/upweight MARMAP longline index: $1/10\times, 10\times$
- S9: Use alternate recruitment estimates for years at the end of the assessment (2012-2018) where recruitment deviations were not estimated, based on geometric mean recruitment deviation from the last six years where recruitment deviations were estimated (2006-2011)

3.5 Retrospective Analysis

Retrospective analyses were run by reducing the terminal year of the model from 2018 to 2010-2017, thereby trimming all time series accordingly, and rerunning the assessment model. This analysis facilitates investigation of patterns in model results, particularly terminal status estimates, that may occur when recent data are excluded.

Retrospective analyses should be interpreted with caution because several data sources are not continuous between 2010 and 2018 (Fig. 1). These include the MARMAP longline index and age compositions, commercial handline age compositions, and recreational length compositions. The final year of recruitment deviations in each retrospective run was set to the terminal year minus seven years to mirror the base run model configuration.

3.6 Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analysis

Yield per recruit and spawning potential ratio were computed as functions of F , as were equilibrium landings and spawning biomass. Equilibrium landings were also computed as functions of biomass B , which itself is a function of F . As in computation of MSY-related benchmarks (described in §3.7), per recruit and equilibrium analyses applied the most recent selectivity patterns averaged across fleets, weighted by each fleet's F from the last three years (2016–2018) of the assessment.

3.7 Benchmarks and Reference Points

In this assessment of Tilefish, the quantities F_{MSY} , SSB_{MSY} , B_{MSY} , and MSY were estimated by the method of [Shepherd \(1982\)](#). In that method, the point of maximum yield is calculated from the spawner-recruit curve and parameters describing growth, natural mortality, maturity, and selectivity. The value of F_{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 (ς) was computed from the variance (σ_R^2) of recruitment deviation in log space: $\varsigma = \exp(\sigma_R^2/2)$. Then, equilibrium recruitment (R_{eq}) associated with any F is,

$$R_{eq} = \frac{R_0 [\varsigma 0.8h\Phi_F - 0.2(1-h)]}{(h-0.2)\Phi_F} \quad (7)$$

where R_0 is virgin recruitment, h is steepness, and Φ_F is spawning potential ratio given growth, maturity, and total mortality at age. In BAM, the calculation of total mortality includes natural, fishing mortality rates, and discard mortality rates (though recall that SEDAR 66 does not model discards). The R_{eq} and mortality schedule imply an equilibrium age structure and an average sustainable yield (ASY). The estimate of F_{MSY} is the F giving the highest ASY, and the estimate of MSY is that ASY. The estimate of SSB_{MSY} follows from the corresponding equilibrium age structure.

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 fleet, where each fleet-specific selectivity was weighted in proportion to its corresponding estimate of F averaged over the last three years (2016–2018) of the assessment. If the selectivities or relative fishing mortalities among fleets were to change, so would the estimates of MSY and related benchmarks.

The maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT) is defined by the SAFMC as F_{MSY} , and the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) as $75\%\text{SSB}_{\text{MSY}}$ ([Restrepo et al. 1998](#)). Overfishing is defined as $F > \text{MFMT}$ and overfished as $\text{SSB} < \text{MSST}$. Current stock size is represented as SSB in the last assessment year (2018), and current fishing mortality (F_{current}) is represented by the geometric mean of F from the last three years of the assessment (2016–2018). Thus, $F_{\text{current}} = F_{2016-2018}$.

In addition to the MSY-related benchmarks, the assessment considered proxies based on per recruit analyses (e.g., $F_{40\%}$). The values of $F_{X\%}$ are defined as those F s corresponding to $X\%$ spawning potential ratio, i.e., spawners (spawning biomass) per recruit relative to that at the unfished level. These quantities may serve as proxies for F_{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](#)).

3.8 Comparison to Previous Assessments

This SEDAR 66 operational assessment builds upon the 2016 Update with an additional 4 years of data, substantial improvements to the structure of the BAM, and minor changes to the configuration of the model. No new data sources were included. See §2 for changes to data included in SEDAR 66 compared with the SEDAR 25.

Changes to the life history information used in the model included:

1. Made a minor correction to the estimate of constant natural mortality, now $M = 0.1038$, which had been incorrectly included as 0.1083 in previous assessments.
2. Less uncertainty in M incorporated into MCBE in SEDAR 66 (0.08–0.14) than in the SEDAR 25 (0.03–0.21).

Changes to model configuration include:

1. The start year of the model was 1972 instead of 1962.
2. Ages 1-20 were modeled in the population and used for fitting most age compositions. Ages 1-16 yr were used to fit the MARMAP longline survey age compositions. The 2016 Update modeled ages 1-25 yr.
3. Length and age compositions were fit using Dirichlet multinomial likelihoods, compared with robust multinomial likelihoods used in the 2016 Update.
4. Selectivity of commercial longline and handline included two time blocks, as opposed to one.
5. Selectivity slope parameters were fit without priors, except for the slope of recreational selectivity.
6. Data sources being fitted were not re-weighted by user-supplied weights. In the 2016 Update assessment, data weights were treated as inputs and varied across data sources.
7. The standard deviation of recruitment deviations (σ_R) was fixed as opposed to being estimated with a strong prior as in the SEDAR 25.
8. The coefficient of variation of length at age CV_l was estimated without a prior distribution.

3.9 Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE) Analysis

For the base run of the catch-age model (BAM), uncertainty in results and precision of estimates was computed thoroughly through an ensemble modeling approach (Scott et al. 2016; Jardim et al. 2021) using a mixed Monte Carlo and bootstrap framework (Efron and Tibshirani 1993; Manly 1997). Monte Carlo and bootstrap methods 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; SEDAR4 2004; SEDAR19 2009; SEDAR24 2010). The approach is among those recommended for use in SEDAR assessments (SEDAR Procedural Guidance 2010).

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 small set of sensitivity runs. A minor disadvantage of the approach is that computation times can be long, though current parallel computing techniques largely mitigate those demands (i.e. computing results many times as fast as a single processor).

In this assessment, the BAM was re-fit in $n = 4200$ trials that differed from the original inputs by bootstrapping on data sources, and by Monte Carlo sampling of several key input parameters. Of the 4200 trials, 4038 were

ultimately retained in the uncertainty analysis. The remaining runs were discarded because of poor model convergence (maximum gradient ≥ 0.01) or unrealistic values of $F_{2016-2018}/F_{MSY}$ (≥ 6) or σ_R (≥ 1). This filtering procedure was also done in 2016 Update, though the gradient limit was not as strict (≥ 1000). A check was also run to see if any estimated parameters were near bounds (within 1% of the range between bounds from either bound) in each run, to see if they should be removed from the ensemble. Based on this criterion, 0 runs had parameters near bounds.

The MCBE should be interpreted as providing an approximation to the uncertainty associated with each output. The results are approximate for two related reasons. First, not all combinations of Monte Carlo parameter inputs are equally likely, as biological parameters might be correlated. Second, all runs are given equal weight in the results, yet some might provide better fits to data than others.

3.9.1 Bootstrapping of Observed Data

To include uncertainty in time series of observed landings, and indices of abundance, multiplicative lognormal errors were applied through a parametric bootstrap. To implement this approach in the MCBE 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, $x_{s,y} \sim N(0, \sigma_{s,y}^2)$]. Annual observations were then perturbed from their original values ($\hat{O}_{s,y}$),

$$O_{s,y} = \hat{O}_{s,y}[\exp(x_{s,y} - \sigma_{s,y}^2/2)] \quad (8)$$

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 log space were computed from CVs in arithmetic space, $\sigma_{s,y} = \sqrt{\log(1.0 + CV_{s,y}^2)}$. The CVs used to generate bootstrap data sets of landings were supplied by the data providers (Table 2). Note that these values are different and generally higher than the CVs used to estimate landings when fitting the assessment model (i.e. 0.05 for all years and fleets). The CVs used to generate bootstrap data sets of indices of abundance were the same as those used when fitting the assessment model (Table 5).

Uncertainty in age and length compositions were included by drawing new distributions for each year of each data source, following a multinomial sampling process. Ages (or lengths) of individual fish (Table 4) were drawn at random with replacement using the cell probabilities of the original data. For each year of each data source, the number of fish sampled was the same as in the original data (Table 5).

3.9.2 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 The point estimate of natural mortality ($M = 0.1038$) was provided by the SEDAR 66 Workshop Panel 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 MCBE trial from a uniform distribution between 0.08 and 0.14. In each run of the ensemble, a drawn value of constant M was then used to rescale natural mortality at age, as described for the base model above.

Beverton-Holt steepness parameter The steepness parameter (h) of the Beverton-Holt stock-recruit function was fixed in the base model at 0.84. For each MCBE trial, a new value of h was drawn from a truncated beta distribution defined by shape parameters ($shape_1 = 5.94$, $shape_2 = 1.97$, truncated to 0.32 to 0.99 (Shertzer and Conn 2012)).

Standard deviation of recruitment deviations (σ_R) In the base model, the standard deviation of recruitment deviations (σ_R) was fixed at 0.6. For each MCBE trial, a new value of σ_R was drawn from a truncated normal distribution defined by $\mu = 0.6$ and $\sigma = 0.15$ truncated to 0.3 to 1.0.

3.10 Projection Analysis

Projections were run to determine the overfishing limit (OFL) and evaluate the existing rebuilding plan as requested in the TORs. The structure of the projection model was the same as that of the assessment model, and parameter estimates were those from the assessment. Any time-varying quantities, such as selectivity, were fixed to the most recent values of the assessment period. A single selectivity curve was applied to calculate landings computed by averaging selectivities across fleets using geometric mean F s from the last three years of the assessment period, similar to computation of MSY benchmarks (§3.7).

Expected values of SSB (time of peak spawning), F , recruits, and landings 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_{MSY} would yield MSY from a stock size at SSB_{MSY} . Uncertainty in future time series was quantified through stochastic projections that extended the ensemble model fits of the stock assessment model.

3.10.1 Initialization of Projections

Although the terminal year of the assessment is 2018, the assessment model computes abundance at age (N_a) at the start of 2019. For projections, those estimates were used to initialize N_a . However, the assessment has no information to inform the strength of 2019 recruitment, and thus it computes 2019 recruits (N_1) as the expected value, that is, without deviation from the spawner-recruit curve, and corrected to be unbiased in arithmetic space. In the stochastic projections, lognormal stochasticity was applied to these abundances after adjusting them to be unbiased in log space, with variability based on the estimate of σ_R . Thus, the initial abundance in year one of projections (2019) included this variability in N_1 . The deterministic projections were not adjusted in this manner, because deterministic recruitment follows Beverton-Holt expectation.

Fishing rates that define the projections were assumed to start in 2022. Because the assessment period ended in 2018, the projections required an interim period (2019–2021). Fishing mortality during this interim period was set at the estimate of F_{current} the assessment model.

3.10.2 Uncertainty of Projections

To characterize uncertainty in future stock dynamics stochasticity was included in replicate projections, each an extension of a single assessment fit from the ensemble. Thus, projections carried forward uncertainties in natural mortality as well as in estimated quantities such as spawner-recruit parameters (R_0 and σ_R), selectivity curves, and in initial (start of 2019) abundance at age.

Initial and subsequent recruitment values were generated with stochasticity using a Monte Carlo procedure in which the estimated recruitment of each model within the ensemble is used to compute expected annual recruitment values (\bar{R}_y). Variability is added to the mean values by choosing multiplicative deviations at random from a lognormal distribution,

$$R_y = \bar{R}_y \exp(\epsilon_y). \quad (9)$$

Here ϵ_y is drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation σ_R , where σ_R is the standard deviation from the relevant ensemble model run.

The procedure generated 20,000 replicate projections of models within the ensemble drawn at random (with replacement). In cases where the same model run was drawn, projections would still differ as a result of stochasticity in projected recruitment streams. Central tendencies were represented by the deterministic projections of the base run, as well as by medians of the stochastic projections. Precision of projections was represented graphically by the 5th and 95th percentiles of the replicate projections.

3.10.3 Projection Scenarios

Projections were run to determine the overfishing limit (OFL) and evaluate the existing rebuilding plan as requested in the TORs. In the projections, management started in 2022, the earliest year possible. Projections were carried forward to 2027. Scenarios 1 and 2 were considered to determine the OFL and scenarios 3 and 4 were considered to determine the ABC. In all scenarios $F = F_{\text{current}}$ from 2019 to 2021:

- Scenario 1: $F = F_{P_{50\%}^*}$ from 2022 to 2027
- Scenario 2: $F = F_{\text{MSY}}$ from 2022 to 2027
- Scenario 3: $F = F_{P_{30\%}^*}$ from 2022 to 2027
- Scenario 4: $F = 75\%F_{\text{MSY}}$ from 2022 to 2027

4 Stock Assessment Results

4.1 Measures of Overall Model Fit

The Beaufort assessment model (BAM) generally fit well to the available data. Predicted age compositions from each fishery were reasonably close to observed data in most years. Fits to length compositions for the recreational fleet were not quite as good, but the data were also very variable, probably due to small sample sizes (often < 50 fish per year; Figure 3; Tables 3 and 4). The model was configured to fit observed commercial and recreational landings closely (Figures 4, 5, and 6). The fit to the commercial longline index captured the general trend well but not all annual fluctuations (Figure 7). The fit to the MARMAP longline survey index (Figure 8) did not capture the general trend very well due in part to the large CVs associated with the index (Table 5). This is largely why sensitivity runs S7 and S8 were developed, investigating the effect of downweighting or upweighting the MARMAP longline index (see §3.4).

4.2 Parameter Estimates

Estimates of all parameters from the catch-age model are shown in Appendix A. No parameters were hitting bounds. Estimates of management quantities and some key parameters, such as those of the spawner-recruit model, are reported in sections below.

4.3 Total Abundance, Spawning Biomass and Recruitment

Total abundance shows a decline in the early 1980s (Figure 9; Table 7) concurrent with large increase in landings, especially in the commercial longline fleet (Figures 18 and 19; Tables 16 and 17). Since then, abundance has fluctuated between approximately 1-1.5 million fish with peaks in the late 1980s, mid 2000s, and an increase through the end of the assessment. Truncation of the older ages also began in the 1980s, declined through the mid 1990s and then expanded after the early 2000s (Figure 9; Table 7). Spawning stock biomass (SSB) declined in the early 1980s and continued to decline to a low point in 1996, despite relatively large numbers of fish in the late 1980s. Since 1996, SSB has generally increased but has decreased gradually since 2012 (Figure 12; Table 10). Recruitment has fluctuated during the period when deviations were estimated (1982-2011) ranging from 177,086 to 392,399 fish with peaks in 1987 and 1998, but with little evidence of a long term trend (Figure 11 upper panel; Table 10). Similarly, recruitment deviations showed fluctuations over this same period with no evidence of a longterm trend. Although the last few years of recruitment deviations are below average, they are all within the range of values exhibited during the lower periods during the 1980s and 1990s (Figure 11 lower panel).

4.4 Selectivity

Selectivity of the MARMAP longline survey is shown in Figure 13, selectivities of landings from commercial and recreational fleets are shown in Figures 14 and 15. In the most recent years, full selection occurred near age-5 in the recreational fleet, age-9 in the commercial handline fleet, age-10 in the MARMAP longline survey, and age-12 in the commercial longline fleet. Logistic selectivity functions were used for all fleets. As noted in §3, dome-shaped (i.e. double-logistic) selectivity was investigated for the commercial handline and recreational fleets, but likelihood profiling suggested that logistic selectivity functions were more appropriate.

Average selectivities of landings were computed from F -weighted selectivities in the most recent period of regulations (Figure 16). These average selectivities were used to compute point estimates of benchmarks. All selectivities from the most recent period, including average selectivities, are tabulated in Table 11. In the average selectivity, full selection occurred near age-12, like the commercial longline fleet which is responsible for $> 80\%$ of the total F in most years (Figure 17).

4.5 Landings, Fishing Mortality, Quotas, and Biomass

From 1972 to 1980, total landings were low (< 200 klb; Figures 18, 19; Tables 16, 17) and estimated fishing mortality rate (F) was very low (≤ 0.02 ; Figure 17, Table 12), with stock biomass still near virgin (B_0). Since this early period of low exploitation, landings and F have occurred in about five main periods of exploitation, each lasting 5-10 years. The first period from 1981 to 1986 represents a set of years with the highest landings in the South Atlantic Tilefish stock, all of which were near or above 1000 klb, with peak landings in 1982 over 2600 klb. During this period F increased to range between 0.1 to nearly 0.4. Estimated biomass during this first period dropped dramatically, from 92 to 42% of B_0 . The second period begins in 1987 with landings dropping sharply down below 300 klb, but quickly increasing again to a range of 600 to 900 klb for most years through 1995. Due to the decline in biomass during the first period, this second period exhibits lower landings but higher F than the first period, with most values of F 0.3 to nearly 0.6. During the second period, biomass continued to decline to 26% of B_0 . In the third period, from 1996 to 2002, landings decreased sharply again, remaining between 300-400 klb in most years through 2002. Total F also declined but remained within a range similar to the first period (0.21-0.43). Biomass in 1996 was the lowest in the history of the stock, but increased slightly over the period. In 2003 landings dropped to 235 klb, the lowest level in the history of the stock since 1980. This fourth period from 2003 to 2011 was characterized by a gradual increase back up to the mid-300 klb range, as F remained low (0.1-0.17). This fourth period marks a period of recovery from 29 to 36% of B_0 . In 2006 the commercial quota was substantially reduced from 1,001 klb to 295 klb, and was met, reducing the fishing season from 365 to 295 days in 2006 (see §I. Table 2.6.2). The quota remained at this level through 2010, and was reduced slightly in 2011 (282 klb) resulting in the commercial fishery being open for only 67 days. In 2012, the commercial quota increased to 541 klb following results of SEDAR 25, and remained at this level through 2017. An increase in landings followed as the commercial fleets repeatedly reached the quota, and total landings remained in the 490-670 klb range again through 2017, until dropping back below 340 klb in 2018 when the quota was again reduced to 313 klb. Values of F generally increased during this period (0.19-0.33) while biomass was again in decline.

4.6 Spawner-Recruitment Parameters

The estimated Beverton–Holt spawner-recruit curve is shown in Figure 20, along with the effect of density dependence on recruitment, depicted graphically by recruits per spawner as a function of spawners (spawning biomass). Values of recruitment-related parameters were as follows: steepness $h = 0.84$ (fixed), unfished age-1 recruitment $R_0 = 298,600$, unfished spawning biomass (mt) per recruit $\phi_0 = 0.00027$, and standard deviation of recruitment residuals in log space $\hat{\sigma}_R = 0.6$ (fixed; which resulted in bias correction of $\varsigma = 1.2$). Uncertainty in these quantities was estimated from the MCBE (Figure 21).

4.7 Per Recruit and Equilibrium Analyses

Yield per recruit and spawning potential ratio were computed as functions of F (Figure 22). 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 (2016 – 2018). The F that provides 40% SPR is $F_{40\%} = 0.126$, 30% is $F_{30\%} = 0.198$, and 20% is $F_{20\%} = 0.36$.

As in per recruit analyses, equilibrium landings and spawning biomass were computed as functions of F (Figure 23). By definition, the F that maximizes equilibrium landings is F_{MSY} , and the corresponding landings and spawning biomass are MSY and SSB_{MSY} .

4.8 Benchmarks / Reference Points

As described in §3.7, biological reference points (benchmarks) were derived analytically assuming equilibrium dynamics, corresponding to the expected spawner-recruit curve (Figure 20). These benchmarks are conditional on the estimated selectivity functions and the relative contributions of each fleet's fishing mortality. Furthermore the selectivity pattern used here was the effort-weighted selectivities at age, with effort from each fishery estimated as the full F averaged over the last three years of the assessment (2016-2018).

Reference points estimated were F_{MSY} , MSY, B_{MSY} and SSB_{MSY} . Based on F_{MSY} , three possible values of F at optimum yield (OY) were considered— $F_{OY} = 65\%F_{MSY}$, $F_{OY} = 75\%F_{MSY}$, and $F_{OY} = 85\%F_{MSY}$ —and for each, the corresponding yield was computed. Estimates of benchmarks are summarized in Table 18. Standard errors of benchmarks were approximated as those from the MCBE (§3.9).

Maximum likelihood estimates (base run) of benchmarks, as well as median values from MCBE, are summarized in Table 18. Point estimates of MSY-related quantities were $F_{MSY} = 0.28$ (y^{-1}), $MSY = 542$ (1000 lb GW), $B_{MSY} = 2398$ (mt), $MSST = 15$ (mt), and $SSB_{MSY} = 20$ (mt). The estimate of SSB_{MSY} is about 25% of the unfished spawning biomass. Median estimates were $F_{MSY} = 0.25$ (y^{-1}), $MSY = 532$ (1000 lb GW), $B_{MSY} = 2642$ (mt), $MSST = 17$ (mt W_{gonad}), and $SSB_{MSY} = 22$ (mt W_{gonad}). Distributions of these benchmarks from the MCBE are shown in Figure 24.

4.9 Status of the Stock and Fishery

Estimated time series of stock status ($SSB/MSST$) showed a rapid decline during the 1980s and a slower decline during the 1990s, to a minimum value in 1995. From 1995 through 2011 stock status improved, but has been in decline again since 2012 (Figure 25, Table 10).

Current stock status was estimated in the base run to be $SSB_{2018}/MSST = 1.235$ (Table 18), indicating that the stock is not overfished. Throughout its history, the stock has only dropped below MSST in a few years during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Results from the MCBE suggested that the estimate of SSB relative to SSB_{MSY} and the status relative to MSST is highly uncertain (Figures 26, 27). Only 54.2% of MCBE runs agreed with the stock status result from the base model.

Age structure estimated by the base run during 2018 shows numbers of fish at all age classes declined over the assessment period but especially older age classes. Numbers of Tilefish age-13 reached their lowest point in the early 2000s. During the recovery of the stock in the 2000s numbers of older fish increased substantially back above the predicted numbers at F_{MSY} equilibrium by 2012. At the end of the assessment, the oldest age classes remain near 2012 levels but numbers of fish 8-12 years old have declined (Figure 28).

The estimated time series of F/F_{MSY} from the base model suggests that although F has exceeded F_{MSY} sporadically for individual years during the assessment period, it has not been a consistent problem since the run of years of

overfishing from 1990 to 1995 (Figure 25; Table 10). However, there is considerable uncertainty in F/F_{MSY} as demonstrated by the MCBE, especially toward the end of the assessment period (Figure 25). Current fishery status in the terminal year, with current F represented by the geometric mean from 2016 to 2018 ($F_{\text{current}} = F_{2016-2018} = 0.2671$), was estimated by the base run to be $F_{2016-2018}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.95$ (Table 18). Thus, at the end of the assessment Tilefish was not undergoing overfishing. However, results from the MCBE show that there is a lot of uncertainty in the status of the fishery (Figures 26, 27). Only 43.8% of MCBE runs agreed with the fishing status result from the base model. Note that F_{MSY} is based on average F 's from last three years of the assessment and thus it is not the technically correct denominator for all years going back in time. Thus, caution should be applied when interpreting F status back in time.

4.10 Comparison to Previous Assessments

The benchmark assessment for Tilefish, SEDAR 04, was completed in 2004 with an assessment period 1961-2002 (SEDAR 04 2004). SEDAR 25 was a standard assessment completed in 2011 with an assessment period spanning 1962-2010 (SEDAR 25 2011). Several important changes were made during SEDAR 25 (e.g. M , h , SSB units) that make it somewhat difficult to compare SEDAR 04 with later assessments. Current management of South Atlantic Tilefish is based on an update assessment completed in 2016 with an assessment period of 1962-2014 (SEDAR 25 2016).

As of 2002, the stock was not overfished ($\text{SSB}_{2002}/\text{MSST} = 1.27$), but overfishing was occurring ($F_{2002}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 1.53$; SEDAR 04 2004). Terminal status estimates in SEDAR 25 found that the Tilefish stock was not overfished ($\text{SSB}_{2010}/\text{MSST} = 2.42$), and it was also not undergoing overfishing ($F_{2008-2010}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.36$; SEDAR 25 2011). Terminal status estimates in the SEDAR 25 showed the stock was not overfished ($\text{SSB}_{2014}/\text{MSST} = 1.13$), but overfishing was occurring ($F_{2008-2010}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 1.22$; SEDAR 25 2016).

Values from the current SEDAR 66 assessment contrast with the stock status designation from SEDAR 04 ($\text{SSB}_{2002}/\text{MSST} = 0.95$) but concur with the unfished status from SEDAR 25 ($\text{SSB}_{2010}/\text{MSST} = 1.64$) and the SEDAR 25 ($\text{SSB}_{2014}/\text{MSST} = 1.44$; Table 10). However, the current assessment results suggest that overfishing was not occurring at the ends of any of the previous South Atlantic Tilefish assessments ($F_{2002}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.72$, $F_{2008-2010}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.53$, $F_{2012-2014}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.82$).

The general pattern in time series of SSB/MSST in SEDAR 66 was similar to the SEDAR 25, but was shifted upward so that it appears higher in all years. The trend and magnitude of SSB/MSST in SEDAR 25 were also similar up to 2003, but from 2004 to 2010 increased much more rapidly than what is reflected in the later assessments. The general pattern in the time series of F/F_{MSY} in SEDAR 66 was also similar to the SEDAR 25, but was shifted downward so that it appears lower in all years. This is particularly true of the period from approximately 1990-2005. The trend and magnitude of F/F_{MSY} in SEDAR 25 were quite similar to SEDAR 66.

Input values of constant M have been similar over the four Tilefish assessments (terminal years: 2002, 2010, 2014, 2018; M : 0.07, 0.1083, 0.1083, 0.1038), though M in SEDAR 04 was a little lower and was not used to scale age-varying M . Steepness has been fixed at similar values in all assessments (h : 0.72, 0.84, 0.84, 0.84) though again the value from SEDAR 04 was a little lower. The estimate of F_{MSY} in SEDAR 04 was considerably lower than in later assessments (F_{MSY} : 0.043, 0.185, 0.236, 0.28). The estimate of MSY was also much lower in SEDAR 04 than in later assessments (MSY , klb: 335, 638, 560, 542). In SEDAR 04 SSB was measured in units of female biomass (MSST , mt: 659) and thus was not comparable to later assessments which were in units of gonad weight (MSST , mt W_{gonad} : 19.0, 16.4, 15).

4.11 Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity runs, described in §3.3, may be useful for evaluating implications of assumptions in the base model, and for interpreting MCBE results in terms of expected effects from input parameters. Time series of F/F_{MSY} , SSB/MSST , B , and recruitment (\bar{R}_y) are plotted to demonstrate sensitivity to natural mortality (Figure 29), the steepness of the stock-recruit relationship (Figure 30), higher values of initial F (F_{init} ; Figure 31), weight of the MARMAP longline index (Figure 32), and using alternate recruitment estimates for years at the end of the assessment (Figure 33).

The qualitative results on terminal stock and fishing status were the same for five of the sensitivity runs (S2: high M , S4: high h , S5-S6: higher F_{init} , and S7: downweight MARMAP longline index by $1/10\times$; Figure 34, Table 19). However, the other four sensitivity runs disagreed, and suggested that the stock was overfished ($\text{SSB}_{2018} < \text{MSST}$) and undergoing overfishing ($F_{2016-2018} > F_{\text{MSY}}$). These exceptions were runs S1 (low M), S3 (low h), S8 (upweight MARMAP longline index by $10\times$), and S9 (alternate recruitment). Sensitivity analyses were in general agreement with those of the MCBE that there is considerable uncertainty in the stock and fishing status of South Atlantic Tilefish.

4.12 Retrospective Analyses

Retrospective analyses did not suggest any patterns of substantial over- or underestimation in terminal-year estimates of F/F_{MSY} , SSB/MSST , or B (Figure 35). Recruitment plots emphasizing the final year of freely estimated recruitment deviations show that estimates of recruitment in those years tended to underestimate values from the base model when the terminal year of the assessment was reduced to 2013 or earlier. There is no data set that is completely eliminated by that point, but it does substantially reduce the commercial handline age and recreational length composition data. And the remaining data for these data sets is mostly from earlier periods that are discontinuous from later data (Fig. 1).

4.13 Projections

Projection results for Tilefish are shown in Figures 36, 37, 38, and 39, and Tables 20, 21, 22, and 23. Among all scenarios considered, the probability that SSB_{MSY} exceeds MSST [$P(> \text{MSST})$] is at least 0.55 in all years of all projections. Thus, under no management prescription considered in the projections thus far is the South Atlantic Tilefish stock predicted to be overfished.

5 Discussion

5.1 Comments on Assessment Results

Estimated benchmarks played a central role in this assessment. Values of MSST and F_{MSY} were used to gauge the status of the stock and fishery. 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 relative catch allocations among sectors estimates of benchmarks would likely change as well.

The base run of the BAM indicated that the stock is not overfished ($\text{SSB}_{2018}/\text{MSST} = 1.235$), and that overfishing is not occurring ($F_{2016-2018}/F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.95$). Sensitivity runs and MCBE analyses show that there is a lot of uncertainty in these qualitative results, with considerably more uncertainty in the overfishing status than in the stock status. Notably, the median value of $F_{2016-2018}/F_{\text{MSY}}$ from the MCBE does suggest that overfishing is occurring. There was also much uncertainty in status in the SEDAR 25. This is partly a statistical phenomenon that occurs when status indicators are near the cutoff values we compare them with (i.e. relative values near 1). But a lot of the

uncertainty in benchmarks is due to uncertainty in data inputs, especially h and M . Despite the uncertainty in M , likelihood profiles conducted during the assessment process favored a value of $M \approx 0.12$, which is close to the value of M used in the base model ($M = 0.1038$). Table 18 shows that 25% of MCBE runs result in $SSB_{2018}/MSST \leq 0.704$ and another 25% of MCBE runs (possibly overlapping) result in $F_{2016-2018}/F_{MSY} \geq 1.975$.

As an overall metric of sensitivity of the model in terms of stock and fishery status, one can measure δ_{status} , the absolute linear distance in status space $[(x, y) = (F/F_{MSY}, SSB/MSST)]$ between results of each sensitivity run and base model result. Based on this metric, the model was least sensitive ($\delta_{status} < 0.5$) to higher values of F_{init} (S5 and S6) and downweighting the MARMAP longline index (S7), moderately sensitive ($0.5 \leq \delta_{status} < 1.0$) to lower and higher values of steepness (S3 and S4) and alternative recruitment (S9), and most sensitive ($\delta_{status} \geq 1.0$) to lower and higher values of M (S1 and S2) and upweighting the MARMAP longline index (S8). This can be observed visually in the sensitivity plots shown in Figures 29-34.

5.2 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. Benchmarks (e.g. MSY) are conditional on the estimated selectivity functions and the relative contributions of each fleet's fishing mortality. New management regulations that reallocate harvest in a way that alters proportions of F by fleet or selectivity patterns would likely affect projection results.
- 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.
- Projections apply the Baranov catch equation to relate F and landings using a one-year time step, as in the assessment. The catch equation implicitly assumes that mortality occurs throughout the year. This assumption is violated when seasonal closures are in effect, introducing additional and unquantified uncertainty into the projection results.

6 Research Recommendations

1. From the previous assessment (2016 Update)
 - (a) Re-examine the quantity and quality of biological samples collected by "Other" commercial gears. If adequate, consider methods for inclusion.
 - (b) Monitor the quantity of commercial and recreational discards and consider methods for inclusion if deemed necessary.
 - (c) More closely examine historical length composition data used in the assessment and consider alternate methods for incorporating this information in the model.

2. From the current assessment (SEDAR 66)

- (a) Explore alternative distributional assumptions for natural mortality M for MCBE uncertainty analysis.
- (b) Consider incorporation of new fishery independent abundance data and/or life history data from: CRP Coop Bottom longline survey data, deepwater survey data, SCDNR vertical longline survey, SA Deepwater longline Survey
- (c) Reconsider evidence for stock structure (i.e. potential for a north/south split)
- (d) Increase age sampling to improve composition data
- (e) Investigate effects of weather/oceanographic patterns on catchability. Due to the derby style nature of the fishery, the fleet tends to operate in less than ideal conditions which may affect catchability and fishery-dependent CPUE.

7 References

- Baranov, F. I. 1918. On the question of the biological basis of fisheries. *Nauchnye Issledovaniya Ikhtiologicheskii Instituta Izvestiya* **1**:81–128.
- Brooks, E. N., J. E. Powers, and E. Cortes. 2009. Analytical reference points for age-structured models: application to data-poor fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **67**:165–175.
- Bubley, W. J., and T. I. Smart. 2020. Golden Tilefish Fishery-Independent Index of Abundance in US South Atlantic Waters Based on a SCDNR Bottom Longline Survey (1996-2016). SEDAR66-WP02. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. pages 1–19.
- Clark, W. G. 2002. $F_{35\%}$ revisited ten years later. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* **22**:251–257.
- Deriso, R. B., T. J. Quinn, and P. R. Neal. 1985. Catch-age analysis with auxiliary information. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **42**:815–824.
- Efron, B., and R. Tibshirani. 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Fitzpatrick, E. 2020. Standardized catch rates of tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*) in the southeast U.S. from commercial logbook data. SEDAR66-WP03. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. pages 1–27.
- Fournier, D., and C. P. Archibald. 1982. A general theory for analyzing catch at age data. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **39**:1195–1207.
- Fournier, D. A., H. J. Skaug, J. Ancheta, J. Ianelli, A. Magnusson, M. N. Maunder, A. Nielsen, and J. Sibert. 2012. AD Model Builder: using automatic differentiation for statistical inference of highly parameterized complex nonlinear models. *Optimization Methods and Software* **27**:233–249.
- Francis, R. 2011. Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **68**:1124–1138.
- Francis, R. 2014. Replacing the multinomial in stock assessment models: A first step. *Fisheries Research* **151**:70–84.
- Francis, R. 2017. Revisiting data weighting in fisheries stock assessment models. *Fisheries Research* **192**:5–15.
- Helies, F. C., J. L. Jamison, P. Barile, and K. Carpenter. 2016. Cooperative Bottom Longline Survey to Augment Fisheries Independent Reef Fish Data Collection in the Deep-Water Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic United States. NOAA/NMFS Final Report pages 1–40.
- Hewitt, D. A., and J. M. Hoenig. 2005. Comparison of two approaches for estimating natural mortality based on longevity. *Fishery Bulletin* **103**:433–437.
- Hoenig, J. M. 1983. Empirical use of longevity data to estimate mortality rates. *Fishery Bulletin* **81**:898–903.
- Jardim, E., M. Azevedo, J. Brodziak, E. N. Brooks, K. F. Johnson, N. Klibansky, C. P. Millar, C. Minto, I. Mosqueira, R. D. M. Nash, P. Vasilakopoulos, and B. K. Wells. 2021. Operationalizing ensemble models for scientific advice to fisheries management. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsab010>.
- Legault, C. M., J. E. Powers, and V. R. Restrepo. 2001. Mixed Monte Carlo/bootstrap approach to assessing king and Spanish mackerel in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico: Its evolution and impact. *Amercian Fisheries Society Symposium* **24**:1–8.
- Lorenzen, K. 1996. The relationship between body weight and natural mortality in juvenile and adult fish: a comparison of natural ecosystems and aquaculture. *Journal of Fish Biology* **49**:627–642.
- Mace, P. M. 1994. Relationships between common biological reference points used as thresholds and targets of fisheries management strategies. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **51**:110–122.

- Manly, B. F. J. 1997. Randomization, Bootstrap and Monte Carlo Methods in Biolog, 2nd edition. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Methot, R. D. 1989. Synthetic estimates of historical abundance and mortality for northern anchovy. American Fisheries Society Symposium **6**:66–82.
- Methot, R. D., 2009. User Manual for Stock Synthesis, Model Version 3.04. NOAA Fisheries, Seattle, WA.
- Methot, R. D., and C. R. Wetzel. 2013. Stock synthesis: a biological and statistical framework for fish stock assessment and fishery management. Fisheries Research **142**:86–99.
- Nuttall, M. A., and V. M. Matter. 2020. Recreational Survey Data for Tilefish in the South Atlantic. SEDAR66-WP01. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. pages 1–25.
- Pella, J. J., and P. K. Tomlinson. 1969. A generalized stock production model. Bulletin of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission **13**:419–496.
- Pennington, M., and J. H. Volstad. 1994. Assessing the effect of intra-haul correlation and variable density on estimates of population characteristics from marine surveys. Biometrics **50**:725–732.
- Quinn, T. J., and R. B. Deriso. 1999. Quantitative Fish Dynamics. Oxford University Press, New York, New York.
- Restrepo, V. R., J. M. Hoenig, J. E. Powers, J. W. Baird, and S. C. Turner. 1992. A simple simulation approach to risk and cost analysis, with applications to swordfish and cod fisheries. Fishery Bulletin **90**:736–748.
- Restrepo, V. R., G. G. Thompson, P. M. Mace, L. L. Gabriel, L. L. Wow, A. D. MacCall, R. D. Methot, J. E. Powers, B. L. Taylor, P. R. Wade, and J. F. Witzig, 1998. Technical guidance on the use of precautionary approaches to implementing Natinoal Standard 1 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. NOAA Technical Memorandum-F/SPO-31.
- Scott, F., E. Jardim, C. Millar, and S. Cervino. 2016. An applied framework for incorporating multiple sources of uncertainty in fisheries stock assessments. PLOS ONE **11**:1–21.
- SEDAR. 2017. SEDAR 53 – South Atlantic Red Grouper Assessment Report. SEDAR, North Charleston SC page 159. URL <http://sedarweb.org/sedar-53>.
- SEDAR 04, 2004. SEDAR4 Stock Assessment Report 1 SECTION III.B Assessment of Tilefish, *Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*, in the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Management Area. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR 25, 2011. SEDAR 25: South Atlantic Tilefish. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR 25, 2016. SEDAR 25: Stock Assessment of Golden Tilefish off the Southeastern United States, 2016 SEDAR Update Assessment. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR 50, 2017. SEDAR 50: Atlantic Blueline Tilefish Assessment Report. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR 60, 2020. SEDAR 60 South Atlantic Red Porgy Stock Assessment Report. SEDAR, North Charleston SC.
- SEDAR Procedural Guidance, 2010. SEDAR Procedural Workshop IV: Characterizing and Presenting Assessment Uncertainty.
- SEDAR19, 2009. SEDAR 19: South Atlantic Red Grouper. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR24, 2010. SEDAR 24: South Atlantic Red Snapper. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.
- SEDAR4, 2004. SEDAR 4: Stock assessment of the deepwater snapper-grouper complex in the South Atlantic. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC.

- Shepherd, J. G. 1982. A versatile new stock-recruitment relationship for fisheries, and the construction of sustainable yield curves. *Journal du Conseil pour l'Exploration de la Mer* **40**:67–75.
- Shertzer, K. W., and P. B. Conn. 2012. Spawner-recruit relationships of demersal marine fishes: Prior distribution of steepness. *Bulletin of Marine Science* **88**:39–50.
- Shertzer, K. W., M. H. Prager, D. S. Vaughan, and E. H. Williams, 2008. Fishery models. Pages 1582–1593 *in* S. E. Jorgensen and F. Fath, editors. *Population Dynamics*. Vol. [2] of *Encyclopedia of Ecology*, 5 vols. Elsevier, Oxford.
- Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel . 2018. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel Golden Tilefish Fishery Performance Report. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. pages 1–5.
- Thorson, J. T., K. F. Johnson, R. D. Methot, and I. G. Taylor. 2017. Model-based estimates of effective sample size in stock assessment models using the Dirichlet-multinomial distribution. *Fisheries Research* **192**:84–93.
- Williams, E. H., and K. W. Shertzer. 2003. Implications of life-history invariants for biological reference points used in fishery management. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* **60**:710–720.
- Williams, E. H., and K. W. Shertzer, 2015. Technical documentation of the Beaufort Assessment Model (BAM). NOAA Technical Memorandum-NMFS-SEFSC-671.

8 Tables

Table 1. Observed time series of landings (L) for commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and recreational (rA). All landings are in units of 1000 lb gutted weight.

Year	L.cH	L.cL	L.rA
1972	0.40	4.74	.
1973	2.17	25.82	.
1974	5.25	62.60	.
1975	8.98	106.29	.
1976	9.42	107.21	.
1977	8.82	40.63	.
1978	23.06	55.85	.
1979	16.61	85.14	.
1980	49.69	148.01	.
1981	117.47	665.27	814.31
1982	242.81	2421.11	0.25
1983	99.42	1392.88	1.79
1984	69.48	925.96	35.39
1985	64.64	855.30	184.49
1986	60.22	941.26	0.27
1987	20.52	248.92	13.04
1988	33.13	431.67	2.21
1989	51.64	686.17	0.25
1990	51.98	699.76	2.00
1991	53.41	706.62	0.63
1992	48.98	787.80	14.94
1993	12.75	880.07	0.25
1994	99.53	636.97	9.18
1995	79.33	539.95	0.25
1996	38.42	273.95	6.16
1997	42.47	296.92	57.35
1998	35.31	301.50	1.61
1999	28.45	443.52	5.35
2000	40.47	620.99	13.63
2001	118.73	237.43	18.46
2002	120.96	198.50	12.17
2003	70.69	133.01	31.29
2004	37.40	209.49	25.65
2005	35.35	207.51	118.84
2006	36.47	337.16	26.85
2007	37.73	232.54	7.62
2008	19.63	262.33	0.25
2009	12.61	282.57	116.33
2010	23.21	306.42	58.08
2011	9.44	317.10	48.65
2012	49.15	419.16	26.22
2013	39.71	455.23	18.07
2014	120.69	523.08	20.38
2015	124.43	361.88	59.01
2016	99.25	389.03	70.81
2017	102.59	435.29	18.47
2018	50.49	235.64	50.74

Table 2. Observed time series of CVs used in the Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE) associated with landings (L) for commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and recreational (rA). These CVs were used to generate bootstrap data sets in the ensemble model analysis only. When fitting the assessment model, CVs of 0.05 were used for estimating landings.

Year	L.cH	L.cL	L.rA
1972	0.05	0.05	.
1973	0.05	0.05	.
1974	0.05	0.05	.
1975	0.05	0.05	.
1976	0.05	0.05	.
1977	0.05	0.05	.
1978	0.05	0.05	.
1979	0.05	0.05	.
1980	0.05	0.05	.
1981	0.05	0.05	1.00
1982	0.05	0.05	0.00
1983	0.05	0.05	1.00
1984	0.05	0.05	1.00
1985	0.05	0.05	0.99
1986	0.05	0.05	1.00
1987	0.05	0.05	0.98
1988	0.05	0.05	1.00
1989	0.05	0.05	0.00
1990	0.05	0.05	1.00
1991	0.05	0.05	1.00
1992	0.05	0.05	0.69
1993	0.05	0.05	0.00
1994	0.05	0.05	0.94
1995	0.05	0.05	0.00
1996	0.05	0.05	0.98
1997	0.05	0.05	0.70
1998	0.05	0.05	1.00
1999	0.05	0.05	0.94
2000	0.05	0.05	0.67
2001	0.05	0.05	0.47
2002	0.05	0.05	0.70
2003	0.05	0.05	0.57
2004	0.05	0.05	0.74
2005	0.05	0.05	0.57
2006	0.05	0.05	0.56
2007	0.05	0.05	0.69
2008	0.05	0.05	1.00
2009	0.05	0.05	0.83
2010	0.05	0.05	0.59
2011	0.05	0.05	0.73
2012	0.05	0.05	0.51
2013	0.05	0.05	0.53
2014	0.05	0.05	0.56
2015	0.05	0.05	0.51
2016	0.05	0.05	0.41
2017	0.05	0.05	0.57
2018	0.05	0.05	0.65

Table 3. Sample sizes (number of trips) of length compositions (lcomp) or age compositions (acom) by survey or fleet. Data sources are recreational (rA), commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and the MARMAP longline survey (sM).

Year	lcomp.rA	acom.cH	acom.cL	acom.sM
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992	.	.	7	.
1993	.	.	15	.
1994
1995	.	.	25	.
1996
1997	.	5	7	11
1998	.	5	.	.
1999	.	5	.	19
2000	.	11	16	.
2001	.	5	11	8
2002	6	20	.	.
2003	7	.	10	.
2004	.	9	5	.
2005	11	10	6	.
2006	.	6	39	.
2007	.	12	46	5
2008	.	.	27	.
2009	.	.	26	21
2010	.	.	30	24
2011	.	.	22	17
2012	.	21	48	.
2013	8	18	25	.
2014	.	35	16	.
2015	19	25	21	.
2016	14	39	31	9
2017	.	21	35	.
2018	16	.	35	.

Table 4. Sample sizes (number of fish) of length compositions (*lcomp*) or age compositions (*acom*) by survey or fleet. Data sources are recreational (*rA*), commercial handline (*cH*), commercial longline (*cL*), and the MARMAP longline survey (*sM*).

Year	<i>lcomp.rA</i>	<i>acom.cH</i>	<i>acom.cL</i>	<i>acom.sM</i>
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992	.	.	100	.
1993	.	.	186	.
1994
1995	.	.	374	.
1996
1997	.	102	186	120
1998	.	39	.	.
1999	.	34	.	156
2000	.	237	270	.
2001	.	44	223	48
2002	28	195	.	.
2003	64	.	148	.
2004	.	241	119	.
2005	132	255	110	.
2006	.	196	796	.
2007	.	272	1115	33
2008	.	.	681	.
2009	.	.	749	206
2010	.	.	863	128
2011	.	.	528	130
2012	.	454	1264	.
2013	27	262	531	.
2014	.	462	387	.
2015	39	177	446	.
2016	30	197	656	25
2017	.	115	591	.
2018	27	.	651	.

Table 5. Observed indices of abundance and CVs from commercial longline (cL) and the MARMAP longline survey (sM).

Year	cL	sM	cv.cL	cv.sM
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993	0.888	.	0.053	.
1994	0.850	.	0.069	.
1995	0.829	.	0.072	.
1996	0.571	0.62	0.062	0.57
1997	0.810	1.69	0.060	0.39
1998	0.963	1.11	0.076	0.57
1999	1.011	1.94	0.079	0.32
2000	1.159	0.76	0.078	0.38
2001	0.847	1.54	0.065	0.36
2002	0.880	.	0.117	.
2003	0.711	.	0.089	.
2004	0.904	.	0.085	.
2005	1.720	.	0.104	.
2006	1.858	.	0.093	.
2007	.	0.29	.	0.40
2008
2009	.	2.06	.	0.23
2010	.	0.61	.	0.24
2011	.	1.04	.	0.36
2012
2013
2014
2015	.	0.12	.	0.56
2016	.	0.20	.	0.52
2017
2018

Table 6. Life-history characteristics at age. Variables include total length (TL) in millimeters (mm) and inches (in) and weight (mid-year), and inches (in), the coefficient of variation (CV) of TL, whole weight (WW) in kilograms (kg) and pounds (lb), gutted weight (GW) in pounds (lb), proportion female [P(fem.)] and proportion of females mature [P(fem. mat.)], gonad weight of females (kg), spawning stock biomass (SSB; sum product of the proportion of females mature and gonad weight), and natural mortality. All values were fixed model input.

Age	TL (mm)	TL (in)	TL CV	WW (kg)	WW (lb)	GW (lb)	P(fem.)	P(fem. mat.)	W_{gonad} (kg)	SSB (kg)	M
1	257	10.1	0.14	0.16	0.36	0.34	0.50	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.30
2	354	14.0	0.14	0.45	0.99	0.93	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.22
3	435	17.1	0.14	0.86	1.89	1.78	0.50	0.50	0.01	0.00	0.18
4	503	19.8	0.14	1.34	2.96	2.80	0.50	1.00	0.01	0.01	0.16
5	558	22.0	0.14	1.87	4.13	3.90	0.50	1.00	0.02	0.01	0.14
6	604	23.8	0.14	2.40	5.30	5.00	0.50	1.00	0.04	0.02	0.13
7	642	25.3	0.14	2.91	6.42	6.07	0.50	1.00	0.05	0.03	0.12
8	674	26.5	0.14	3.39	7.47	7.06	0.50	1.00	0.07	0.04	0.12
9	700	27.5	0.14	3.82	8.42	7.95	0.50	1.00	0.09	0.05	0.11
10	721	28.4	0.14	4.21	9.27	8.76	0.50	1.00	0.11	0.06	0.11
11	739	29.1	0.14	4.54	10.02	9.46	0.50	1.00	0.13	0.07	0.11
12	754	29.7	0.14	4.84	10.66	10.07	0.50	1.00	0.15	0.07	0.11
13	766	30.2	0.14	5.09	11.22	10.59	0.50	1.00	0.17	0.08	0.10
14	776	30.6	0.14	5.30	11.69	11.04	0.50	1.00	0.18	0.09	0.10
15	785	30.9	0.14	5.49	12.10	11.42	0.50	1.00	0.19	0.10	0.10
16	792	31.2	0.14	5.64	12.44	11.74	0.50	1.00	0.21	0.10	0.10
17	797	31.4	0.14	5.77	12.72	12.02	0.50	1.00	0.22	0.11	0.10
18	802	31.6	0.14	5.88	12.96	12.24	0.50	1.00	0.23	0.11	0.10
19	806	31.7	0.14	5.97	13.17	12.43	0.50	1.00	0.24	0.12	0.10
20	809	31.9	0.14	6.05	13.34	12.59	0.50	1.00	0.24	0.12	0.10

Table 7. Estimated total abundance at age (1000 fish) at start of year.

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
1972	358.65	266.58	214.51	179.48	153.65	133.47	116.98	102.93	90.79	80.32	71.26	63.39	56.49	50.43	45.08	40.34	36.13	32.38	29.03	253.98	2375.85
1973	358.65	266.58	214.51	179.48	153.66	133.52	117.17	103.44	91.52	81.05	71.93	63.99	57.03	50.91	45.51	40.72	36.47	32.69	29.31	256.40	2384.55
1974	358.83	266.58	214.51	179.48	153.66	133.51	117.16	103.48	91.79	81.53	72.43	64.45	57.44	51.28	45.84	41.02	36.74	32.92	29.52	258.25	2390.40
1975	358.90	266.71	214.51	179.48	153.65	133.48	117.05	103.25	91.52	81.46	72.57	64.64	57.63	51.45	45.99	41.15	36.85	33.03	29.62	259.08	2391.98
1976	358.90	266.76	214.61	179.47	153.64	133.43	116.91	102.88	90.94	80.84	72.16	64.45	57.52	51.37	45.92	41.09	36.80	32.98	29.57	258.69	2388.94
1977	358.87	266.76	214.66	179.56	153.63	133.42	116.86	102.74	90.61	80.32	71.61	64.08	57.35	51.27	45.84	41.02	36.74	32.92	29.52	258.26	2386.03
1978	358.87	266.73	214.66	179.60	153.72	133.45	116.99	103.07	91.00	80.55	71.62	64.02	57.41	51.46	46.06	41.23	36.92	33.09	29.67	259.58	2389.71
1979	358.91	266.74	214.64	179.60	153.73	133.46	116.89	102.98	91.05	80.68	71.63	63.85	57.19	51.36	46.10	41.31	37.01	33.17	29.74	260.17	2390.19
1980	358.91	266.76	214.64	179.58	153.73	133.48	116.88	102.79	90.80	80.54	71.57	63.71	56.91	51.05	45.91	41.25	36.99	33.16	29.74	260.15	2388.55
1981	358.83	266.76	214.66	179.57	153.67	133.33	116.52	102.15	89.87	79.58	70.78	63.06	56.24	50.32	45.20	40.69	36.59	32.84	29.45	257.67	2377.77
1982	202.45	266.70	214.64	178.87	143.60	123.21	106.46	91.17	78.44	68.69	60.89	54.28	48.45	43.28	38.77	34.86	31.41	28.27	25.38	222.13	2061.98
1983	197.13	150.47	214.57	179.40	152.35	121.97	99.85	76.89	59.23	49.15	42.77	37.95	33.88	30.29	27.09	24.29	21.86	19.71	17.75	155.54	1712.12
1984	218.96	146.51	121.06	179.40	153.04	130.37	101.26	76.24	54.29	40.74	33.67	29.34	26.07	23.32	20.87	18.69	16.77	15.11	13.63	119.88	1539.22
1985	223.92	162.74	117.88	101.21	152.42	130.67	108.89	79.26	56.15	39.19	29.34	24.29	21.20	18.87	16.90	15.14	13.57	12.19	10.98	97.13	1431.94
1986	296.99	166.43	130.94	98.41	83.88	126.53	105.89	82.30	56.12	38.91	27.08	20.30	16.84	14.72	13.12	11.76	10.55	9.46	8.50	75.45	1394.16
1987	392.40	220.74	133.90	109.48	83.96	71.76	104.77	80.09	57.18	37.89	26.15	18.22	13.68	11.36	9.95	8.88	7.96	7.15	6.41	56.96	1458.89
1988	358.18	291.65	177.62	111.99	93.38	72.41	61.75	88.35	66.21	47.04	31.20	21.58	15.07	11.33	9.42	8.26	7.37	6.62	5.94	52.76	1538.14
1989	257.66	266.22	234.67	148.55	95.67	80.45	61.68	50.50	69.51	51.48	36.55	24.29	16.83	11.77	8.87	7.38	6.47	5.78	5.19	46.10	1485.65
1990	243.36	191.50	214.20	196.22	126.78	81.96	67.06	47.60	36.26	48.73	35.97	25.57	17.02	11.81	8.27	6.24	5.20	4.56	4.08	36.19	1408.57
1991	315.15	180.87	154.08	179.08	167.30	108.30	67.64	50.40	32.78	24.24	32.43	23.96	17.06	11.37	7.91	5.54	4.18	3.49	3.06	27.05	1415.88
1992	305.79	234.23	145.52	128.80	152.63	142.54	88.39	49.31	33.06	20.74	15.25	20.41	15.10	10.77	7.19	5.00	3.51	2.65	2.21	19.11	1402.22
1993	307.41	227.27	188.44	121.60	109.27	128.94	113.70	60.71	29.44	18.80	11.69	8.59	11.52	8.54	6.10	4.07	2.84	1.99	1.50	12.12	1374.54
1994	259.19	228.48	182.85	157.51	103.56	92.59	101.85	74.09	32.96	14.98	9.45	5.87	4.32	5.80	4.30	3.08	2.06	1.43	1.01	6.89	1292.26
1995	193.10	192.64	183.79	152.71	133.36	86.61	71.92	66.87	41.76	17.61	7.93	5.00	3.11	2.29	3.08	2.29	1.64	1.10	0.76	4.22	1171.80
1996	177.09	143.52	154.97	153.55	129.77	112.20	68.00	48.10	38.64	22.94	9.58	4.31	2.72	1.70	1.25	1.69	1.25	0.90	0.60	2.73	1075.50
1997	230.07	131.62	115.47	129.55	130.72	110.76	93.05	52.28	34.49	27.07	16.02	6.70	3.02	1.91	1.19	0.88	1.19	0.88	0.63	2.35	1089.85
1998	378.81	171.00	105.90	96.45	108.52	109.63	90.40	70.69	37.17	23.99	18.78	11.13	4.66	2.11	1.33	0.83	0.62	0.83	0.62	2.09	1235.54
1999	352.50	281.55	137.58	88.55	82.29	93.05	91.90	71.10	52.40	27.03	17.40	13.64	8.10	3.40	1.54	0.97	0.61	0.45	0.61	1.98	1326.65
2000	284.17	261.99	226.53	115.03	75.44	70.33	77.09	69.72	49.66	35.59	18.28	11.78	9.25	5.50	2.31	1.05	0.66	0.42	0.31	1.77	1316.86
2001	314.61	211.20	210.78	189.29	97.54	63.76	56.41	53.93	42.93	29.25	20.79	10.68	6.90	5.42	3.23	1.36	0.62	0.39	0.24	1.22	1320.57
2002	333.60	233.83	169.91	176.06	160.03	82.01	51.69	42.86	38.86	30.43	20.70	14.74	7.59	4.91	3.86	2.30	0.97	0.44	0.28	1.05	1376.10
2003	299.64	247.94	188.11	141.95	149.26	135.16	67.08	40.04	31.79	28.45	22.25	15.17	10.82	5.58	3.61	2.85	1.70	0.72	0.32	0.98	1393.41
2004	278.77	222.70	199.49	157.21	120.06	126.77	113.27	54.61	31.82	25.10	22.48	17.62	12.03	8.60	4.44	2.88	2.27	1.35	0.57	1.04	1403.08
2005	250.34	207.19	179.19	166.78	133.42	102.64	107.21	92.49	43.17	24.91	19.65	17.63	13.85	9.47	6.78	3.50	2.27	1.79	1.07	1.28	1384.63
2006	232.68	186.07	166.71	149.63	138.50	111.44	85.06	86.30	72.46	33.56	19.38	15.32	13.77	10.83	7.42	5.31	2.75	1.78	1.41	1.85	1342.23
2007	187.30	172.94	149.71	139.38	127.03	118.38	93.89	68.45	66.52	55.10	25.50	14.75	11.68	10.52	8.28	5.68	4.07	2.11	1.37	2.50	1265.15
2008	225.31	139.21	139.15	125.21	118.92	109.37	101.20	78.07	55.45	53.50	44.35	20.56	11.92	9.45	8.52	6.72	4.61	3.31	1.71	3.15	1259.69
2009	240.07	167.46	112.01	116.40	107.05	102.75	94.01	84.64	63.59	44.83	43.27	35.94	16.70	9.69	7.70	6.95	5.48	3.76	2.70	3.97	1268.99
2010	217.14	178.43	134.74	93.56	97.13	90.22	86.89	78.70	68.86	50.12	34.77	33.42	27.75	12.91	7.50	5.96	5.39	4.25	2.92	5.18	1235.86
2011	240.09	161.39	143.56	112.61	79.00	82.89	77.17	73.46	64.55	54.64	39.09	27.00	25.94	21.57	10.04	5.84	4.65	4.20	3.32	6.33	1237.35
2012	322.16	178.45	129.86	120.01	95.31	67.63	71.21	65.59	60.60	51.51	42.86	30.52	21.07	20.27	16.87	7.86	4.58	3.64	3.30	7.58	1320.88
2013	321.53	239.43	143.57	108.54	101.92	81.69	57.86	59.73	52.69	46.48	38.57	31.86	22.67	15.67	15.09	12.57	5.86	3.41	2.72	8.12	1369.99
2014	319.54	238.97	192.63	120.01	92.33	87.53	69.98	48.46	47.59	39.80	34.14	28.09	23.17	16.50	11.41	11.00	9.17	4.28	2.50	7.93	1405.04
2015	316.11	237.47	192.21	160.88	101.70	78.53	73.43	56.54	36.55	33.44	26.95	22.85	18.75	15.48	11.03	7.64	7.37	6.15	2.87	7.00	1412.93
2016	312.41	234.92	191.00	160.42	134.92	85.51	65.20	59.07	43.08	26.36	23.44	18.72	15.85	13.02	10.76	7.68	5.32	5.13	4.29	6.88	1423.98
2017	309.94	232.17	188.96	159.41	134.17	113.18	70.86	52.20	44.41	30.35	17.95	15.79	12.59	10.66	8.77	7.25	5.18	3.59	3.47	7.55	1428.44
2018	307.61	230.34	186.74	157.80	135.07	114.05	94.73	56.85	38.73	30.38	19.90	11.61	10.18	8.12	6.88	5.67	4.69	3.35	2.32	7.14	1432.17

Table 8. Estimated total abundance at age (mt) at start of year.

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
1972	57.77	119.11	183.56	241.37	287.63	320.74	340.87	348.88	346.88	337.75	323.72	306.53	287.45	267.47	247.33	227.56	208.50	190.40	173.40	1536.27	6353.19
1973	57.77	119.11	183.56	241.37	287.65	320.86	341.44	350.60	349.68	340.86	326.78	309.45	290.19	270.02	249.69	229.73	210.49	192.21	175.05	1550.91	6397.40
1974	57.80	119.11	183.56	241.37	287.64	320.84	341.40	350.74	350.72	342.84	329.04	311.66	292.28	271.97	251.49	231.39	212.01	193.60	176.31	1562.11	6427.88
1975	57.81	119.17	183.56	241.37	287.63	320.76	341.09	349.94	349.67	342.54	329.66	312.57	293.21	272.85	252.30	232.14	212.70	194.23	176.88	1567.17	6437.23
1976	57.81	119.19	183.65	241.36	287.61	320.65	340.66	348.71	347.46	339.96	327.83	311.68	292.68	272.42	251.92	231.79	212.38	193.94	176.62	1564.82	6423.12
1977	57.81	119.19	183.68	241.48	287.60	320.62	340.53	348.24	346.19	337.75	325.30	309.90	291.79	271.88	251.49	231.40	212.02	193.62	176.33	1562.21	6409.03
1978	57.81	119.18	183.68	241.53	287.76	320.70	340.91	349.34	347.71	338.73	325.37	309.59	292.09	272.90	252.69	232.57	213.10	194.60	177.23	1570.19	6427.70
1979	57.82	119.18	183.66	241.53	287.78	320.73	340.61	349.03	347.91	339.27	325.39	308.78	290.98	272.41	252.92	233.03	213.57	195.04	177.63	1573.75	6431.03
1980	57.82	119.19	183.67	241.50	287.79	320.78	340.60	348.38	346.94	338.70	325.15	308.08	289.54	270.73	251.87	232.69	213.49	195.01	177.61	1573.62	6423.15
1981	57.80	119.19	183.68	241.49	287.67	320.40	339.54	346.23	343.38	334.65	321.55	304.95	286.15	266.85	247.96	229.54	211.17	193.10	175.91	1558.63	6369.84
1982	32.61	119.16	183.67	240.56	268.83	296.09	310.23	309.02	299.70	288.85	276.63	262.50	246.52	229.53	212.72	196.67	181.30	166.24	151.60	1343.62	5616.05
1983	31.75	67.23	183.60	241.26	285.19	293.11	290.96	260.59	226.32	206.67	194.31	183.50	172.39	160.63	148.63	137.05	126.18	115.93	106.01	940.82	4372.15
1984	35.27	65.46	103.59	241.27	286.50	313.29	295.07	258.40	207.43	171.32	152.97	141.89	132.66	123.66	114.50	105.42	96.80	88.83	81.39	725.14	3740.86
1985	36.07	72.71	100.87	136.11	285.33	314.02	317.31	268.64	214.55	164.82	133.30	117.45	107.87	100.07	92.70	85.41	78.30	71.66	65.58	587.51	3350.28
1986	47.84	74.36	112.04	132.35	157.02	304.06	308.56	278.94	214.43	163.62	123.04	98.19	85.66	78.06	71.97	66.33	60.86	55.61	50.75	456.40	2940.10
1987	63.21	98.63	114.58	147.23	157.18	172.44	305.30	271.45	218.47	159.32	118.80	88.12	69.63	60.27	54.58	50.07	45.95	42.02	38.29	344.57	2620.12
1988	57.70	130.31	151.99	150.62	174.82	174.00	179.93	299.44	252.99	197.80	141.73	104.37	76.66	60.10	51.70	46.59	42.56	38.93	35.50	319.15	2686.87
1989	41.51	118.95	200.81	199.78	179.09	193.34	179.74	171.16	265.61	216.50	166.06	117.47	85.65	62.43	48.64	41.63	37.35	34.01	31.03	278.88	2669.62
1990	39.20	85.56	183.29	263.89	237.33	196.97	195.42	161.32	138.54	204.90	163.39	123.65	86.60	62.66	45.38	35.18	29.99	26.82	24.35	218.92	2523.35
1991	50.77	80.81	131.84	240.83	313.19	260.25	197.10	170.81	125.24	101.94	147.31	115.86	86.81	60.33	43.37	31.26	24.13	20.50	18.28	163.64	2384.27
1992	49.26	104.66	124.52	173.22	285.73	342.55	257.58	167.12	126.33	87.22	69.26	98.69	76.84	57.13	39.45	28.22	20.25	15.58	13.20	115.60	2252.41
1993	49.52	101.55	161.25	163.53	204.55	309.85	331.32	205.77	112.49	79.07	53.10	41.55	58.61	45.28	33.45	22.98	16.37	11.71	8.99	73.29	2084.21
1994	41.75	102.09	156.46	211.82	193.86	222.51	296.78	251.10	125.92	63.01	42.92	28.38	21.98	30.76	23.62	17.36	11.88	8.43	6.02	41.71	1898.35
1995	31.11	86.07	157.27	205.37	249.66	208.14	209.57	226.65	159.56	74.07	36.02	24.17	15.82	12.16	16.91	12.92	9.45	6.45	4.57	25.50	1771.43
1996	28.53	64.13	132.61	206.50	242.92	269.63	198.15	163.03	147.65	96.45	43.53	20.86	13.86	9.00	6.87	9.51	7.23	5.28	3.59	16.52	1685.84
1997	37.06	58.81	98.81	174.22	244.71	266.17	271.16	177.20	131.76	113.84	72.76	32.40	15.37	10.13	6.54	4.97	6.85	5.19	3.78	14.22	1745.94
1998	61.02	76.40	90.62	129.71	203.16	263.46	263.43	239.58	142.03	100.88	85.30	53.80	23.72	11.17	7.32	4.70	3.55	4.88	3.69	12.64	1781.05
1999	56.78	125.80	117.73	119.08	154.05	223.60	267.80	240.99	200.20	113.65	79.06	65.97	41.20	18.03	8.43	5.50	3.51	2.65	3.63	12.00	1859.68
2000	45.78	117.06	193.84	154.70	141.21	169.01	224.63	236.31	189.74	149.65	83.03	56.98	47.08	29.17	12.68	5.90	3.83	2.44	1.84	10.70	1875.57
2001	50.68	94.37	180.36	254.57	182.59	153.23	164.38	182.79	164.03	123.01	94.46	51.66	35.09	28.77	17.71	7.66	3.55	2.30	1.46	7.40	1800.09
2002	53.74	104.48	145.39	236.77	299.57	197.09	150.61	145.27	148.49	127.95	94.03	71.27	38.60	26.01	21.19	12.98	5.59	2.58	1.67	6.35	1889.64
2003	48.27	110.78	160.97	190.90	279.42	324.80	195.48	135.71	121.46	119.62	101.09	73.34	55.04	29.58	19.81	16.06	9.80	4.21	1.94	5.94	2004.22
2004	44.91	99.51	170.70	211.42	224.76	304.64	330.08	185.09	121.57	105.56	102.12	85.22	61.22	45.59	24.35	16.23	13.10	7.96	3.41	6.31	2163.73
2005	40.33	92.58	153.33	224.29	249.76	246.65	312.41	313.48	164.94	104.76	89.28	85.28	70.47	50.23	37.18	19.75	13.11	10.55	6.40	7.73	2292.49
2006	37.48	83.14	142.66	201.23	259.27	267.81	247.87	292.50	276.86	141.14	88.02	74.08	70.07	57.45	40.70	29.97	15.86	10.49	8.41	11.17	2356.16
2007	30.17	77.27	128.11	187.44	237.81	284.48	273.61	231.99	254.15	231.71	115.84	71.32	59.43	55.77	45.45	32.03	23.49	12.39	8.17	15.11	2375.74
2008	36.29	62.20	119.07	168.38	222.62	262.83	294.90	264.60	211.89	224.99	201.46	99.45	60.63	50.13	46.76	37.91	26.61	19.45	10.23	19.03	2439.41
2009	38.67	74.82	95.85	156.54	200.41	246.92	273.96	286.87	242.95	188.53	196.59	173.81	84.96	51.40	42.23	39.19	31.64	22.14	16.13	24.02	2487.65
2010	34.98	79.72	115.30	125.83	181.83	216.80	253.21	266.74	263.11	210.78	157.96	161.61	141.22	68.46	41.15	33.64	31.09	25.02	17.45	31.35	2457.23
2011	38.68	72.11	122.85	151.45	147.89	199.19	224.88	249.00	246.65	229.76	177.60	130.55	132.00	114.38	55.09	32.95	26.82	24.70	19.82	38.29	2434.64
2012	51.90	79.73	111.12	161.40	178.41	162.53	207.50	222.31	231.55	216.60	194.69	147.61	107.23	107.51	92.56	44.36	26.42	21.43	19.69	45.83	2430.37
2013	51.79	106.98	122.85	145.97	190.79	196.32	168.60	202.44	201.33	195.46	175.21	154.09	115.37	83.09	62.77	70.90	33.83	20.08	16.25	49.13	2383.25
2014	51.47	106.77	164.84	161.40	172.84	210.34	203.93	164.24	181.84	167.36	155.09	135.83	117.91	87.51	62.62	62.06	52.94	25.18	14.90	47.96	2347.04
2015	50.92	106.10	164.47	216.36	190.38	188.72	213.98	191.63	139.65	140.63	122.41	110.48	95.42	82.09	60.52	43.09	42.52	36.15	17.15	42.32	2254.98
2016	50.32	104.97	163.44	215.74	252.58	205.48	189.99	200.21	164.60	110.83	106.47	90.55	80.66	69.06	59.02	43.30	30.69	30.19	25.60	41.64	2235.34
2017	49.93	103.74	161.69	214.38	251.17	271.98	206.49	176.94	169.68	127.61	81.53	76.36	64.06	56.56	48.10	40.91	29.88	21.11	20.71	45.67	2218.49
2018	49.55	102.92	159.79	212.22	252.86	274.09	276.06	192.67	147.97	127.76	90.39	56.13	51.81	43.07	37.77	31.96	27.07	19.71	13.89	43.19	2210.87

Table 9. Estimated total abundance at age (1000 lb) at start of year.

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
1972	127.40	262.60	404.70	532.10	634.10	707.10	751.50	769.10	764.70	744.60	713.70	675.80	633.70	589.70	545.30	501.70	459.70	419.80	382.30	3386.90	14006.20
1973	127.40	262.60	404.70	532.10	634.20	707.40	752.70	772.90	770.90	751.50	720.40	682.20	639.80	595.30	550.50	506.50	464.00	423.70	385.90	3419.10	14103.70
1974	127.40	262.60	404.70	532.10	634.10	707.30	752.70	773.20	773.20	755.80	725.40	687.10	644.40	599.60	554.40	510.10	467.40	426.80	388.70	3443.80	14170.90
1975	127.40	262.70	404.70	532.10	634.10	707.10	752.00	771.50	770.90	755.20	726.80	689.10	646.40	601.50	556.20	511.80	468.90	428.20	389.90	3455.00	14191.50
1976	127.40	262.80	404.90	532.10	634.10	706.90	751.00	768.80	766.00	749.50	722.70	687.10	645.20	600.60	555.40	511.00	468.20	427.60	389.40	3449.80	14160.40
1977	127.40	262.80	404.90	532.40	634.00	706.80	750.70	767.70	763.20	744.60	717.20	683.20	643.30	599.40	554.40	510.10	467.40	426.90	388.70	3444.00	14129.30
1978	127.40	262.70	404.90	532.50	634.40	707.00	751.60	770.20	766.60	746.80	717.30	682.50	643.90	601.60	557.10	512.70	469.80	429.00	390.70	3461.60	14170.50
1979	127.50	262.70	404.90	532.50	634.40	707.10	750.90	769.50	767.00	748.00	717.40	680.70	641.50	600.60	557.60	513.70	470.80	430.00	391.60	3469.50	14177.80
1980	127.50	262.80	404.90	532.40	634.50	707.20	750.90	768.00	764.90	746.70	716.80	679.20	638.30	596.90	555.30	513.00	470.70	429.90	391.60	3469.20	14160.50
1981	127.40	262.80	404.90	532.40	634.20	706.40	748.50	763.30	757.00	737.80	708.90	672.30	630.80	588.30	546.70	506.00	465.50	425.70	387.80	3436.20	14042.90
1982	71.90	262.70	404.90	530.30	592.70	652.80	683.90	681.30	660.70	636.80	609.90	578.70	543.50	506.00	469.00	433.60	399.70	366.50	334.20	2962.10	12381.10
1983	70.00	148.20	404.80	531.90	628.70	646.20	641.50	574.50	498.90	455.60	428.40	404.50	380.10	354.10	327.70	302.10	278.20	255.60	233.70	2074.10	9638.80
1984	77.80	144.30	228.40	531.90	631.60	690.70	650.50	569.70	457.30	377.70	337.20	312.80	292.50	272.60	252.40	232.40	213.40	195.80	179.40	1595.60	8247.10
1985	79.50	160.30	222.40	300.10	629.00	692.30	699.50	592.20	473.00	363.40	293.90	258.90	237.80	220.60	204.40	188.30	172.60	158.00	144.60	1295.20	7386.00
1986	105.50	163.90	247.00	291.80	346.20	670.30	680.30	615.00	472.70	360.70	271.30	216.50	188.80	172.10	158.70	146.20	134.20	122.60	111.90	1006.20	6481.70
1987	139.40	217.40	252.60	324.60	346.50	380.20	673.10	598.40	481.60	351.20	261.90	194.30	153.50	132.90	120.30	110.40	101.30	92.60	84.40	759.60	5776.30
1988	127.20	287.30	335.10	332.10	385.40	383.60	396.70	660.10	557.70	436.10	312.50	230.10	169.00	132.50	114.00	102.70	93.80	85.80	78.30	703.60	5923.50
1989	91.50	262.20	442.70	440.40	394.80	426.20	396.30	377.30	585.60	477.30	366.10	259.00	188.80	137.60	107.20	91.80	82.30	75.00	68.40	614.80	5885.40
1990	86.40	188.60	404.10	581.80	523.20	434.20	430.80	355.60	305.40	451.70	360.20	272.60	190.90	138.10	100.00	77.60	66.10	59.10	53.70	482.60	5563.00
1991	111.90	178.20	290.70	530.90	690.50	573.70	434.50	376.60	276.10	224.70	324.80	255.40	191.40	133.00	95.60	68.90	53.20	45.20	40.30	360.80	5256.40
1992	108.60	230.70	274.50	381.90	629.90	755.20	567.90	368.40	278.50	192.30	152.70	217.60	169.40	125.90	87.00	62.20	44.60	34.30	29.10	254.90	4965.70
1993	109.20	223.90	355.50	360.50	451.00	683.10	730.40	453.60	248.00	174.30	117.10	91.60	129.20	99.80	73.70	50.70	36.10	25.80	19.80	161.60	4594.80
1994	92.00	225.10	344.90	467.00	427.40	490.50	654.30	553.60	277.60	138.90	94.60	62.60	48.50	67.80	52.10	38.30	26.20	18.60	13.30	92.00	4185.10
1995	68.60	189.70	346.70	452.80	550.40	458.90	462.00	499.70	351.80	163.30	79.40	53.30	34.90	26.80	37.30	28.50	20.80	14.20	10.10	56.20	3905.30
1996	62.90	141.40	292.40	455.20	535.50	594.40	436.80	359.40	325.50	212.60	96.00	46.00	30.60	19.80	15.10	21.00	15.90	11.60	7.90	36.40	3716.60
1997	81.70	129.70	217.80	384.10	539.50	586.80	597.80	390.70	290.50	251.00	160.40	71.40	33.90	22.30	14.40	11.00	15.10	11.40	8.30	31.30	3849.10
1998	134.50	168.40	199.80	286.00	447.90	580.80	580.80	528.20	313.10	222.40	188.10	118.60	52.30	24.60	16.10	10.40	7.80	10.80	8.10	27.90	3926.50
1999	125.20	277.30	259.50	262.50	339.60	492.90	590.40	531.30	441.40	250.60	174.30	145.40	90.80	39.70	18.60	12.10	7.70	5.80	8.00	26.50	4099.90
2000	100.90	258.10	427.30	341.10	311.30	372.60	495.20	521.00	418.30	329.90	183.00	125.60	103.80	64.30	28.00	13.00	8.40	5.40	4.10	23.60	4134.90
2001	111.70	208.00	397.60	561.20	402.50	337.80	362.40	403.00	361.60	271.20	208.20	113.90	77.40	63.40	39.00	16.90	7.80	5.10	3.20	16.30	3968.50
2002	118.50	230.30	320.50	522.00	660.40	434.50	332.00	320.30	327.40	282.10	207.30	157.10	85.10	57.30	46.70	28.60	12.30	5.70	3.70	14.00	4165.90
2003	106.40	244.20	354.90	420.90	616.00	716.10	431.00	299.20	267.80	263.70	222.90	161.70	121.30	65.20	43.70	35.40	21.60	9.30	4.30	13.10	4418.50
2004	99.00	219.40	376.30	466.10	495.50	671.60	727.70	408.00	268.00	232.70	225.10	187.90	135.00	100.50	53.70	35.80	28.90	17.50	7.50	13.90	4770.20
2005	88.90	204.10	338.00	494.50	550.60	543.80	688.70	691.10	363.60	231.00	196.80	188.00	155.40	110.70	82.00	43.50	28.90	23.30	14.10	17.00	5054.00
2006	82.60	183.30	314.50	443.60	571.60	590.40	546.50	644.80	610.40	311.20	194.00	163.30	154.50	126.70	89.70	66.10	35.00	23.10	18.50	24.60	5194.40
2007	66.50	170.30	282.40	413.20	524.30	627.20	603.20	511.40	560.30	510.80	255.40	157.20	131.00	123.00	100.20	70.60	51.80	27.30	18.00	33.30	5237.60
2008	80.00	137.10	262.50	371.20	490.80	579.40	650.10	583.30	467.10	496.00	444.10	219.20	133.70	110.50	103.10	83.60	58.70	42.90	22.60	42.00	5377.90
2009	85.30	164.90	211.30	345.10	441.80	544.40	604.00	632.40	535.60	415.60	433.40	383.20	187.30	113.30	93.10	86.40	69.80	48.80	35.60	53.00	5484.30
2010	77.10	175.80	254.20	277.40	400.90	478.00	558.20	588.10	580.10	464.70	348.20	356.30	311.30	150.90	90.70	74.20	68.50	55.20	38.50	69.10	5417.20
2011	85.30	159.00	270.80	333.90	326.00	439.10	495.80	548.90	543.80	506.50	391.50	287.80	291.00	252.20	121.50	72.60	59.10	54.50	43.70	84.40	5367.40
2012	114.40	175.80	245.00	355.80	393.30	358.30	457.50	490.10	510.50	477.50	429.20	325.40	236.40	237.00	204.10	97.80	58.20	47.20	43.40	101.00	5358.00
2013	114.20	235.80	270.80	321.80	420.60	432.80	371.70	446.30	443.90	430.90	386.30	339.70	254.30	183.20	182.50	156.30	74.60	44.30	35.80	108.30	5254.10
2014	113.50	235.40	363.40	355.80	381.00	463.70	449.60	362.10	400.90	369.00	341.90	299.50	259.90	192.90	138.10	136.80	116.70	55.50	32.80	105.70	5174.30
2015	112.30	233.90	362.60	477.00	419.70	416.10	471.70	422.50	307.90	310.00	269.90	243.60	210.40	181.00	133.40	95.00	93.70	79.70	37.80	93.30	4971.30
2016	110.90	231.40	360.30	475.60	556.80	453.00	418.90	441.40	362.90	244.30	234.70	199.60	177.80	152.20	130.10	95.50	67.70	66.60	56.40	91.80	4928.00
2017	110.10	228.70	356.50	472.60	553.70	599.60	455.20	390.10	374.10	281.30	179.70	168.30	141.20	124.70	106.00	90.20	65.90	46.50	45.70	100.70	4890.90
2018	109.20	226.90	352.30	467.90	557.50	604.30	608.60	424.80	326.20	281.70	199.30	123.70	114.20	95.00	83.30	70.50	59.70	43.50	30.60	95.20	4874.10

Table 10. Estimated time series of status indicators. Fishing mortality rate is apical F (F_{apical}). Total and spawning stock biomass (B and SSB , mt) are at the start of the year. The MSST is defined by $MSST = (1 - M)SSB_{MSY}$, with constant $M = 0.1038$. SPR is static spawning potential ratio and R_y is expected annual recruitment.

Year	F_{apical}	F/F_{MSY}	B	$B/B_{unfished}$	SSB	SSB/SSB_{MSY}	$SSB/MSST$	SPR	R_y
1972	0.001	0.002	6353	0.915	86	4.341	5.788	0.994	358655
1973	0.003	0.010	6397	0.921	87	4.390	5.853	0.967	358655
1974	0.007	0.024	6428	0.926	88	4.409	5.878	0.924	358831
1975	0.012	0.041	6437	0.927	88	4.410	5.880	0.876	358900
1976	0.012	0.041	6423	0.925	88	4.399	5.866	0.874	358904
1977	0.005	0.017	6409	0.923	88	4.400	5.867	0.943	358867
1978	0.008	0.027	6428	0.926	88	4.411	5.881	0.912	358870
1979	0.010	0.036	6431	0.926	88	4.411	5.881	0.889	358908
1980	0.020	0.069	6423	0.925	87	4.389	5.851	0.801	358907
1981	0.158	0.562	6370	0.917	82	4.109	5.479	0.258	358827
1982	0.366	1.299	5616	0.809	66	3.313	4.417	0.174	202449
1983	0.270	0.958	4372	0.630	51	2.549	3.399	0.219	197126
1984	0.220	0.780	3741	0.539	43	2.147	2.862	0.251	218956
1985	0.261	0.927	3350	0.483	37	1.844	2.459	0.205	223918
1986	0.290	1.027	2940	0.423	31	1.555	2.073	0.209	296992
1987	0.085	0.302	2620	0.377	28	1.414	1.886	0.470	392399
1988	0.143	0.508	2687	0.387	28	1.392	1.857	0.344	358181
1989	0.251	0.889	2670	0.385	26	1.299	1.732	0.231	257658
1990	0.300	1.062	2523	0.363	23	1.166	1.554	0.203	243356
1991	0.356	1.264	2384	0.343	21	1.041	1.388	0.179	315151
1992	0.467	1.656	2252	0.324	18	0.911	1.215	0.148	305786
1993	0.583	2.066	2084	0.300	15	0.774	1.032	0.131	307413
1994	0.530	1.880	1898	0.273	13	0.673	0.897	0.132	259194
1995	0.502	1.781	1771	0.255	12	0.616	0.822	0.139	193104
1996	0.251	0.890	1686	0.243	12	0.625	0.833	0.228	177086
1997	0.258	0.913	1746	0.251	13	0.672	0.896	0.213	230067
1998	0.213	0.754	1781	0.257	14	0.707	0.943	0.260	378807
1999	0.283	1.005	1860	0.268	14	0.726	0.967	0.211	352496
2000	0.430	1.526	1876	0.270	14	0.689	0.918	0.155	284166
2001	0.237	0.842	1800	0.259	13	0.672	0.896	0.224	314612
2002	0.204	0.724	1890	0.272	14	0.716	0.954	0.251	333602
2003	0.126	0.448	2004	0.289	16	0.786	1.048	0.353	299636
2004	0.136	0.482	2164	0.312	17	0.878	1.171	0.346	278767
2005	0.142	0.504	2292	0.330	19	0.962	1.282	0.313	250339
2006	0.166	0.589	2356	0.339	20	1.022	1.362	0.304	232682
2007	0.108	0.383	2376	0.342	22	1.084	1.445	0.408	187297
2008	0.103	0.366	2439	0.351	23	1.160	1.546	0.425	225306
2009	0.154	0.547	2488	0.358	24	1.207	1.609	0.335	240065
2010	0.149	0.528	2457	0.354	24	1.219	1.625	0.358	217143
2011	0.143	0.509	2435	0.351	24	1.227	1.635	0.372	240094
2012	0.193	0.686	2430	0.350	24	1.210	1.613	0.312	322156
2013	0.215	0.761	2383	0.343	23	1.160	1.546	0.296	321531
2014	0.301	1.066	2347	0.338	22	1.081	1.441	0.230	319537
2015	0.262	0.928	2255	0.325	20	1.005	1.340	0.238	316112
2016	0.293	1.040	2235	0.322	19	0.960	1.280	0.222	312407
2017	0.336	1.190	2218	0.320	18	0.920	1.227	0.216	309939
2018	0.194	0.687	2211	0.318	18	0.927	1.235	0.300	307615

Table 11. Selectivity at age for landings from commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and recreational (rA) fleets, selectivity for the MARMAP longline (sM) survey, selectivity of landings averaged across fisheries (L.avg), and selectivity of total removals (Total = L.avg). For time-varying selectivities, values shown are from the first year of each constant selectivity time period.

Age	TL (mm)	TL (in)	cH- 1972	cH- 2009	cL- 1972	cL- 2009	rA	sM	L.avg	Total
1	257	10.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	354	13.95	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	435	17.14	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01
4	503	19.79	0.08	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.90	0.05	0.06	0.06
5	558	21.97	0.30	0.26	0.04	0.02	1.00	0.17	0.09	0.09
6	604	23.78	0.69	0.55	0.18	0.07	1.00	0.43	0.17	0.17
7	642	25.28	0.92	0.81	0.52	0.20	1.00	0.74	0.31	0.31
8	674	26.52	0.98	0.94	0.85	0.47	1.00	0.91	0.55	0.55
9	700	27.55	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.76	1.00	0.98	0.80	0.80
10	721	28.40	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.92	1.00	0.99	0.93	0.93
11	739	29.10	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.98
12	754	29.68	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99
13	766	30.17	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
14	776	30.57	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
15	785	30.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
16	792	31.17	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
17	797	31.40	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
18	802	31.58	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
19	806	31.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
20	809	31.87	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 12. Estimated time series of fully selected fishing mortality rates for commercial handline (F_{cH}), commercial longline (F_{cL}), and recreational (F_{rA}). Also shown is apical F (F_{apical}), the maximum F at age summed across fleets.

Year	F_{cH}	F_{cL}	F_{rA}	F_{apical}
1972	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
1973	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.003
1974	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.007
1975	0.001	0.011	0.000	0.012
1976	0.001	0.011	0.000	0.012
1977	0.001	0.004	0.000	0.005
1978	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.008
1979	0.002	0.009	0.000	0.010
1980	0.005	0.015	0.000	0.020
1981	0.012	0.073	0.074	0.158
1982	0.030	0.336	0.000	0.366
1983	0.016	0.254	0.000	0.270
1984	0.013	0.201	0.006	0.220
1985	0.014	0.215	0.033	0.261
1986	0.015	0.275	0.000	0.290
1987	0.005	0.077	0.003	0.085
1988	0.009	0.134	0.001	0.143
1989	0.015	0.235	0.000	0.251
1990	0.017	0.282	0.001	0.300
1991	0.020	0.337	0.000	0.356
1992	0.020	0.443	0.004	0.467
1993	0.006	0.577	0.000	0.583
1994	0.051	0.475	0.003	0.530
1995	0.045	0.457	0.000	0.502
1996	0.021	0.227	0.002	0.251
1997	0.021	0.216	0.020	0.258
1998	0.016	0.196	0.001	0.213
1999	0.013	0.269	0.002	0.283
2000	0.020	0.405	0.005	0.430
2001	0.063	0.167	0.007	0.237
2002	0.061	0.139	0.004	0.204
2003	0.031	0.085	0.010	0.126
2004	0.015	0.114	0.007	0.136
2005	0.012	0.098	0.032	0.142
2006	0.012	0.147	0.007	0.166
2007	0.012	0.094	0.002	0.108
2008	0.006	0.097	0.000	0.103
2009	0.004	0.123	0.027	0.154
2010	0.007	0.128	0.014	0.149
2011	0.003	0.129	0.012	0.143
2012	0.015	0.172	0.007	0.193
2013	0.013	0.197	0.005	0.215
2014	0.042	0.253	0.006	0.301
2015	0.047	0.197	0.017	0.262
2016	0.040	0.233	0.021	0.293
2017	0.043	0.287	0.005	0.336
2018	0.020	0.159	0.014	0.194

Table 13. Estimated instantaneous fishing mortality rate F (per yr) at age

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1972	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
1973	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
1974	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007
1975	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.006	0.010	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
1976	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.006	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
1977	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005
1978	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.007	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008
1979	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.006	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.010
1980	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.006	0.012	0.017	0.019	0.019	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020
1981	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.068	0.080	0.095	0.123	0.147	0.156	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158
1982	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.005	0.023	0.080	0.203	0.314	0.355	0.364	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366	0.366
1983	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.015	0.056	0.147	0.231	0.261	0.268	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270	0.270
1984	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.008	0.018	0.050	0.122	0.189	0.213	0.218	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.220
1985	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.033	0.046	0.080	0.157	0.228	0.254	0.260	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261
1986	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.016	0.059	0.157	0.247	0.280	0.288	0.289	0.289	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290	0.290
1987	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.008	0.020	0.048	0.073	0.082	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085
1988	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.009	0.030	0.078	0.123	0.139	0.142	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143
1989	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.014	0.052	0.136	0.214	0.242	0.249	0.250	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251
1990	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.017	0.062	0.163	0.256	0.290	0.298	0.299	0.299	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300
1991	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.020	0.073	0.193	0.304	0.345	0.354	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356	0.356
1992	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.009	0.028	0.096	0.253	0.399	0.452	0.464	0.466	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467	0.467
1993	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.005	0.025	0.106	0.306	0.494	0.563	0.579	0.582	0.582	0.583	0.583	0.583	0.583	0.583	0.583	0.583	0.583
1994	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.011	0.038	0.123	0.298	0.456	0.514	0.527	0.529	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530	0.530
1995	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.007	0.032	0.112	0.280	0.431	0.486	0.499	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502	0.502
1996	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.006	0.018	0.057	0.140	0.216	0.243	0.249	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251	0.251
1997	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.022	0.036	0.073	0.152	0.224	0.250	0.256	0.257	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258	0.258
1998	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.013	0.046	0.117	0.182	0.206	0.211	0.212	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213	0.213
1999	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.005	0.017	0.058	0.154	0.242	0.274	0.281	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283	0.283
2000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.010	0.028	0.090	0.235	0.368	0.416	0.428	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430	0.430
2001	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.013	0.033	0.080	0.152	0.211	0.231	0.236	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.237
2002	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.010	0.028	0.071	0.133	0.182	0.199	0.203	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204	0.204
2003	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.012	0.023	0.047	0.083	0.113	0.123	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126	0.126
2004	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.009	0.016	0.037	0.080	0.118	0.132	0.135	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136	0.136
2005	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.030	0.040	0.058	0.094	0.127	0.139	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142
2006	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.008	0.017	0.041	0.095	0.143	0.161	0.165	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166	0.166
2007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.009	0.027	0.062	0.093	0.105	0.107	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108	0.108
2008	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.006	0.021	0.056	0.088	0.100	0.102	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103	0.103
2009	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.026	0.031	0.038	0.055	0.089	0.125	0.144	0.151	0.153	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.154
2010	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.014	0.018	0.026	0.045	0.081	0.119	0.139	0.146	0.148	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.149	0.149
2011	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.012	0.015	0.022	0.040	0.075	0.113	0.133	0.140	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143	0.143
2012	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.008	0.014	0.026	0.053	0.102	0.152	0.180	0.189	0.192	0.193	0.193	0.193	0.193	0.193	0.193	0.193	0.193
2013	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.006	0.012	0.025	0.055	0.110	0.168	0.199	0.210	0.213	0.214	0.215	0.215	0.215	0.215	0.215	0.215	0.215
2014	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.010	0.021	0.046	0.091	0.165	0.240	0.280	0.295	0.299	0.300	0.300	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.301
2015	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.021	0.033	0.056	0.095	0.155	0.214	0.246	0.257	0.260	0.261	0.262	0.262	0.262	0.262	0.262	0.262	0.262
2016	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.023	0.035	0.058	0.100	0.168	0.237	0.275	0.288	0.292	0.293	0.293	0.293	0.293	0.293	0.293	0.293	0.293
2017	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.010	0.022	0.048	0.098	0.182	0.267	0.312	0.329	0.334	0.335	0.335	0.335	0.335	0.336	0.336	0.336	0.336
2018	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.016	0.023	0.036	0.063	0.109	0.156	0.181	0.190	0.193	0.193	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194

Table 14. Estimated total landings at age in numbers (1000 fish)

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1972	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.13
1973	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.07	0.17	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.68
1974	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.18	0.41	0.56	0.57	0.52	0.46	0.41	0.37	0.33	0.29	0.26	0.24	0.21	0.19	1.66
1975	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.31	0.69	0.95	0.96	0.88	0.79	0.70	0.63	0.56	0.50	0.45	0.40	0.36	0.32	2.82
1976	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.31	0.70	0.97	0.97	0.88	0.79	0.71	0.63	0.57	0.51	0.45	0.41	0.36	0.33	2.86
1977	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.16	0.32	0.41	0.41	0.37	0.33	0.30	0.27	0.24	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.15	0.14	1.20
1978	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.13	0.31	0.53	0.66	0.65	0.58	0.52	0.47	0.42	0.38	0.34	0.30	0.27	0.24	0.22	1.91
1979	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.12	0.32	0.64	0.85	0.84	0.76	0.68	0.61	0.55	0.49	0.44	0.39	0.35	0.32	0.28	2.49
1980	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.29	0.73	1.31	1.65	1.62	1.47	1.31	1.17	1.05	0.94	0.85	0.76	0.68	0.61	0.55	4.80
1981	0.00	0.02	0.80	10.97	11.10	11.33	12.67	13.20	12.28	11.03	9.84	8.78	7.84	7.02	6.31	5.68	5.11	4.59	4.11	36.01
1982	0.01	0.05	0.21	0.86	3.03	8.91	18.43	23.27	22.22	19.91	17.75	15.85	14.16	12.66	11.35	10.21	9.20	8.28	7.44	65.09
1983	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.60	2.17	6.23	12.87	14.99	12.91	10.98	9.62	8.55	7.64	6.83	6.11	5.49	4.94	4.45	4.01	35.16
1984	0.00	0.01	0.09	1.27	2.49	5.96	10.98	12.40	9.86	7.59	6.31	5.51	4.90	4.38	3.93	3.52	3.16	2.84	2.57	22.58
1985	0.00	0.02	0.24	3.00	6.37	9.45	14.94	15.29	11.94	8.52	6.41	5.31	4.64	4.14	3.70	3.32	2.98	2.67	2.41	21.32
1986	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.32	1.21	6.75	14.47	17.04	13.00	9.24	6.47	4.86	4.03	3.53	3.14	2.82	2.53	2.27	2.04	18.11
1987	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.37	0.60	1.34	4.61	5.34	4.28	2.91	2.02	1.41	1.06	0.88	0.77	0.69	0.62	0.56	0.50	4.43
1988	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.24	0.75	2.02	4.39	9.63	8.12	5.92	3.95	2.74	1.91	1.44	1.20	1.05	0.94	0.84	0.76	6.72
1989	0.01	0.03	0.14	0.44	1.26	3.82	7.42	9.21	14.18	10.77	7.69	5.12	3.55	2.49	1.87	1.56	1.37	1.22	1.10	9.75
1990	0.01	0.03	0.15	0.75	2.01	4.63	9.51	10.17	8.65	11.91	8.84	6.30	4.20	2.91	2.04	1.54	1.28	1.13	1.01	8.94
1991	0.01	0.03	0.13	0.74	3.05	7.15	11.22	12.52	9.07	6.87	9.24	6.84	4.87	3.25	2.26	1.59	1.20	1.00	0.88	7.75
1992	0.01	0.04	0.17	1.09	3.97	12.25	18.64	15.35	11.41	7.32	5.41	7.26	5.37	3.84	2.56	1.78	1.25	0.94	0.79	6.82
1993	0.01	0.04	0.18	0.59	2.54	12.15	28.26	22.43	12.04	7.86	4.91	3.62	4.86	3.60	2.57	1.72	1.20	0.84	0.64	5.12
1994	0.01	0.07	0.30	1.61	3.63	10.03	24.78	25.72	12.58	5.84	3.70	2.30	1.70	2.28	1.69	1.21	0.81	0.56	0.40	2.71
1995	0.01	0.05	0.26	1.05	3.97	8.60	16.55	22.20	15.28	6.58	2.98	1.88	1.17	0.86	1.16	0.86	0.62	0.41	0.29	1.59
1996	0.00	0.02	0.12	0.80	2.16	5.83	8.38	8.82	7.90	4.81	2.02	0.91	0.58	0.36	0.26	0.36	0.27	0.19	0.13	0.58
1997	0.01	0.02	0.18	2.59	4.26	7.32	12.39	9.92	7.23	5.80	3.45	1.45	0.65	0.41	0.26	0.19	0.26	0.19	0.14	0.51
1998	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.31	1.35	4.65	9.44	11.13	6.55	4.34	3.41	2.03	0.85	0.38	0.24	0.15	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.38
1999	0.01	0.03	0.09	0.41	1.27	4.93	12.33	14.45	11.91	6.30	4.08	3.20	1.90	0.80	0.36	0.23	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.47
2000	0.01	0.05	0.26	1.02	1.92	5.71	15.20	20.32	16.06	11.77	6.08	3.93	3.09	1.84	0.77	0.35	0.22	0.14	0.10	0.59
2001	0.01	0.05	0.33	2.21	2.95	4.59	7.50	9.68	8.40	5.84	4.17	2.15	1.39	1.09	0.65	0.27	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.25
2002	0.01	0.05	0.23	1.59	4.19	5.26	6.05	6.73	6.65	5.31	3.63	2.59	1.33	0.86	0.68	0.41	0.17	0.08	0.05	0.18
2003	0.01	0.03	0.20	1.59	3.16	5.77	5.03	4.03	3.49	3.19	2.51	1.71	1.22	0.63	0.41	0.32	0.19	0.08	0.04	0.11
2004	0.00	0.02	0.15	1.27	1.83	4.37	8.20	5.74	3.72	3.01	2.71	2.13	1.45	1.04	0.54	0.35	0.27	0.16	0.07	0.13
2005	0.00	0.02	0.33	4.64	4.83	5.40	9.09	10.42	5.30	3.12	2.47	2.22	1.75	1.20	0.86	0.44	0.29	0.23	0.14	0.16
2006	0.00	0.02	0.12	1.16	2.13	4.22	7.23	10.89	10.20	4.84	2.81	2.23	2.00	1.58	1.08	0.77	0.40	0.26	0.21	0.27
2007	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.44	1.10	2.92	5.31	5.77	6.26	5.32	2.48	1.44	1.14	1.03	0.81	0.55	0.40	0.21	0.13	0.24
2008	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.15	0.64	2.15	5.19	6.22	4.98	4.94	4.12	1.91	1.11	0.88	0.80	0.63	0.43	0.31	0.16	0.29
2009	0.00	0.01	0.17	2.73	3.02	3.55	4.75	6.82	7.08	5.72	5.77	4.86	2.27	1.32	1.05	0.95	0.75	0.51	0.37	0.54
2010	0.01	0.02	0.13	1.19	1.63	2.18	3.61	5.79	7.29	6.16	4.48	4.37	3.65	1.70	0.99	0.79	0.71	0.56	0.39	0.68
2011	0.00	0.01	0.11	1.20	1.10	1.67	2.84	5.04	6.52	6.46	4.86	3.41	3.29	2.74	1.28	0.74	0.59	0.54	0.42	0.81
2012	0.02	0.03	0.12	0.90	1.21	1.63	3.47	6.00	8.11	8.03	7.02	5.07	3.52	3.39	2.82	1.32	0.77	0.61	0.55	1.27
2013	0.01	0.04	0.12	0.65	1.12	1.87	2.89	5.88	7.71	7.95	6.94	5.82	4.16	2.88	2.78	2.31	1.08	0.63	0.50	1.50
2014	0.04	0.10	0.33	1.14	1.83	3.65	5.71	6.96	9.62	9.24	8.28	6.91	5.72	4.08	2.83	2.72	2.27	1.06	0.62	1.97
2015	0.04	0.10	0.44	3.04	3.08	4.01	6.26	7.66	6.67	6.92	5.80	4.98	4.11	3.39	2.42	1.68	1.62	1.35	0.63	1.54
2016	0.03	0.09	0.44	3.44	4.37	4.50	5.82	8.64	8.63	6.01	5.57	4.51	3.83	3.15	2.61	1.86	1.29	1.25	1.04	1.67
2017	0.04	0.10	0.33	1.52	2.73	4.95	6.21	8.19	9.85	7.73	4.78	4.26	3.41	2.90	2.38	1.97	1.41	0.98	0.94	2.06
2018	0.02	0.05	0.26	2.28	2.83	3.79	5.43	5.53	5.29	4.77	3.27	1.93	1.70	1.36	1.15	0.95	0.79	0.56	0.39	1.20

Table 15. Estimated total landings at age in gutted weight (1000 lb)

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1972	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.19	0.30	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.31	0.29	0.27	0.25	0.23	0.21	0.20	0.18	1.58
1973	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.09	0.37	1.03	1.65	1.86	1.87	1.80	1.71	1.61	1.50	1.38	1.27	1.17	1.07	0.97	8.61
1974	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.22	0.90	2.48	3.98	4.51	4.53	4.38	4.15	3.90	3.63	3.36	3.09	2.83	2.59	2.36	20.89
1975	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.38	1.53	4.21	6.74	7.62	7.67	7.43	7.06	6.63	6.18	5.71	5.26	4.82	4.40	4.01	35.54
1976	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.39	1.56	4.27	6.81	7.68	7.72	7.50	7.14	6.71	6.25	5.79	5.33	4.88	4.46	4.06	35.99
1977	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.23	0.80	1.92	2.91	3.24	3.24	3.14	3.00	2.82	2.63	2.44	2.24	2.06	1.88	1.71	15.15
1978	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.10	0.49	1.53	3.25	4.68	5.14	5.12	4.94	4.71	4.45	4.16	3.86	3.55	3.25	2.97	2.71	23.99
1979	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.45	1.60	3.90	5.97	6.67	6.67	6.44	6.12	5.78	5.41	5.03	4.63	4.25	3.88	3.53	31.32
1980	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.23	1.12	3.63	7.97	11.67	12.88	12.88	12.43	11.80	11.10	10.39	9.67	8.94	8.20	7.49	6.83	60.49
1981	0.00	0.02	1.42	30.72	43.26	56.70	76.87	93.16	97.72	96.53	93.09	88.41	83.03	77.48	72.04	66.71	61.39	56.15	51.16	453.43
1982	0.00	0.05	0.37	2.42	11.81	44.56	111.79	164.19	176.74	174.34	167.89	159.60	150.02	139.77	129.60	119.87	110.53	101.38	92.47	819.68
1983	0.00	0.02	0.24	1.67	8.46	31.18	78.10	105.80	102.73	96.17	90.95	86.05	80.91	75.45	69.84	64.43	59.34	54.53	49.88	442.72
1984	0.00	0.01	0.16	3.56	9.72	29.81	66.61	87.47	78.46	66.43	59.66	55.44	51.89	48.40	44.84	41.30	37.93	34.82	31.91	284.35
1985	0.00	0.02	0.43	8.41	24.82	47.29	90.62	107.90	94.94	74.55	60.61	53.50	49.18	45.66	42.31	39.00	35.77	32.74	29.97	268.55
1986	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.89	4.73	33.79	87.76	120.26	103.37	80.86	61.16	48.90	42.70	38.94	35.92	33.11	30.39	27.78	25.36	228.08
1987	0.00	0.01	0.08	1.05	2.33	6.72	27.94	37.65	34.04	25.48	19.12	14.21	11.24	9.73	8.82	8.09	7.43	6.80	6.19	55.75
1988	0.00	0.02	0.11	0.66	2.92	10.12	26.61	67.98	64.59	51.84	37.38	27.58	20.28	15.91	13.69	12.34	11.28	10.32	9.41	84.63
1989	0.00	0.03	0.25	1.23	4.90	19.12	44.99	64.97	112.83	94.30	72.76	51.56	37.63	27.45	21.40	18.32	16.44	14.98	13.66	122.85
1990	0.00	0.02	0.27	2.11	7.84	23.14	57.68	71.74	68.79	104.26	83.62	63.40	44.45	32.18	23.32	18.08	15.42	13.79	12.53	112.64
1991	0.00	0.03	0.22	2.08	11.90	35.79	68.04	88.32	72.13	60.13	87.38	68.86	51.64	35.91	25.83	18.62	14.38	12.22	10.90	97.58
1992	0.00	0.04	0.30	3.05	15.49	61.27	113.10	108.35	90.76	64.10	51.17	73.05	56.93	42.35	29.26	20.94	15.03	11.57	9.80	85.86
1993	0.00	0.04	0.32	1.67	9.89	60.77	171.47	158.31	95.79	68.85	46.48	36.43	51.43	39.76	29.39	20.20	14.39	10.30	7.90	64.47
1994	0.00	0.06	0.54	4.50	14.15	50.17	150.31	181.52	100.04	51.12	35.00	23.18	17.97	25.16	19.33	14.21	9.73	6.91	4.93	34.18
1995	0.00	0.05	0.46	2.95	15.46	43.05	100.42	156.66	121.53	57.65	28.18	18.94	12.41	9.54	13.28	10.15	7.43	5.07	3.59	20.05
1996	0.00	0.02	0.21	2.24	8.41	29.18	50.85	62.26	62.86	42.07	19.10	9.17	6.10	3.96	3.03	4.19	3.19	2.33	1.58	7.29
1997	0.00	0.02	0.33	7.25	16.60	36.61	75.14	70.02	57.52	50.82	32.66	14.57	6.92	4.56	2.95	2.24	3.09	2.34	1.70	6.41
1998	0.00	0.02	0.11	0.86	5.27	23.28	57.26	78.57	52.12	37.96	32.29	20.40	9.00	4.24	2.78	1.79	1.35	1.86	1.40	4.81
1999	0.00	0.03	0.17	1.14	4.95	24.65	74.78	101.95	94.71	55.11	38.56	32.24	20.15	8.82	4.13	2.69	1.72	1.30	1.78	5.88
2000	0.00	0.04	0.47	2.86	7.50	28.55	92.23	143.40	127.72	103.07	57.50	39.53	32.69	20.27	8.82	4.10	2.67	1.70	1.28	7.45
2001	0.00	0.05	0.58	6.18	11.50	22.99	45.48	68.33	66.85	51.13	39.46	21.62	14.70	12.05	7.43	3.21	1.49	0.96	0.61	3.11
2002	0.00	0.05	0.41	4.46	16.35	26.33	36.70	47.52	52.88	46.46	34.31	26.05	14.12	9.52	7.76	4.76	2.05	0.95	0.61	2.33
2003	0.00	0.03	0.36	4.44	12.31	28.86	30.54	28.46	27.77	27.90	23.70	17.22	12.94	6.96	4.66	3.78	2.31	0.99	0.46	1.40
2004	0.00	0.02	0.26	3.56	7.12	21.88	49.76	40.53	29.59	26.31	25.60	21.40	15.39	11.47	6.13	4.09	3.30	2.01	0.86	1.59
2005	0.00	0.01	0.58	12.99	18.84	27.02	55.12	73.53	42.14	27.30	23.38	22.37	18.50	13.20	9.77	5.19	3.45	2.77	1.68	2.03
2006	0.00	0.01	0.22	3.26	8.29	21.13	43.89	76.82	81.16	42.40	26.60	22.43	21.23	17.42	12.35	9.10	4.81	3.19	2.56	3.39
2007	0.00	0.01	0.11	1.24	4.28	14.63	32.19	40.68	49.83	46.59	23.43	14.45	12.06	11.32	9.23	6.51	4.77	2.52	1.66	3.07
2008	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.43	2.48	10.76	31.49	43.87	39.64	43.24	38.97	19.27	11.76	9.73	9.08	7.37	5.17	3.78	1.99	3.70
2009	0.00	0.01	0.31	7.66	11.78	17.75	28.80	48.13	56.28	50.06	54.59	48.92	24.02	14.55	11.97	11.11	8.97	6.28	4.58	6.82
2010	0.00	0.02	0.24	3.34	6.36	10.90	21.92	40.83	57.96	53.92	42.41	44.04	38.66	18.77	11.29	9.24	8.54	6.87	4.80	8.62
2011	0.00	0.01	0.20	3.36	4.27	8.37	17.23	35.55	51.88	56.55	45.98	34.32	34.87	30.27	14.59	8.73	7.11	6.55	5.26	10.16
2012	0.01	0.03	0.21	2.53	4.71	8.15	21.04	42.36	64.52	70.32	66.39	51.09	37.29	37.45	32.27	15.47	9.22	7.48	6.87	16.00
2013	0.00	0.04	0.21	1.81	4.35	9.33	17.56	41.49	61.31	69.64	65.65	58.61	44.09	31.81	31.72	27.18	12.98	7.70	6.23	18.85
2014	0.01	0.09	0.58	3.19	7.14	18.27	34.65	49.14	76.56	80.86	78.33	69.53	60.62	45.06	32.27	32.00	27.30	12.99	7.69	24.75
2015	0.01	0.09	0.78	8.52	12.01	20.06	38.00	54.07	53.09	60.55	54.89	50.16	43.50	37.48	27.65	19.69	19.44	16.53	7.84	19.36
2016	0.01	0.08	0.78	9.62	17.05	22.53	35.32	60.99	68.65	52.61	52.71	45.40	40.61	34.82	29.78	21.86	15.50	15.25	12.93	21.04
2017	0.01	0.09	0.59	4.25	10.63	24.78	37.70	57.81	78.39	67.71	45.22	42.93	36.17	31.98	27.22	23.16	16.92	11.96	11.74	25.88
2018	0.01	0.05	0.47	6.37	11.04	18.94	32.94	39.04	42.05	41.75	30.91	19.46	18.05	15.02	13.19	11.16	9.46	6.89	4.85	15.10

Table 16. Estimated time series of landings in numbers (1000 fish) for commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and recreational (rA)

Year	L.cH	L.cL	L.rA
1972	0.04	0.47	0.00
1973	0.23	2.55	0.00
1974	0.56	6.18	0.00
1975	0.96	10.49	0.00
1976	1.01	10.58	0.00
1977	0.94	4.01	0.00
1978	2.47	5.51	0.00
1979	1.77	8.39	0.00
1980	5.31	14.59	0.00
1981	12.60	65.76	100.32
1982	26.59	242.25	0.03
1983	11.35	142.12	0.25
1984	8.26	96.98	5.11
1985	7.92	92.22	26.54
1986	7.52	104.37	0.04
1987	2.56	27.97	1.90
1988	4.11	48.28	0.32
1989	6.48	76.49	0.04
1990	6.78	78.88	0.34
1991	7.40	82.14	0.11
1992	7.18	96.42	2.69
1993	1.94	113.21	0.05
1994	15.43	84.73	1.77
1995	12.59	73.75	0.05
1996	6.15	37.11	1.23
1997	6.68	39.58	10.96
1998	5.41	39.99	0.29
1999	4.22	57.99	0.93
2000	5.92	81.08	2.42
2001	17.64	30.59	3.56
2002	18.34	25.35	2.37
2003	10.79	17.03	5.90
2004	5.61	26.84	4.70
2005	5.18	26.42	21.28
2006	5.25	42.49	4.69
2007	5.34	28.98	1.29
2008	2.71	32.20	0.04
2009	1.68	32.11	18.44
2010	3.03	34.40	8.89
2011	1.21	35.05	7.39
2012	6.24	45.62	4.01
2013	5.06	49.00	2.78
2014	15.65	56.20	3.23
2015	16.56	39.27	9.92
2016	13.61	42.79	12.37
2017	14.57	48.87	3.32
2018	7.31	27.10	9.15

Table 17. Estimated time series of landings in gutted weight (1000 lb) for commercial handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and recreational (rA)

Year	L.cH	L.cL	L.rA
1972	0.40	4.74	0.00
1973	2.17	25.83	0.00
1974	5.25	62.60	0.00
1975	8.98	106.31	0.00
1976	9.42	107.23	0.00
1977	8.82	40.63	0.00
1978	23.07	55.86	0.00
1979	16.61	85.15	0.00
1980	49.70	148.05	0.00
1981	117.49	666.17	815.63
1982	242.93	2433.87	0.25
1983	99.44	1397.23	1.79
1984	69.49	927.90	35.39
1985	64.65	857.03	184.59
1986	60.23	943.67	0.27
1987	20.52	249.12	13.04
1988	33.14	432.31	2.21
1989	51.65	687.78	0.25
1990	51.99	701.31	2.00
1991	53.42	707.91	0.63
1992	48.98	788.52	14.94
1993	12.75	874.87	0.25
1994	99.49	634.33	9.18
1995	79.45	547.15	0.25
1996	38.40	273.47	6.16
1997	42.40	292.11	57.25
1998	35.28	298.47	1.61
1999	28.45	440.99	5.35
2000	40.50	627.70	13.64
2001	119.25	240.00	18.47
2002	121.36	200.08	12.17
2003	70.68	133.11	31.29
2004	37.36	207.89	25.63
2005	35.32	206.02	118.53
2006	36.47	336.94	26.85
2007	37.75	233.22	7.62
2008	19.64	262.92	0.25
2009	12.61	283.61	116.37
2010	23.21	307.42	58.09
2011	9.44	317.20	48.64
2012	49.13	418.05	26.22
2013	39.70	452.80	18.07
2014	120.61	520.06	20.38
2015	124.34	360.38	59.01
2016	99.20	387.56	70.80
2017	102.55	434.13	18.47
2018	50.49	235.53	50.73

Table 18. Estimated status indicators, benchmarks, and related quantities from the base run of the Beaufort catch-age model, conditional on estimated current selectivities averaged across fleets. Also presented are median values and measures of precision (standard errors, SE), 25th and 75th percentiles from the Monte Carlo Bootstrap Ensemble (MCBE). Rate estimates (F) are in units of 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 in gonad wgt (mt)

Quantity	Units	Estimate	MCBE			
			Median	SE	25%	75%
F_{MSY}	y^{-1}	0.282	0.249	0.164	0.171	0.36
$85\%F_{MSY}$	y^{-1}	0.24	0.212	0.139	0.145	0.306
$75\%F_{MSY}$	y^{-1}	0.211	0.187	0.123	0.128	0.27
$65\%F_{MSY}$	y^{-1}	0.183	0.162	0.106	0.111	0.234
$F_{20\%}$	y^{-1}	0.36	0.411	0.121	0.318	0.522
$F_{30\%}$	y^{-1}	0.198	0.219	0.052	0.18	0.269
$F_{40\%}$	y^{-1}	0.126	0.138	0.029	0.114	0.165
B_{MSY}	metric tons	2398.3	2642.1	445.9	2371.3	2970.4
SSB_{MSY}	gonad wgt (mt)	19.9	22.4	6.9	17.9	27.8
MSST	gonad wgt (mt)	14.9	16.8	5.2	13.4	20.8
MSY	1000 lb gutted	541.6	531.6	78.8	478.2	589.1
R_{MSY}	1000 fish	312.1	357.1	112.2	272.3	460.4
$L_{85\%MSY}$	1000 lb gutted	539.4	528.6	79.4	475	586.3
$L_{75\%MSY}$	1000 lb gutted	534	522.7	80.7	468.1	581.7
$L_{65\%MSY}$	1000 lb gutted	525	512.9	82.6	455.9	572.9
$F_{2016-2018}/F_{MSY}$	—	0.947	1.122	1.173	0.662	1.975
$SSB_{2018}/MSST$	—	1.235	1.07	0.623	0.704	1.564
SSB_{2018}/SSB_{MSY}	—	0.927	0.803	0.467	0.528	1.173

Table 19. Results from sensitivity runs of the Beaufort catch-age model. Current F represented by geometric mean of last three assessment years ($F/F_{\text{MSY}} = F_{2016-2018}/F_{\text{MSY}}$). MSY is in 1000 lb gutted weight. Stock and rebuild status based on terminal year ($\text{SSB}/\text{MSST} = \text{SSB}_{2018}/\text{MSST}$; $\text{SSB}/\text{SSB}_{\text{MSY}} = \text{SSB}_{2018}/\text{SSB}_{\text{MSY}}$). h = Beverton-Holt steepness. δ_{status} is the absolute linear distance in status space $[(x, y) = (F/F_{\text{MSY}}, \text{SSB}/\text{MSST})]$ between sensitivity results and base model results, as an overall metric of sensitivity. See text for full description of sensitivity runs.

Description	F_{MSY}	SSB_{MSY} (mt)	B_{MSY} (mt)	MSY (1000 lb)	F/F_{MSY}	SSB/MSST	SSB/SSB _{MSY}	h	R_0 (1000 fish)	δ_{status}
Base	0.282	20	2398	542	0.95	1.24	0.93	0.84	299	0.00
S1 set M constant lo	0.195	24	2375	479	1.88	0.73	0.55	0.84	192	1.06
S2 set M constant up	0.498	16	2569	644	0.40	2.10	1.57	0.84	552	1.02
S3 set steep lo	0.201	25	2710	505	1.53	0.86	0.65	0.74	313	0.69
S4 set steep up	0.438	15	2089	582	0.54	1.81	1.35	0.94	286	0.70
S5 set F init 0.5lkmin	0.279	21	2511	564	0.89	1.26	0.95	0.84	311	0.06
S6 set F init lkmin	0.279	22	2610	587	0.83	1.30	0.98	0.84	324	0.13
S7 set w cpue sM lo	0.273	21	2480	559	0.69	1.59	1.19	0.84	310	0.44
S8 set w cpue sM up	0.429	17	2052	466	2.26	0.91	0.68	0.84	249	1.35
S9 rec alt 06to11	0.270	19	2324	520	1.43	0.74	0.55	0.84	288	0.69

Table 20. Projection results with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = F_{P_{50\%}}$ starting in 2022 and projecting forward to 2027. From 2019 to 2021 the fishing mortality rate was fixed at F_{current} . R = number of age-1 recruits (in 1000s), F = fishing mortality rate (per year), S = spawning stock (mt), L = landings expressed in numbers (n, in 1000s) or gutted weight (GW, in 1000 lb), $P(> \text{MSST})$ = proportion of stochastic projection replicates with $\text{SSB} \geq \text{MSST}$. The extension b indicates expected values (deterministic) from the base run; the extension med indicates median values from the stochastic projections.

Year	R_b	R_{med}	F_b	F_{med}	S_b (mt)	S_{med} (mt)	L_b (n)	L_{med} (n)	L_b (GW)	L_{med} (GW)	$P(> \text{MSST})$
2019	294	255	0.26	0.28	19	18	54	58	440	457	0.558
2020	297	257	0.26	0.28	19	18	57	59	457	465	0.565
2021	297	258	0.26	0.28	20	18	58	60	472	472	0.569
2022	298	256	0.30	0.25	20	18	68	57	552	442	0.579
2023	298	258	0.30	0.25	20	18	67	58	546	457	0.600
2024	298	262	0.30	0.25	19	18	67	58	539	461	0.620
2025	297	266	0.30	0.25	19	18	66	59	533	465	0.636
2026	297	265	0.30	0.25	19	18	65	59	529	467	0.650
2027	297	268	0.30	0.25	19	18	65	59	526	466	0.660

Table 21. Projection results with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = F_{\text{MSY}}$ starting in 2022 and projecting forward to 2027. From 2019 to 2021 the fishing mortality rate was fixed at F_{current} . R = number of age-1 recruits (in 1000s), F = fishing mortality rate (per year), S = spawning stock (mt), L = landings expressed in numbers (n, in 1000s) or gutted weight (GW, in 1000 lb), $P(> \text{MSST})$ = proportion of stochastic projection replicates with $\text{SSB} \geq \text{MSST}$. The extension b indicates expected values (deterministic) from the base run; the extension med indicates median values from the stochastic projections.

Year	R_b	R_{med}	F_b	F_{med}	S_b (mt)	S_{med} (mt)	L_b (n)	L_{med} (n)	L_b (GW)	L_{med} (GW)	$P(> \text{MSST})$
2019	294	260	0.26	0.28	19	18	54	58	440	457	0.558
2020	297	259	0.26	0.28	19	18	57	59	457	465	0.562
2021	297	258	0.26	0.28	20	18	58	60	472	471	0.567
2022	298	258	0.30	0.25	20	18	68	57	552	445	0.576
2023	298	263	0.30	0.25	20	18	67	58	546	459	0.597
2024	298	261	0.30	0.25	19	18	67	59	539	464	0.617
2025	297	263	0.30	0.25	19	18	66	59	533	468	0.631
2026	297	265	0.30	0.25	19	18	65	59	529	468	0.644
2027	297	266	0.30	0.25	19	18	65	59	526	468	0.657

Table 22. Projection results with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = F_{P_{30\%}}$ starting in 2022 and projecting forward to 2027. From 2019 to 2021 the fishing mortality rate was fixed at F_{current} . R = number of age-1 recruits (in 1000s), F = fishing mortality rate (per year), S = spawning stock (mt), L = landings expressed in numbers (n, in 1000s) or gutted weight (GW, in 1000 lb), $P(> \text{MSST})$ = proportion of stochastic projection replicates with $\text{SSB} \geq \text{MSST}$. The extension b indicates expected values (deterministic) from the base run; the extension med indicates median values from the stochastic projections.

Year	R_b	R_{med}	F_b	F_{med}	S_b (mt)	S_{med} (mt)	L_b (n)	L_{med} (n)	L_b (GW)	L_{med} (GW)	$P(> \text{MSST})$
2019	294	259	0.26	0.28	19	18	54	58	440	457	0.557
2020	297	259	0.26	0.28	19	18	57	59	457	465	0.562
2021	297	257	0.26	0.28	20	18	58	60	472	471	0.568
2022	298	257	0.20	0.17	20	19	47	39	386	307	0.590
2023	300	258	0.20	0.17	21	20	50	42	407	335	0.636
2024	301	268	0.20	0.17	22	20	51	44	424	355	0.678
2025	303	271	0.20	0.17	22	21	53	46	438	373	0.716
2026	304	276	0.20	0.17	23	21	54	47	449	389	0.746
2027	305	281	0.20	0.17	23	22	54	48	457	401	0.772

Table 23. Projection results with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = 0.75F_{\text{MSY}}$ starting in 2022 and projecting forward to 2027. From 2019 to 2021 the fishing mortality rate was fixed at F_{current} . R = number of age-1 recruits (in 1000s), F = fishing mortality rate (per year), S = spawning stock (mt), L = landings expressed in numbers (n, in 1000s) or gutted weight (GW, in 1000 lb), $P(> \text{MSST})$ = proportion of stochastic projection replicates with $\text{SSB} \geq \text{MSST}$. The extension b indicates expected values (deterministic) from the base run; the extension med indicates median values from the stochastic projections.

Year	R_b	R_{med}	F_b	F_{med}	S_b (mt)	S_{med} (mt)	L_b (n)	L_{med} (n)	L_b (GW)	L_{med} (GW)	$P(> \text{MSST})$
2019	294	259	0.26	0.28	19	18	54	58	440	457	0.559
2020	297	259	0.26	0.28	19	18	57	59	457	465	0.563
2021	297	259	0.26	0.28	20	18	58	61	472	472	0.568
2022	298	261	0.22	0.19	20	19	52	43	425	340	0.587
2023	299	257	0.22	0.19	21	19	54	46	442	366	0.630
2024	301	266	0.22	0.19	21	20	55	48	455	385	0.671
2025	302	269	0.22	0.19	22	20	56	49	465	399	0.705
2026	302	275	0.22	0.19	22	20	57	51	472	411	0.734
2027	303	276	0.22	0.19	22	21	57	52	478	420	0.757

9 Figures

Figure 1. Timeline of data fit to in this assessment. Date types include landings (L), indices of abundance (index; CPUE), age compositions (ageComp; acomp), and length compositions (lengthComp; lcomp). Data sources include the commercial (com) handline (cH), commercial longline (cL), and general recreational (rec all; rA) fleets, and the MARMAP longline survey.




Figure 2. Length, female maturity, and reproductive output at age. Top panel: Mean length at age (mm) and estimated 95% confidence interval of the population. Middle panel: Female maturity by age. Bottom panel: Reproductive output ($mt W_{gonad}$) by age.




Figure 3. Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual and length compositions by fleet. In panels indicating the data set: acomp = age compositions, lcomp = length compositions, cH = commercial handline, cL = commercial longline, sM = MARMAP longline survey, rA = general recreational. N indicates the number of trips from which individual fish samples were taken. The four digit number in upper right corner of each panel indicates year of sampling (e.g. 1997, 1998).




Figure 3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual age and length compositions by fleet.




Figure 3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual age and length compositions by fleet.




Figure 3. (cont.) Observed (open circles) and estimated (solid line) annual age and length compositions by fleet.




Figure 4. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial handline landings (1000 lb gutted weight).




Figure 5. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial longline landings (1000 lb gutted weight).




Figure 6. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) recreational landings (1000 lb gutted weight).




Figure 7. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) commercial longline index of abundance . In the upper panel, error bars indicate ± 2 standard errors of the observed index (U_{ob}). In the lower panel, scaled residuals are computed $(U_{ob} - U_{pr})/\text{mean}(\text{abs}(U_{ob} - U_{pr}))$.




Figure 8. Observed (open circles) and estimated (line, solid circles) MARMAP longline survey index of abundance. In the upper panel, error bars indicate ± 2 standard errors of the observed index (U_{ob}). In the lower panel, scaled residuals are computed $(U_{ob} - U_{pr})/\text{mean}(\text{abs}(U_{ob} - U_{pr}))$.





Figure 9. Estimated abundance at age at start of year

Figure 10. Estimated biomass at age at start of year.




Figure 11. Estimated recruitment time series. Top panel: Estimated recruitment of age-1 fish. Horizontal dashed line indicates R_{MSY} . Bottom panel: log recruitment residuals (open circles). These are annual recruitment deviations (r_y) estimated within the model. The solid tan line is a lowess smoother fit to the residuals.




Figure 12. Estimated total biomass and spawning stock time series. Top panel: Estimated total biomass (metric tons) at start of year. Horizontal dashed line indicates B_{MSY} . Bottom panel: Estimated spawning stock (mt) at time of peak spawning (May 31st; 0.42 yr).




Figure 13. Selectivity of MARMAP longline index. Different colored lines indicate different selectivity blocks. The first year of each selectivity block is indicated in the legend. In this case, there was only one selectivity block.




Figure 14. Selectivities of commercial handline landings (top) and commercial longline landings (bottom). Different colored lines indicate different selectivity blocks. The first year of each selectivity block is indicated in the legend.




Figure 15. Selectivity of recreational landings. Different colored lines indicate different selectivity blocks. The first year of each selectivity block is indicated in the legend. In this case, there was only one selectivity block.




Figure 16. Average selectivity from the terminal assessment year weighted by geometric mean F s from the last three assessment years, for landings. This selectivity is used in computation of benchmarks and central-tendency projections.




Figure 17. Estimated fully selected fishing mortality rate (per year) by fleet. *rA* = recreational, *cL* = commercial longline, and *cH* = commercial handline landings.




Figure 18. Estimated landings in absolute numbers (top) and proportion of total numbers (bottom) by fleet from the catch-at-age model. *rA* = recreational landings, *cL* = commercial longline landings, and *cH* = commercial handline landings




Figure 19. Estimated landings in absolute weight (top) and proportion of total weight (bottom) by fleet from the catch-at-age model. *rA* = recreational landings, *cL* = commercial longline landings, and *cH* = commercial handline landings




Figure 20. Beverton–Holt spawner–recruit curve (top) with and without lognormal bias correction. The expected (upper) curve was used for computing management benchmarks. Years within panel indicate year of recruitment generated from spawning biomass. Natural log of recruits (number of age-1 fish) per spawner is also plotted as function of the spawning stock (lower).




Figure 21. Probability densities of spawner-recruit quantities R_0 (unfished recruitment of age-1 fish), steepness, unfished spawners per recruit, and standard deviation of recruitment residuals in log space. Solid vertical lines represent point estimates or values from the BAM base run; dashed vertical lines represent medians from the MCBE runs ($n = 4038$).




Figure 22. Yield per recruit (top; lb GW) and spawning potential ratio (bottom; spawning biomass per recruit relative to that at the unfished level) over a range of F . Both curves are based on average selectivity from the end of the assessment period.




Figure 23. The top panels shows equilibrium landings at F . The peak occurs where fishing rate is $F_{\text{MSY}} = 0.28$ and equilibrium landings are $\text{MSY} = 542$ (1000 lb GW). The bottom panel shows equilibrium spawning biomass at F . Both curves are based on average selectivity from the end of the assessment period.




Figure 24. Probability densities of MSY-related benchmarks from MCBE analysis ($n = 4038$). Vertical lines represent point estimates from the BAM base run; dashed vertical lines represent medians from the MCBE runs.




Figure 25. Estimated time series of SSB and F relative to benchmarks: (top) spawning biomass relative to the minimum stock size threshold (MSST), (bottom) F relative to F_{MSY} . Shaded region represents 95% confidence bands from the MCBE runs ($n = 4038$).




Figure 26. Probability densities of terminal status estimates from MCBE analysis of the Beaufort Assessment Model ($n = 4038$). Vertical lines represent point estimates from the BAM base run; dashed vertical lines represent medians from the MCBE runs.




Figure 27. Phase plot of terminal status estimates from MCBE analysis of the Beaufort Assessment Model ($n = 4038$). Stock status is plotted along the vertical axis relative to MSST. The intersection of crosshairs indicates estimates from the BAM base run; lengths of crosshairs defined by 5th and 95th percentiles of MCBE runs.




Figure 28. Estimated age structure from a series of individual years during the assessment, relative to the equilibrium expected at F_{MSY} .




Figure 29. Sensitivity to low and high fixed values of natural mortality: (S1-S2). Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Sensitivity runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to MSST. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 30. Sensitivity to low and high fixed values of steepness: ($S3-S4$). Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Sensitivity runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to $MSST$. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 31. Sensitivity to higher values of F_{init} based on likelihood profiling: (S5-S6). Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Sensitivity runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to MSST. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 32. Sensitivity to downweighting ($1/10\times$) or upweighting ($10\times$) the MARMAP longline index: (S7-S8). Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Sensitivity runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to MSST. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 33. Sensitivity to using alternate recruitment estimates for years at the end of the assessment (2012-2018) where recruitment deviations were not estimated, based on geometric mean recruitment deviation from the last six years where recruitment deviations were estimated (2006-2011): (S9). Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Sensitivity runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to $MSST$. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 34. Phase plots of terminal status estimates from BAM sensitivity runs. Point colors and shapes are indicated in the legend. The number of each sensitivity run is also plotted in black text over each point. The base run is represented by a black point labeled “base”.




Figure 35. Retrospective analysis reducing the terminal year of the assessment from 2018 to values over a range from 2010 to 2017. Estimated time series of F and SSB relative to benchmarks, as well as biomass (B) and number of recruits. Solid line and solid circles indicate estimates from the BAM base run. Solid colored points in the top and bottom left panels emphasize values in the terminal year of the assessment. Solid colored points in the bottom right panel emphasize values in the last year for which recruitment deviations were estimated. Retrospective runs are indicated by colored broken lines, represented in the legend. (top left) F relative to F_{MSY} . (top right) spawning stock biomass (SSB) relative to $MSST$. (bottom left) biomass (B). (bottom right) number of recruits.




Figure 36. Plots of SSB, landings, recruits, F , and the probability that $SSB > MSST$ for projections with fishing mortality rate at fixed F that provides $P^* = 0.50$. In all panels except the bottom right, expected values (base run) represented by solid lines with solid circles, medians represented by dashed lines with open circles, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to 5th and 95th percentiles of replicate projections. Solid horizontal blue lines mark MSY-related quantities; dashed horizontal green lines represent corresponding medians. Spawning stock (SSB) is at time of peak spawning. In the bottom right panel, the curve represents the proportion of projection replicates for which SSB exceeds the replicate-specific MSST.




Figure 37. Plots of SSB, landings, recruits, F , and the probability that $SSB > MSST$ for projections with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = F_{MSY}$. In all panels except the bottom right, expected values (base run) represented by solid lines with solid circles, medians represented by dashed lines with open circles, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to 5th and 95th percentiles of replicate projections. Solid horizontal blue lines mark MSY-related quantities; dashed horizontal green lines represent corresponding medians. Spawning stock (SSB) is at time of peak spawning. In the bottom right panel, the curve represents the proportion of projection replicates for which SSB exceeds the replicate-specific MSST.




Figure 38. Plots of SSB, landings, recruits, F , and the probability that $SSB > MSST$ for projections with fishing mortality rate at fixed F that provides $P^* = 0.30$. In all panels except the bottom right, expected values (base run) represented by solid lines with solid circles, medians represented by dashed lines with open circles, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to 5th and 95th percentiles of replicate projections. Solid horizontal blue lines mark MSY-related quantities; dashed horizontal green lines represent corresponding medians. Spawning stock (SSB) is at time of peak spawning. In the bottom right panel, the curve represents the proportion of projection replicates for which SSB exceeds the replicate-specific $MSST$.





Figure 39. Plots of SSB, landings, recruits, F , and the probability that $SSB > MSST$ for projections with fishing mortality rate fixed at $F = 75\%F_{MSY}$. In all panels except the bottom right, expected values (base run) represented by solid lines with solid circles, medians represented by dashed lines with open circles, and uncertainty represented by thin lines corresponding to 5th and 95th percentiles of replicate projections. Solid horizontal blue lines mark MSY-related quantities; dashed horizontal green lines represent corresponding medians. Spawning stock (SSB) is at time of peak spawning. In the bottom right panel, the curve represents the proportion of projection replicates for which SSB exceeds the replicate-specific MSST.



Appendix A Parameter estimates from the Beaufort Assessment Model

Table 24. Names and estimated values of parameters estimated in the base run of the Beaufort Assessment Model.

ID	Parameter	Value
1	len.cv.val	0.14441000
2	log.R0	12.60700000
3	log.rec.dev.1982	-0.38936000
4	log.rec.dev.1983	-0.40476000
5	log.rec.dev.1984	-0.28260000
6	log.rec.dev.1985	-0.24648000
7	log.rec.dev.1986	0.05000900
8	log.rec.dev.1987	0.34682000
9	log.rec.dev.1988	0.26698000
10	log.rec.dev.1989	-0.06044500
11	log.rec.dev.1990	-0.10842000
12	log.rec.dev.1991	0.16541000
13	log.rec.dev.1992	0.15278000
14	log.rec.dev.1993	0.18106000
15	log.rec.dev.1994	0.04223000
16	log.rec.dev.1995	-0.22132000
17	log.rec.dev.1996	-0.28705000
18	log.rec.dev.1997	-0.02854400
19	log.rec.dev.1998	0.45280000
20	log.rec.dev.1999	0.36904000
21	log.rec.dev.2000	0.14796000
22	log.rec.dev.2001	0.26135000
23	log.rec.dev.2002	0.32568000
24	log.rec.dev.2003	0.20403000
25	log.rec.dev.2004	0.11189000
26	log.rec.dev.2005	-0.01748900
27	log.rec.dev.2006	-0.10701000
28	log.rec.dev.2007	-0.33430000
29	log.rec.dev.2008	-0.15908000
30	log.rec.dev.2009	-0.10596000
31	log.rec.dev.2010	-0.21213000
32	log.rec.dev.2011	-0.11307000
33	log.dm.lenc.rA	2.94030000
34	log.dm.agec.cH	3.83860000
35	log.dm.agec.cL	4.31710000
36	log.dm.agec.sM	2.93040000
37	selpar.L50.cH	5.51070000
38	selpar.L50.cH2	5.83530000
39	selpar.slope.cH	1.61700000
40	selpar.slope.cH2	1.25100000

Table 24. (continued)

ID	Parameter	Value
41	selpar.L50.cL	6.94920000
42	selpar.L50.cL2	8.08380000
43	selpar.slope.cL	1.62370000
44	selpar.slope.cL2	1.27730000
45	selpar.L50.rA	3.57120000
46	selpar.slope.rA	5.13210000
47	selpar.L50.sM	6.20940000
48	selpar.slope.sM	1.31460000
49	log.q.cpue.cL	-7.46150000
50	log.q.cpue.sM	-7.92540000
51	log.avg.F.L.cH	-4.70400000
52	log.F.dev.L.cH.1972	-5.50010000
53	log.F.dev.L.cH.1973	-3.81110000
54	log.F.dev.L.cH.1974	-2.92950000
55	log.F.dev.L.cH.1975	-2.39250000
56	log.F.dev.L.cH.1976	-2.34300000
57	log.F.dev.L.cH.1977	-2.40910000
58	log.F.dev.L.cH.1978	-1.44950000
59	log.F.dev.L.cH.1979	-1.77750000
60	log.F.dev.L.cH.1980	-0.67571000
61	log.F.dev.L.cH.1981	0.25885000
62	log.F.dev.L.cH.1982	1.20800000
63	log.F.dev.L.cH.1983	0.56220000
64	log.F.dev.L.cH.1984	0.35358000
65	log.F.dev.L.cH.1985	0.40451000
66	log.F.dev.L.cH.1986	0.47575000
67	log.F.dev.L.cH.1987	-0.52679000
68	log.F.dev.L.cH.1988	-0.02212600
69	log.F.dev.L.cH.1989	0.50996000
70	log.F.dev.L.cH.1990	0.63849000
71	log.F.dev.L.cH.1991	0.76760000
72	log.F.dev.L.cH.1992	0.77101000
73	log.F.dev.L.cH.1993	-0.45375000
74	log.F.dev.L.cH.1994	1.73530000
75	log.F.dev.L.cH.1995	1.60930000
76	log.F.dev.L.cH.1996	0.84950000
77	log.F.dev.L.cH.1997	0.84724000
78	log.F.dev.L.cH.1998	0.58605000
79	log.F.dev.L.cH.1999	0.34644000
80	log.F.dev.L.cH.2000	0.78951000

Table 24. (continued)

ID	Parameter	Value
81	log.F.dev.L.cH.2001	1.94180000
82	log.F.dev.L.cH.2002	1.91280000
83	log.F.dev.L.cH.2003	1.24540000
84	log.F.dev.L.cH.2004	0.47078000
85	log.F.dev.L.cH.2005	0.32151000
86	log.F.dev.L.cH.2006	0.29617000
87	log.F.dev.L.cH.2007	0.26817000
88	log.F.dev.L.cH.2008	-0.45273000
89	log.F.dev.L.cH.2009	-0.88189000
90	log.F.dev.L.cH.2010	-0.27916000
91	log.F.dev.L.cH.2011	-1.17520000
92	log.F.dev.L.cH.2012	0.50642000
93	log.F.dev.L.cH.2013	0.34997000
94	log.F.dev.L.cH.2014	1.54430000
95	log.F.dev.L.cH.2015	1.65640000
96	log.F.dev.L.cH.2016	1.48390000
97	log.F.dev.L.cH.2017	1.55410000
98	log.F.dev.L.cH.2018	0.81445000
99	log.avg.F.L.cL	-2.32940000
100	log.F.dev.L.cL.1972	-5.31020000
101	log.F.dev.L.cL.1973	-3.62170000
102	log.F.dev.L.cL.1974	-2.74050000
103	log.F.dev.L.cL.1975	-2.21060000
104	log.F.dev.L.cL.1976	-2.19920000
105	log.F.dev.L.cL.1977	-3.17010000
106	log.F.dev.L.cL.1978	-2.85400000
107	log.F.dev.L.cL.1979	-2.43200000
108	log.F.dev.L.cL.1980	-1.87280000
109	log.F.dev.L.cL.1981	-0.29245000
110	log.F.dev.L.cL.1982	1.23870000
111	log.F.dev.L.cL.1983	0.95924000
112	log.F.dev.L.cL.1984	0.72723000
113	log.F.dev.L.cL.1985	0.79153000
114	log.F.dev.L.cL.1986	1.03820000
115	log.F.dev.L.cL.1987	-0.23744000
116	log.F.dev.L.cL.1988	0.31953000
117	log.F.dev.L.cL.1989	0.88325000
118	log.F.dev.L.cL.1990	1.06310000
119	log.F.dev.L.cL.1991	1.24100000
120	log.F.dev.L.cL.1992	1.51520000

Table 24. (continued)

ID	Parameter	Value
121	log.F.dev.L.cL.1993	1.77900000
122	log.F.dev.L.cL.1994	1.58580000
123	log.F.dev.L.cL.1995	1.54610000
124	log.F.dev.L.cL.1996	0.84870000
125	log.F.dev.L.cL.1997	0.79728000
126	log.F.dev.L.cL.1998	0.69877000
127	log.F.dev.L.cL.1999	1.01490000
128	log.F.dev.L.cL.2000	1.42620000
129	log.F.dev.L.cL.2001	0.54135000
130	log.F.dev.L.cL.2002	0.35306000
131	log.F.dev.L.cL.2003	-0.13590000
132	log.F.dev.L.cL.2004	0.15674000
133	log.F.dev.L.cL.2005	0.00553350
134	log.F.dev.L.cL.2006	0.41188000
135	log.F.dev.L.cL.2007	-0.03110000
136	log.F.dev.L.cL.2008	-0.00033554
137	log.F.dev.L.cL.2009	0.23452000
138	log.F.dev.L.cL.2010	0.27536000
139	log.F.dev.L.cL.2011	0.28003000
140	log.F.dev.L.cL.2012	0.56792000
141	log.F.dev.L.cL.2013	0.70544000
142	log.F.dev.L.cL.2014	0.95314000
143	log.F.dev.L.cL.2015	0.70645000
144	log.F.dev.L.cL.2016	0.87214000
145	log.F.dev.L.cL.2017	1.08200000
146	log.F.dev.L.cL.2018	0.48918000
147	log.avg.F.L.rA	-5.99040000
148	log.F.dev.L.rA.1981	3.38710000
149	log.F.dev.L.rA.1982	-4.50650000
150	log.F.dev.L.rA.1983	-2.31540000
151	log.F.dev.L.rA.1984	0.79321000
152	log.F.dev.L.rA.1985	2.57830000
153	log.F.dev.L.rA.1986	-3.78340000
154	log.F.dev.L.rA.1987	0.15776000
155	log.F.dev.L.rA.1988	-1.59700000
156	log.F.dev.L.rA.1989	-3.73100000
157	log.F.dev.L.rA.1990	-1.59220000
158	log.F.dev.L.rA.1991	-2.70240000
159	log.F.dev.L.rA.1992	0.56216000
160	log.F.dev.L.rA.1993	-3.40440000

Table 24. (continued)

ID	Parameter	Value
161	log.F.dev.L.rA.1994	0.30135000
162	log.F.dev.L.rA.1995	-3.25650000
163	log.F.dev.L.rA.1996	-0.08031800
164	log.F.dev.L.rA.1997	2.09580000
165	log.F.dev.L.rA.1998	-1.49160000
166	log.F.dev.L.rA.1999	-0.27035000
167	log.F.dev.L.rA.2000	0.73509000
168	log.F.dev.L.rA.2001	1.01900000
169	log.F.dev.L.rA.2002	0.51575000
170	log.F.dev.L.rA.2003	1.37600000
171	log.F.dev.L.rA.2004	1.08500000
172	log.F.dev.L.rA.2005	2.54340000
173	log.F.dev.L.rA.2006	1.01810000
174	log.F.dev.L.rA.2007	-0.28082000
175	log.F.dev.L.rA.2008	-3.74450000
176	log.F.dev.L.rA.2009	2.39360000
177	log.F.dev.L.rA.2010	1.71730000
178	log.F.dev.L.rA.2011	1.55140000
179	log.F.dev.L.rA.2012	0.95554000
180	log.F.dev.L.rA.2013	0.62779000
181	log.F.dev.L.rA.2014	0.80979000
182	log.F.dev.L.rA.2015	1.90980000
183	log.F.dev.L.rA.2016	2.10450000
184	log.F.dev.L.rA.2017	0.76930000
185	log.F.dev.L.rA.2018	1.74940000

Appendix B Abbreviations and Symbols

Table 25. Acronyms and abbreviations used in this report

Symbol	Meaning
ABC	Acceptable Biological Catch
AW	Assessment Workshop (here, for tilefish)
ASY	Average Sustainable Yield
B	Total biomass of stock, conventionally on January 1
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 tilefish)
F	Instantaneous rate of fishing mortality
F_{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
MCBE	Monte Carlo/Bootstrap Ensemble, an approach to quantifying uncertainty in model results
MFMT	Maximum fishing-mortality threshold; a limit reference point used in U.S. fishery management; often based on F_{MSY}
mm	Millimeter(s); 1 inch = 25.4 mm
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, a data-collection program of NMFS, predecessor of MRIP
MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program, a data-collection program of NMFS, descended from MRFSS
MSST	Minimum stock-size threshold; a limit reference point used in U.S. fishery management. The SAFMC has defined MSST for tilefish as $(1 - M)\text{SSB}_{\text{MSY}} = 0.7\text{SSB}_{\text{MSY}}$.
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 $\text{OY} \leq \text{MSY}$.
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
SDNR	Standard deviation of normalized residuals
SEDAR	SouthEast Data Assessment and Review process
SEFIS	SouthEast Fishery-Independent Survey
SERFS	SouthEast Reef Fish Survey
SFA	Sustainable Fisheries Act; the Magnuson–Stevens Act, as amended
SL	Standard length (of a fish)
SPR	Spawning potential ratio
SSB	Spawning stock biomass; mature biomass of males and females
SSB_{MSY}	Level of SSB at which MSY can be attained
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)