Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 09-08

The 2008 Assessment of Atlantic Halibut in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Region

by Laurel A. Col and Christopher M. Legault

Northeast Fisheries Science Center, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Fisheries Science Center
Woods Hole, Massachusetts

April 2009

Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Documents

This series is a secondary scientific series designed to assure the long-term documentation and to enable the timely transmission of research results by Center and/or non-Center researchers, where such results bear upon the research mission of the Center (see the outside back cover for the mission statement). These documents receive internal scientific review, and most receive copy editing. The National Marine Fisheries Service does not endorse any proprietary material, process, or product mentioned in these documents.

All documents issued in this series since April 2001, and several documents issued prior to that date, have been copublished in both paper and electronic versions. To access the electronic version of a document in this series, go to *http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/*. The electronic version is available in PDF format to permit printing of a paper copy directly from the Internet. If you do not have Internet access, or if a desired document is one of the pre-April 2001 documents available only in the paper version, you can obtain a paper copy by contacting the senior Center author of the desired document. Refer to the title page of the document for the senior Center author's name and mailing address. If there is no Center author, or if there is corporate (*i.e.*, non-individualized) authorship, then contact the Center's Woods Hole Laboratory Library (166 Water St., Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026).

This document's publication history is as follows: manuscript submitted for review February 27, 2009; manuscript accepted through technical review May 6, 2009; manuscript accepted through policy review May 6, 2009; and final copy submitted for publication May 14, 2009. Pursuant to section 515 of Public Law 106-554 (the Information Quality Act), this information product has undergone a pre-dissemination review by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, completed on May 6, 2009. The signed pre-dissemination review and documentation is on file at the NEFSC Editorial Office. This document may be cited as:

Col LA, Legault CM. 2009. The 2008 Assessment of Atlantic Halibut in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Region. US Dept Commer, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 09-08; 39 p. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026, or online at http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT v
INTRODUCTION 1
THE FISHERY 2
RESEARCH SURVEYS 2
YIELD PER RECRUIT 3
REPLACEMENT YIELD MODEL 5
Replacement Yield Model Results 6
Sensitivity Analyses for Replacement Yield Model 6
BIOLOGICAL REFERENCE POINTS 7
Depletion-Adjusted Average Catch 8
STOCK STATUS 9
REBUILDING PROJECTIONS 9
$F_{rebuild}$ 9
2009 Catch Estimates 10
SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY 10
Model Uncertainty 10
Minimum Size Regulations 10
Transboundary Movement 11
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 11
REFERENCES 12

List of Tables

Table 1. Reported catch of Atlantic halibut from the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank, 1893-2007 14
Table 2. Atlantic halibut United States discards based on Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology combined ratio estimation (1989-2007) 15
Table 3. Atlantic halibut stratified mean weight and numbers per tow from NEFSC spring and autumn surveys and 5-year average swept-area biomass estimates 16
Table 4. Input data for Atlantic halibut yield per recruit analysis. 17
Table 5. Mean and minimum sizes of Atlantic halibut discarded and landed from Northeast Fisheries Observer Program data. 18
Table 6. Atlantic halibut catch and resulting biomass, replacement yield, and relative F from the Replacement Yield Model. Note that reported landings began in 1893, and 1800-1892 catch is assumed to be a linear increase. 19
Table 7. Residuals of NEFSC survey swept-area biomass indices to estimated swept-area biomass indices from the Replacement Yield Model. 21
Table 8. Projected catch and biomass for Atlantic halibut under three relative F scenarios in 2009, assuming catch in 2008 equals catch in 2007. 22

List of Figures

Figure 1. Statistical areas used to define United States commercial fishing catch for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region of the Atlantic halibut stock. 23
Figure 2. Atlantic halibut total catch (mt) from the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region, 1893-2007..... 24
Figure 3. Trends in Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass indices from Northeast Fisheries Science Center autumn bottom trawl surveys and previous index-based assessment reference points. 24
Figure 4. Atlantic halibut total catch (mt) by country, 1950-2007..... 25
Figure 5. Distribution of Atlantic halibut from Northeast Fisheries Science Center autumn surveys (1963-2007) used to calculate the survey biomass time series..... 26
Figure 6. Total numbers of Atlantic halibut caught annually in Northeast Fisheries Science Center spring and autumn surveys. 27
Figure 7. Northeast Fisheries Science Center spring and autumn survey trends for Atlantic halibut weight per tow indices and 5-year average swept-area biomass and number per tow indices and 5-year average number per tow from the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region, 1963-2008..... 28
Figure 8. Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass verses eastern Gulf of Maine spring bottom temperature anomalies (1968-2005). 29
Figure 9. Female Atlantic halibut length-weight relationship..... 29
Figure 10. Von Bertalanffy growth for female Atlantic halibut. 30
Figure 11. Maturity ogive for female Atlantic halibut based on Sigourney et al. (2006)..... 30
Figure 12. Yield per recruit and spawning stock biomass per recruit for Atlantic halibut..... 31
Figure 13. Atlantic halibut biomass and ½ B_{MSY} proxy from the Replacement Yield Model..... 31
Figure 14. Atlantic halibut relative fishing mortality from the Replacement Yield Model 32
Figure 15. Atlantic halibut replacement yield from the Replacement Yield Model..... 32
Figure 16. Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass estimates from the NEFSC autumn survey and predicted survey indices from the Replacement Yield Model and log Z-score residuals 33
Figure 17. Replacement Yield Model sensitivity analyses testing parabolic versus linear increase in catch prior to 1893 and varying natural mortality rates..... 34
Figure 18. Alternative Maximum Sustainable Yield estimates based on Depletion-Corrected Average Catch using F_{MSY}/ M ratio = 0.487 from Replacement Yield Model and using F_{MSY}/ M = 1 from DCAC default. 35
Figure 19. Status plot for Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut. 36
Figure 22. Minimum distance traveled of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing). 38
Figure 23. Days at large of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing). 38
Figure 24. Days at large v. distance traveled of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing). 39

ABSTRACT

Atlantic halibut were fished heavily during the mid-1800s to early 1900s, and due to current low population sizes there are minimal data on halibut in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region. Previous assessments have relied on Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) autumn bottom trawl indices to provide relative measures of population abundance (NEFSC 2001; Brodziak 2002; Brodziak and Col 2005). However, during the 2008 Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM) (NEFSC 2008), a simple production model, termed Replacement Yield Model here, was accepted as an appropriate method to assess Atlantic halibut. The fishing mortality reference point proxy (0.073) from the re-estimated yield per recruit analysis was used to inform the intrinsic rate of growth for the Replacement Yield Model, and the model was tuned to the NEFSC autumn survey swept-area biomass index. The resulting fishing mortality (0.065) was slightly below the FMSY proxy, indicating that overfishing is not occurring for Atlantic halibut. On the other hand, the resulting biomass (1300 mt) from the Replacement Yield Model was well below both the BMSY proxy (49000 mt) and ½ BMSY proxy (24000 mt), indicating that Atlantic halibut continues to be in an overfished condition.

Although there is a great deal of uncertainty associated with using a simple production model like the Replacement Yield Model, all of the available data for Atlantic halibut were incorporated, and the model was accepted as the best available science at the time of the 2008 GARM meeting (NEFSC 2008). The Replacement Yield Model utilized the extensive time series of commercial halibut catch without requiring the use of age data or survey indices that matched the full time series of the commercial fishery data set. This was particularly useful for Atlantic halibut where the early years of catch data provide information on the potential maximum biomass levels whereas the NEFSC survey time series started roughly 80 years after the collapse of the commercial halibut fishery. The Replacement Yield Model provides annual estimates of relative F, biomass, and replacement yield in addition to revised biomass reference points, enabling overfishing status to be determined for the first time.

Two major considerations for Atlantic halibut are minimum size regulations and transboundary movements. A growth and maturity study by Sigourney et al. (2006) estimated the L50 for females to be 103 cm which is well above the current minimum size limit (91 cm). An increase in the minimum size limit may increase the survival of halibut to spawning size, however greater compliance with minimum size regulations would need to occur for the benefits to be realized. Additional information from recent Atlantic halibut longline tagging studies (Kanwit 2007) has indicated transboundary movement rates of 33% from US to Canadian waters. This indicates that in the future, Atlantic halibut should be assessed as a transboundary US/Canadian stock, and that further work should be conducted to clarify stock boundaries.

INTRODUCTION

Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) is the largest species of flatfish in the northwest Atlantic Ocean. It is a long-lived, late-maturing species distributed from Labrador to southern New England (Bigelow and Schroeder 1953). Atlantic halibut within the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region (NAFO Divisions 5Y and 5Z, Figure 1) have been exploited since the early 1800s, with major abundance declines noted as early as the 1870s (Goode 1884, Hennemuth and Rockwell 1987, Grasso 2008). Grasso (2008) provides a comprehensive summary of the historical fishery, and explains that prior to 1836, halibut were incredibly abundant and were largely discarded due to the meat being poor for salting. During this time halibut were considered to be an unpalatable species, a substantial inconvenience and even a danger to cod fishermen using small dories, and a voracious predator of the cod that they targeted. A small market occurred for halibut fins prior to the 1830s, which gradually became a delicacy as cod declined. During the late 1830s-1840s improvements in icing techniques and refrigeration technology led to many fleets converting from salt to ice to preserve catch, and halibut was found to be ideal for preserving on ice. This, along with a cultural shift of preferring fresh to salted fish led to the height of the halibut fishery during the 1840s to 1870s. The height was quickly followed by a series of local depletions. This was due to general overfishing as well as recruitment overfishing since small halibut were heavily targeted, and halibut reach marketable sizes well before they reach maturity. During the 1880s halibut was considered to be commercially extinct as populations had declined to low levels from southern New England north to Greenland. Halibut suffered further declines during the 1930s due to their susceptibility to trawl gear at young ages (Figure 2). It was not until 1999 that halibut were specifically managed under the Northeast Multispecies Fisheries Management Plan (Amendment 9) which limited the landing of Atlantic halibut in Federal waters to one halibut per trip, with a minimum size limit of 91 cm.

In previous index-based assessments (NEFSC 2001; Brodziak 2002, Brodziak and Col 2005), Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) autumn weight per tow survey indices were expanded to swept-area biomass estimates, and the 5-year average biomass index was compared to B_{MSY} proxy reference points for status determination (Figure 3). Reference points for Atlantic halibut were originally determined by the New England Fisheries Management Council (Applegate et al. 1998) using Canadian Atlantic halibut length-weight equations (McCracken 1958) and von Bertalanffy growth curves (Nielson and Bowering 1989) to perform yield per recruit (YPR) and biomass per recruit analyses. Natural mortality was assumed to be 0.1, and a Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) proxy was chosen to be 300 mt, yielding a B_{MSY} proxy = 5400 mt, a ½ B_{MSY} proxy = 2700 mt, and an F_{MSY} proxy (threshold) = $F_{0.1}$ = 0.06. Based on the Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM) 2005 assessment of Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut, the stock was overfished (B_{2004} was 5% of B_{MSY} proxy) and it was unknown whether overfishing was occurring (Brodziak and Col 2005).

In the Atlantic halibut assessment presented here, NEFSC survey and commercial fishery data were updated through 2007 and estimates of discards from the United States (US) commercial fishery were included in total catch estimates to reflect the GARM Data Meeting recommendations. Reference points were re-evaluated by updating YPR analyses using recent estimates of growth (Sigourney 2002) and maturity parameters (Sigourney et al. 2006). The resulting F_{MSY} proxy was used to define the intrinsic rate of growth in a Replacement Yield Model as recommended by the GARM Biological Reference Points meeting panel (O'Boyle

2008b). The Replacement Yield Model incorporates the entire time series of catch data, tunes to the autumn survey swept-area biomass index, and results in B_{MSY} and MSY proxy reference points, as well as annual estimates of biomass and relative fishing mortality.

THE FISHERY

Consistent records of Atlantic halibut landings from the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region (Statistical Areas 511-515, 521-522, 525-526, 561-562) began in 1893 (ICNAF 1952, Table 1, Figure 2). Current US landings were extracted from the NEFSC commercial fisheries database (CFDBS) AA tables, and current Canadian landings (Division 5Zc) were extracted from the NAFO 21A database[1]. Historical distant water fleet landings are also included from 1962-1974 (Table 1). Landings have continued to decrease since the 1890s as components of the resource have been sequentially depleted. Annual landings averaged 663 mt between 1893 and 1940, declined to an average of 144 mt during 1941-1976, and declined further to an average of 91 mt during 1977-2000 (Table 1, Figure 2). Total reported commercial landings of halibut increased somewhat from record lows of 17-20 mt during 1998-2000 to 52 mt in 2007. Of the 2007 landings, 22 mt (42%) were landed by US fishermen and 30 mt (58%) were landed by Canadian fishermen (Table 1, Figure 4).

US discards from the Northeast Fisheries Observer Program database were estimated for the period 1989 to 2007 based on the Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology combined ratio estimation (Wigley et al. 2007). The 1999 implementation of a one halibut per trip limit as well as a 91 cm minimum retention size increased the discard to kept ratio from 17% during 1989-1998 to 147% during 1999-2007 (Table 2, Figure 4). Due to the low occurrence of Atlantic halibut in the observer database, the 1989-1998 average discard ratio was applied to the landings from 1893 to 1998 and the 1999-2007 average discard ratio was applied to landings in those years (Table 1, Figure 2). Discards were not estimated by gear due to low encounter rates and high variability, however it should be noted that primary gear types for halibut landings have changed over time. Including US discards, total catch increased from 18 mt in 1998 to 84 mt in 2007 (Table 1, Figure 4). Canadian discard estimates were not available.

RESEARCH SURVEYS

The NEFSC spring and autumn bottom trawl surveys provide measures of relative abundance of Atlantic halibut within the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region (offshore survey strata 13-30 and 36-40, Table 3, Figure 5). Both indices have high interannual variability since the surveys capture low numbers of halibut, and in some years there are no halibut caught (Figure 6), indicating that halibut abundance is close to being below the detectability levels of the surveys. The autumn survey biomass and abundance indices show little contrast or trend (Figures 7a and b), whereas the spring survey biomass and abundance indices (Figures 7a and b) suggest a relative increase during the late 1970s to early 1980s, a decline during the 1990s, and an increase since the late 1990s. It is unknown whether these trends in survey indices for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region have been influenced by changes in the seasonal distribution and availability of Atlantic halibut. There is some evidence of environmental

[1] http://www.nafo.int/science/frames/research.html

forcing in the spring survey indicated by a negative correlation with spring bottom water temperature anomalies (Figure 8). However, the differences in trends between the two surveys also likely reflect the high variability due to low encounter rates of halibut in the NEFSC surveys.

Due to the lack of alternative population estimates, the expansion of autumn survey indices to swept-area biomass has been used to estimate Atlantic halibut biomass and compared to previous MSY reference points for status determination in previous assessments (Figure 3). Relying entirely on surveys for stock status determination is not ideal for most species. However, this method is particularly problematic for Atlantic halibut since the NEFSC autumn bottom trawl survey started roughly 80 years after the fishery collapsed, and encounter rates of halibut in consistently sampled survey strata are very low (Figures 5 and 6). In previous assessments a survey catchability coefficient of one was assumed for swept-area biomass estimates, which is likely high. There have also been changes in doors, nets and vessels throughout the time series which may affect catchability of Atlantic halibut over the time series. Since the surveys encounter so few halibut, conversion factors have not been estimable. The inability to calculate conversion factors for halibut will become a much greater problem in 2009 when the NEFSC survey will change to the R/V *Henry Bigelow*, which is likely to have vastly different catchabilities than the R/V *Albatross IV* or *Delaware II* for most species.

YIELD PER RECRUIT

Currently the NEFSC does not age Atlantic halibut samples from either the commercial fishery or NEFSC bottom trawl surveys. Fortunately age samples from the experimental halibut lonline fishery (Kanwit 2007) and NEFSC spring and autumn bottom trawl surveys through 2000 have been aged for growth analyses (Sigourney 2002), and maturity analyses (Sigourney et al. 2006). This information was used along with NEFSC length and weight data to update yield per recruit (YPR) analyses for Atlantic halibut.

Combined years (1992-2007) of NEFSC spring and autumn length and weight data over all strata were used to estimate length-weight parameters:

$$W = \alpha L\beta$$

where:
α was estimated to be 0.00415 (using cm and grams) and
β was estimated to be 3.23040.

This length-weight relationship was very similar to the McCracken (1958) equation used for previous Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut reference point determinations (Applegate et al. 1998, Figure 9). A von Bertalanffy growth equation was used to estimate length at age by sex for aged Atlantic halibut from NEFSC surveys and the halibut experimental longline fishery (Sigourney 2002). The growth equation resulted in somewhat larger halibut at age than the previously used Nielson and Bowering (1989) equation, and confidence intervals reflect high uncertainty in the estimates (Figure 10). However, this was considered to be the best available information for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region by the August, 2008 GARM

review panel (NEFSC 2008), and the length-weight equation was applied to the female lengths at age to determine weight-at-age inputs for YPR analyses (Table 4).

Maturity percentiles at age from Sigourney et al. (2006) were used to calculate a maturity ogive for female halibut (Figure 11):

$$S(a) = (1+e(-\alpha - \beta a))-1$$

where:
a is age,
β is a parameter assumed to be equal to (2ln3)/(L75-L25), estimated to be 0.518, and
α is a parameter assumed to be equal to $-\beta L50$, estimated to be -3.778.

The resulting maturity at age and weight at age were used in YPR analyses with a plus group for ages 41 to 50 (Table 4, Figure 12). Sigourney et al. (2006) recorded halibut from the recent NEFSC survey time series up to age 40, and it is likely that larger halibut landed in the earlier part of the fishery time series were at least 50 years of age. No estimates of natural mortality rates for Atlantic halibut or Greenland halibut are included in previous assessments (Brodziak and Col 2005, DFO 2006, DFO 2007, DFO 2008). Pacific halibut have similar growth patterns and maximum age, and in recent reports, M was estimated to be 0.15 for Pacific halibut based on catch curve analysis and energetic models of growth and reproduction (Clark and Hare 2006). Therefore M was assumed to be 0.15 for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut, however it should be cautioned that this estimate is somewhat higher than using maximum age as a proxy to estimate M (for –ln(0.05)/(max age of 50), M ~ 0.06).

As in the previous reference point determination (Applegate et al. 1998) a knife-edge selectivity at age 4 (~60cm and 2.4kg) was used for YPR analyses. Since Amendment 9 was implemented in 1999, regulations have prohibited landing halibut less than 91cm. However there is evidence from Northeast Fisheries Observer Program data that smaller halibut are continuing to be landed (Table 5). Kept halibut from observer data indicate that even after implementation, mean lengths of kept halibut generally ranged from 80-90cm (~ages 5.5-6.5), with minimum sizes of kept halibut generally ranging from 40-50cm (~ages 2.5-3.5, Table 5). Discarded halibut mean lengths have ranged from 27-70cm (~ages 2-5), with minimum discard lengths generally ranging from 20-40cm (~ages 1-3, Table 5). Survival of Atlantic halibut discarded from longline gear is estimated to be 77% whereas survival of discards from otter trawl gear was estimated to be substantially lower at 35% (Neilson et al. 1989). Thus, selectivity of Atlantic halibut likely starts around age 2 (30cm) for bottom trawl gear, which corresponds to the size selectivity of other flatfish (NEFSC 2008), whereas selectivity from longline gear likely occurs at older ages around 6-7 years. This disparity in gear selectivity should be researched further, however with limited data to compare the NEFSC survey Yankee 36 otter trawl gear to commercial fishing gear, age 4 was chosen as a reasonable midpoint for knife-edged selectivity (Table 4, Figure 12). NFT YPR version 2.7.22 was used to perform the YPR analysis, which resulted in an F0.1 of 0.073. This is slightly higher than the previous F0.1 of 0.06, using M = 0.1 (Applegate et al. 1998).

[2] http://nft.nefsc.noaa.gov/YPR.html NOAA Fisheries Toolbox Version 3.0, 2008. Age Based Yield per Recruit Version 2.7.2

REPLACEMENT YIELD MODEL

Available models are limited for data poor species such as Atlantic halibut. An age-structured production model as described in Brandao and Butterworth (2008b) was not considered to be a reasonable approach given the lack of available data (O'Boyle 2008a). A simplistic LOSS model without constraining the intrinsic rate of growth to YPR output or tuning to survey catchability yielded a wide range of results with little information on which to inform model selection. By using $F_{0.1}$ to inform the intrinsic rate of growth in a Replacement Yield Model, and penalizing results that differed greatly from an assumed NEFSC autumn survey catchability, model results were considered to be more reliably estimated. This approach also incorporated the most available data for Atlantic halibut and was recommended by the GARM Biological Reference Points review panel (O'Boyle 2008b). Therefore, the resulting F_{MSY} proxy ($F_{0.1}$) from the YPR analysis was used to inform the intrinsic rate of growth (defined as $2*F_{0.1}$ or 0.146) for the Replacement Yield Model. Since Atlantic halibut catch predates reliable landings statistics beginning in 1893 (ICNAF 1953, Grasso 2008), a linear increase in catch was assumed from 1800-1893 following the advice of the August, 2008 GARM review panel (NEFSC 2008, Table 6). Although this estimate is crude, it was considered preferable to assuming that 1893 biomass was representative of an unfished population and thus equal to carrying capacity.

A Replacement Yield Model similar to that described in Brandao and Butterworth (2008a) was used to provide annual estimates of biomass, replacement yield and fishing mortality. In this model, estimated biomass is defined as:

$$B_y = B_{y-1} + R_{y-1} - C_{y-1}$$

where:
B_y is the biomass at the start of year y,
B_{y-1} is the biomass at the start of the previous year,
R_{y-1} is the replacement yield in the previous year, and
C_{y-1} is the total catch in the previous year.

Replacement yield is defined as:

$$R_y = rB_y (1- B_y /K)$$

where:
r is the intrinsic rate of growth, and
K is the carrying capacity (assumed to be equal to the model estimated biomass in 1800).

The model was fitted to the NEFSC autumn survey swept-area biomass index, and the following negative log-likelihood (-ln*L*) was used to determine the model with the best estimates of carrying capacity and predicted survey catchability coefficient parameters:

$$-\ln L = \log(\delta) + 0.5\sum(\ln(I_y)-\ln(B_y q))^2/\delta^2 + p_1 + p_2$$

where:
δ is a constant,
I_y is the swept-area biomass index in year y,

q is the catchability of the NEFSC fall survey defined as the exponent of the average of $\ln(I_y)-\ln(B_y)$,
p_1 is the sum of the penalties for biomass going to the defined minimum boundary in a given year, and
p_2 is a penalty for the difference between the model-estimated q and the assumption that the NEFSC autumn survey q is 0.5

Replacement Yield Model Results

The estimated biomass for the Replacement Yield Model indicated a sharp decline from around 4,000-5,000 mt during the early 1900s to around 1,000 mt during the mid-1900s. Atlantic halibut hit record low biomass levels of less than 500 mt during the 1990s and has since increased to 1,300 mt in 2007 (Table 6, Figure 13). Relative F (catch/biomass) has been highly variable with spikes close to 0.7 in the late 1800s, and around 0.4 in 1940 and 1967. However, relative F has been comparatively low since the mid-1990s, with a slight increase to 0.065 in 2007 (Table 6, Figure 14). Replacement yield decreased sharply in the 1870s to a low of 500 mt in 1900, increased slightly to 700 mt around 1920, gradually decreased to 60 mt in the early 1990s, and is currently close to 190 mt (Table 6, Figure 15).

For the Replacement Yield Model, only the most recent 45 years can be included for residual pattern analyses, where survey swept-area biomass estimates are available. The predicted survey index from the Replacement Yield Model is fairly flat compared to the noisy NEFSC survey index (Figure 16a). The residuals for the Replacement Yield Model (Table 7, Figure 16b) indicate that there was minor patterning in the residuals, with the Replacement Yield Model slightly overestimating biomass during the mid-1960s and greatly underestimating biomass in some other years due to the high variability in the autumn survey index. However there are no periods of consistently strong residual patterns.

Sensitivity Analyses for Replacement Yield Model

Two sensitivity analyses were run for the Replacement Yield Model based on panel recommendations from the GARM Biological Reference Points meeting (O'Boyle 2008b). The first was to test using a parabolic increase of catch instead of a linear increase to represent 1800-1892 catch in the Replacement Yield Model. The resulting biomass estimates were essentially identical using either method, indicating that the Replacement Yield Model was not highly sensitive to the method of estimating historic catch (Figure 17a).

The second sensitivity recommended by the review panel (O'Boyle 2008b) was to test various natural mortality rates for Atlantic halibut in the Replacement Yield Model based on published values from halibut assessments in other regions. No alternative natural mortality rates were available from published assessments. However, three natural mortality rates were tested in the YPR analyses to generate three $F_{0.1}$ estimates used to determine the intrinsic growth rates in Replacement Yield Models. The natural mortality estimate of 0.15 was the preferred M since this was based on current Pacific halibut estimates (Clark and Hare 2006), resulting in $F_{0.1}$ = 0.073. A natural mortality estimate of 0.10 was tested since this was used in the previous YPR analysis for Atlantic halibut (Applegate et al. 1998), resulting in $F_{0.1}$ = 0.053. However, it should be noted that the natural mortality used for the 1998 YPR analysis was simply based on Pacific halibut assessments at that time (Applegate et al. 1998). Finally, a natural mortality estimate of 0.08 was tested based on a maximum age of 40 years, resulting in $F_{0.1}$ = 0.046. F_{MSY} proxies based on YPR analyses with alternative estimates of M are presented below with the resulting

biomass reference points, Maximum Sustainable Yield, current relative fishing mortality, and current biomass estimates from the Replacement Yield Model.

Replacement Yield Model Reference Points (M=0.15 based on Pacific halibut):

	Threshold	Target	Current Estimate	% Threshold	MSY
Fishing mortality	0.073		0.065	89%	3,500 mt
Stock biomass	24,000 mt	49,000 mt	1,300 mt	5%	

Replacement Yield Model Reference Points (M=0.10 based on 1998 YPR):

	Threshold	Target	Current Estimate	% Threshold	MSY
Fishing mortality	0.053		0.038	72%	3,200 mt
Stock biomass	30,000 mt	60,000 mt	1,800 mt	6%	

Replacement Yield Model Reference Points (M=0.08 based on maximum age of 40):

	Threshold	Target	Current Estimate	% Threshold	MSY
Fishing mortality	0.046		0.043	93%	3,000 mt
Stock biomass	32,000 mt	65,000 mt	2,000 mt	6%	

As natural mortality rates decreased, resulting biomass from the Replacement Yield Model increased (Figure 17b). The reference point tables above indicate that biomass reference points from Replacement Yield Models also increased with decreasing natural mortality rates. Although initially counter-intuitive, this was due to defining the intrinsic rate of growth in the Replacement Yield Model as being $2*F_{MSY}$ proxy from the YPR analysis. As the intrinsic growth rate decreased with M, carrying capacity (estimated biomass in 1800) and thus biomass reference points had to be increased in the Replacement Yield Model in order to keep biomass from decreasing to zero over the time series of the catch. Since biomass reference points increased proportionally with biomass, all sensitivity runs for natural mortality rates resulted in current biomass levels of 5-6% of ½ B_{MSY} proxies. Therefore, the review panel (NEFSC 2008) concluded that the natural mortality estimate essentially was a scaling mechanism, and in relation to biomass reference points, was not highly influential on the assessment results.

BIOLOGICAL REFERENCE POINTS

The review panel (NEFSC 2008) concluded that the fishing mortality reference point based on M = 0.15 for YPR analyses was most appropriate since the Pacific halibut assessment is the only halibut assessment that assumes a natural mortality rate based on empirical research (Clarke and Hare 2006). Biomass reference points were based on Replacement Yield Model estimated carrying capacity (97,000 mt), which was informed by the F_{MSY} proxy ($F_{0.1}$) from the YPR analysis. Target biomass (B_{MSY} proxy) was defined as half of K and threshold biomass was equal to ½ of the B_{MSY} proxy (note that only two significant digits were included for the ½ B_{MSY} proxy to reflect input data). A maximum sustainable yield was calculated as the F_{MSY} proxy multiplied by the B_{MSY} proxy from the Replacement Yield Model. Therefore, the Atlantic halibut reference points as accepted by the 2008 GARM review panel were as follows:

F_{MSY}	0.073
B_{MSY}	49,000 mt
½ B_{MSY}	24,000 mt
MSY	3,500 mt

In comparison to previous index-based assessments, B_{MSY}, MSY and current biomass from all of the Replacement Yield Model scenarios are substantially higher since they include the implied higher biomass levels that enabled large amounts of catch in the late 1800s. However, current biomass as a percent of the threshold is similar for the two methods. Below are the biological reference points from the previous index-based assessment (Brodziak and Col 2005) and NEFSC survey swept-area biomass updated through 2007:

Previous Index-Based Reference Points (M=0.10):

	Threshold	Target	Current Estimate	% Threshold	MSY
Fishing mortality	0.06		none	n/a	300 mt
Stock biomass	2,700 mt	5,400 mt	252 mt	9%	

Depletion-Adjusted Average Catch

Calculating a Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC) is an alternative method to estimate MSY for data poor stocks where a time series of catch is the most dependable data source (MacCall 2007). Using NFT DCAC version 1.0.0.4[3], sensitivities were run to calculate average DCAC as a proxy for MSY using various time series of catch and assumptions for the relationship of F_{MSY} to M (Figure 18). The time series used for the DCAC model runs included the total time series of the available catch data (1893-2007), a period of steady decline in biomass (1893-1943), the period of sharpest decline in biomass (1895-1899), the entire time series used for the Replacement Yield Model (1800-2007), and the period from the start of directed fishing effort on Atlantic halibut to the first sharp decline in biomass (1830-1899). As seen in both Figure 18a (using F_{MSY} and M values consistent with the Replacement Yield Model) and Figure 18b (assuming that F_{MSY} is roughly equal to M), average DCAC estimates for Atlantic halibut are substantially lower than the 3,500 mt MSY value estimated by the Replacement Yield Model.

MacCall (2007) cautions that the yields calculated through the DCAC model are only sustainable if the biomass is at or above B_{MSY} and that if the resource is below B_{MSY}, the currently sustainable yield ($Y_{current}$) can be approximated using the following equation:

$$Y_{current} = Y_{sust}(B_{current}/B_{MSY})$$

where $Y_{sust} = (\sum C)/(n + (DELTA/0.2*M))$
where C = catch
n = number of years of catch
DELTA = the biomass at the beginning of the time series minus the biomass at the end of the time series

[3] http://nft.nefsc.noaa.gov/DCAC.html NOAA Fisheries Toolbox Version 3.1, 2009. Depletion Corrected Average Catch Version 1.0.0.4

Using the entire time series of data in the Replacement Yield Model, and output of current biomass and B_{MSY} estimates from the model: $\sum C$ = 317,390 mt, n = 208, DELTA = 0.987, and $Y_{current}$ = 35 mt. Using the entire time series of recorded catch: $\sum C$ = 45,665 mt, n = 115, DELTA = 0.098, and $Y_{current}$ = 10 mt. Since the Replacement Yield Model estimates MSY for a population at B_{MSY}, this indicates that given the current low biomass of Atlantic halibut, the current yield should be much lower than the estimated MSY.

STOCK STATUS

The review panel for the GARM 2008 assessment recommended going forward with using M = 0.15 for the YPR analysis, resulting in a F_{MSY} proxy of 0.073. Current relative F from the Replacement Yield Model was 0.065 in 2007, indicating that overfishing is not occurring for Atlantic halibut. However, it should be cautioned that relative F is 89% of the proxy F threshold. The 2007 estimated biomass from the Replacement Yield Model was 1,300 mt, or 5% of the biomass threshold, indicating that Atlantic halibut continues to be in an overfished condition (Figure 19).

REBUILDING PROJECTIONS

$F_{rebuild}$

In 2001 the Gulf of Maine-Georges bank portion of the Atlantic halibut stock was determined to be overfished (Brodziak 2002) and in 2004 Amendment 13 to the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act required a rebuilding plan for Atlantic halibut. However, a trajectory for rebuilding could not be calculated until the acceptance of the Replacement Yield Model (NEFSC 2008) which resulted in the first fishing mortality estimates for Atlantic halibut. Therefore, the rebuilding time period for Atlantic halibut was determined to be from 2004 to the estimated year in which halibut would rebuild to B_{MSY} at F = 0, plus one mean generation time from the updated YPR analyses. Based on panel recommendations (NEFSC 2008), projections were run for Atlantic halibut using the Replacement Yield Model, assuming M = 0.15 and a linear increase in catch from 1800-1893. The resulting rebuilding time frame for Atlantic halibut was 2056, and $F_{rebuild}$ = 0.044.

There are a number of reasons to suggest that both the rebuilding time frame and the $F_{rebuild}$ are highly optimistic, the first being that the Replacement Yield Model assumes maximum growth rate of the population even at low abundance. There are currently no indications that Atlantic halibut are either reproducing or growing at their maximum potential in the currently depleted state. The second is that the Replacement Yield Model does not incorporate age structure. This is of particular concern for Atlantic halibut since the mean age of maturity for females is 7.3 years (Sigourney 2006), creating both a lag time of initial response to management measures and a slower rebuilding trajectory which are not realized in the current projections. The final source of concern for calculating rebuilding trajectories is that the currently assessed Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank component is likely a small portion of a larger US-Canadian Atlantic halibut stock (Kanwit 2007, see sources of uncertainty below). This substantially

increases uncertainty in the current projections since the Replacement Yield Model does not incorporate the entire dynamics of the stock.

The $F_{rebuild}$ for the current Replacement Yield Model is only slightly lower than the average model-estimated relative fishing mortality for the 1995-2007 period (0.052). Under this $F_{rebuild}$ the projected biomass is estimated to roughly double over the next seven years and to continue with roughly exponential growth throughout the rebuilding time period (Figure 20). This rate of increase has not been shown in the 200+ years of model estimated biomass and is thus unlikely to be biologically feasible. Further, there are no indications in the NEFSC survey indices that significant recent increases in population abundance or biomass are occurring. Therefore, both the rebuilding time frame and the $F_{rebuild}$ from the Replacement Yield Model are highly optimistic.

2009 Catch Estimates

Three scenarios of relative F in 2009 were calculated for $F_{status\ quo}$, F_{MSY} and $F_{rebuild}$. In each case the catch in 2008 was set equal to the catch in 2007. The results for 2009 catch estimates based on the three scenarios were as follows: $F_{status\ quo}$= 100 mt, F_{MSY} = 112 mt, and $F_{rebuild}$ = 68 mt (Table 8).

SOURCES OF UNCERTAINTY

Model Uncertainty

Limited biological data lead to uncertainty in growth and maturity at age estimates for the YPR analysis, although recent research and the experimental halibut fishery have allowed for updated estimates to be based on Atlantic halibut in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region. A lack of reported landings prior to 1893 lead to rough estimates of catch during 1800-1892; however, the Replacement Yield Model does not appear to be highly sensitive to these estimates. A lack of available natural mortality estimates for Atlantic halibut necessitates the use of Pacific halibut estimates, and this leads to uncertainty in MSY and biomass reference point estimation in the Replacement Yield Model. Previous estimates of MSY as well as MSY approximations from Depletion-Corrected Average Catch analyses indicate that MSY may be overestimated, and that given the current low biomass of Atlantic halibut, current yield should be substantially lower than MSY. However, the resulting status of Atlantic halibut being near the overfishing level and far below ½ B_{MSY} remains regardless of the assessment model or assumptions of M. Another problem for any Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut model is providing informative tuning indices. Although the NEFSC autumn survey swept-area biomass index has been considered to be the best available estimate of biomass in previous assessments, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to whether this index is reliable for detecting population biomass trends due to the low encounter rates of Atlantic halibut. Finally, the greatest uncertainty with the Replacement Yield Model is the rebuilding projections. These projections are likely to be highly optimistic, especially considering the model inclusion of maximum intrinsic growth despite recent low biomass.

Minimum Size Regulations

Atlantic halibut maturity at length estimations from Sigourney et al. (2006) indicate that the female L_{50} (103 cm) is well above the current minimum size limit (91 cm), and that

recruitment overfishing is likely occurring. Increasing the minimum size limit may increase survival of halibut to spawning size, especially in the longline fishery where discarded survival rates are higher than in the otter trawl fishery (77% and 35% respectively, Neilson et al. 1989). However, regulation of the minimum size is a concern since it appears that even with the current regulations, there are undersized halibut being landed (Table 5). In order to ensure that the fishery minimizes the take of immature Atlantic halibut and thus promotes rebuilding, size limits would not only need to be increased to 103 cm, but compliance with the minimum size limit would need to be increased.

Transboundary Movement

Another source of uncertainty is the stock boundary determination for Atlantic halibut. For management purposes, the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region is considered to be a separate stock from Canadian Scotian Shelf-Southern Grand Banks and Gulf of St. Lawrence stocks. However in 2007, Kanwit showed that substantial transboundary movements occurred in Atlantic halibut tagged off of the coast of Maine. As of January, 2009, 1,547 Atlantic halibut had been tagged from the experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008), and an ongoing voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (starting in 2002). Of these tagged halibut, 227 tags had been returned, resulting in a 15% return rate, and 33% of the 195 tagged halibut with reliable release and recapture locations had crossed into Canadian waters (Figure 21). By using the haversine great-circle method (Sinnot, 1984) to estimate the minimum distance traveled, we found that several individuals traveled over 1,000 km north-east to Newfoundland, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and the Grand Banks. The distribution of distances that tagged halibut traveled was skewed (Figure 22) and recaptures may be biased due to landings restrictions on halibut in US waters as well as to high rates of recaptures from the above mentioned programs (Kanwit, 2007). However, there is strong evidence that Atlantic halibut are capable of both long distance movements and crossing US-Canada boundaries in substantial numbers. The days at large for the tagged halibut varied (Figure 23), and no significant relationship was found between days at large and distance traveled (Figure 24), indicating that there may be both residential and migratory populations. Further examination of season-specific distances traveled and directions of movement as well as length-specific distances traveled could be informative. Although previous tagging results from Canada (McCracken 1958, Stobo et al. 1988) do not show substantial movements into US waters, it would be informative to update and expand on this work as well. Overall, the recent tagging results in Maine inshore waters clearly indicate trans-boundary movement of Atlantic halibut, and future assessments should consider combining the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region with Canadian stocks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Jon Brodziak for his previous work on Atlantic halibut assessments and his insightful feedback on the 2008 assessment. We would also like to thank Kohl Kanwit and the rest of the staff from the Maine Department of Marine Resources as well as the participating fishermen for their initiation and involvement in the experimental halibut fishery, the DFO longline surveys, and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project. The data provided by these sources have not only added to important growth and maturity estimates, but have provided a much needed insight into the movement patterns of Atlantic halibut. We are

also indebted to the participants and reviewers throughout each stage of the GARM process, who have provided constructive and valuable feedback on the Atlantic halibut assessment. Finally, this assessment could not have been completed without the dedicated Ecosystems Survey Branch staff and all of the scientists and volunteers who have collected data on NEFSC surveys, the Northeast Fisheries Observer Program staff, the Data Management Systems staff, and all who participated in collecting commercial fisheries data from New England ports.

REFERENCES

Applegate A, Cadrin S, Hoenig J, Moore C, Murawski S, Pikitch E. 1998. Evaluation of existing overfishing definitions and recommendations for new overfishing definitions to comply with the Sustainable Fisheries Act. Final Report, Overfishing Definition Review Panel. New England Fishery Management Council, Newburyport, MA; 179 p.

Brandao A, Butterworth DS. 2008 a. A "replacement yield" model fit to catch and survey data for the south coast kingklip resource of South Africa. WG-Dem:K:05.

Brandao A, Butterworth DS. 2008 b. An updated assessment of the South African kingklip resource including some sensitivity tests. WG-Dem:K:02

Brodziak J. 2002. Atlantic halibut. In NEFSC, Assessment of 20 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2001, pp.306-313. NEFSC Ref. Doc. 02-16, 509 p. Available at: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/crd/crd0216/

Brodziak J, Col L. 2005. Atlantic halibut. In: Assessment of 19 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2004. 2005 Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (2005 GARM), Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA, 15-19 Aug. 2005. NEFSC Ref. Doc. 05-14; p 424-431. Available at: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/crd/crd0513/

Clark WG, Hare SR. 2006. Assessment and management of Pacific halibut: data, methods, and policy. IPHC Sci Report No. 83. Available at: http://www.iphc.washington.edu/halcom/pubs/scirep/SciReport0083.pdf

Collette BB, Klein-MacPhee G, Editors. 2002. Bigelow and Schroeder's Fishes of the Gulf of Maine (3rd Edition). Washington (DC): Smithsonian Institution; 748 p.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). 2006. Atlantic halibut on the Scotian Shelf and Southern Grand Banks (Div. 3NOPs4VWX). DFO Can Sci Advis Sec Sci Advis Rep. 2006/038.

DFO. 2007. Stock assessment of Atlantic halibut of the Gulf of St. Lawrence (NAFO Divisions 4RST) in 2006. DFO Can Sci Advis Sec Sci Advis Rep. 2007/007.

DFO. 2008. Assessment of the Greenland halibut stock in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (4RST) in 2006. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2007/044.

Goode, G.B.1884. The fisheries and fishing industries of the United States. U.S. Commission of Fish and Fisheries. Section V, Vol. 1, Part 1: 1-119.

Grasso GM. 2008. What appeared limitless plenty: the rise and fall of the nineteenth-century Atlantic halibut fishery. Environ Hist. 13: 66-91.

Hennemeth RC, Rockwell S. 1987. History of fisheries conservation and management. In: Georges Bank. Backus R, Price R, Bourne D, eds. MIT Press, Cambridge MA; p 431-446.

International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF). 1952. United States landings of groundfish from the convention area, 1893-1950. In: ICNAF annual meeting 1952. St. Andrews, New Brunswick, June 30 – July 10, 1952. Vol. 4, Doc. 7.

Kanwit JK. 2007. Tagging results from the 2000-2004 Federal Experimental Fishery for Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) in the Eastern Gulf of Maine. J Northw Atl Fish Sci. 38:37-42.

MacCall A. 2007. Appendix D – Depletion-Adjusted Average Catch. Report of the Lenfest Working Group on Annual Catch Limits, p 27-32.

McCracken FD. 1958. On the biology and fishery of the Canadian Atlantic halibut, (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus L.*). J Fish Res Bd Canada. 15(6):1269-1311.

Neilson JD, Bowering WR. 1989. Minimum size regulations and the implications for yield value in the Canadian Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) fishery. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. 46: 1899-1903.

Neilson JD, Waiwood KG, Smith SJ. 1989. Survival of Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) caught by longline and otter trawl gear. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. 46: 887-897.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC). 2001. Assessment of 19 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2000. NEFSC Ref Doc. 01-20; 217 p.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center. 2008. Assessment of 19 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2007: report of the 3rd Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III), Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA, August 4-8, 2008. US Dep Commer, NOAA Fisheries, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 08-15; 884 p + xvii. Available at: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/crd/crd0815/

O'Boyle R, Chair. 2008a. Part 2. Assessment Methodology (Models). In: Appendix to the Report of the 3rd Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III): assessment of 19 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2007. Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole MA, August 4-8, 2008. US Dep Commer, NOAA Fisheries, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 08-16; 1056 p. http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/crd/crd0816/part2.pdf

O'Boyle R, Chair. 2008b. Part 3. Biological Reference Points. In: Appendix to the Report of the 3rd Groundfish Assessment Review Meeting (GARM III): assessment of 19 Northeast groundfish stocks through 2007. Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA, August 4-8, 2008. US Dep Commer, NOAA Fisheries, Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 08-16; 1056 p. http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/crd/crd0816/part3.pdf

Sigourney DB. 2002. Growth, sexual maturity and distribution of the Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus L.*) in the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. Mass. Amherst, Amherst, MA.

Sigourney DB, Ross MR, Brodziak J, Burnett J. 2006. Length at Age, Sexual Maturity and Distribution of Atlantic Halibut, *Hippoglossus hippoglossus* L., off the Northeast USA. J Northw Atl Fish Sci. 36:81-90.

Sinnott KW. 1984. Virtues of the haversine. Sky and Telescope. 68(2):159.

Stobo WT, Neilson JD, Simpson PG. 1988. Movement of Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*) in the Canadian North Atlantic. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. 45: 484-491.

Wigley SE, Rago PJ, Sosebee KA, Palka DL. 2007. The analytic component to the Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology omnibus amendment: sampling design and estimation of precision and accuracy. NEFSC Ref Doc. 07-09; 156 p.

Table 1. Reported catch (mt) of Atlantic halibut from the Gulf of Maine and Georges Bank (NAFO divisions 5Y and 5Z), 1893-2007.

Year	USA	US Discards	Canada	Other	Total Landings	Total Catch	Year	USA	US Discards	Canada	Other	Total Landings	Total Catch
1893	684	114	0	0	684	798	1951	154	26	0	0	154	180
1894	843	140	0	0	843	983	1952	123	20	0	0	123	143
1895	4200	699	0	0	4200	4899	1953	104	17	0	0	104	121
1896	4908	817	0	0	4908	5725	1954	125	21	0	0	125	146
1897	733	122	0	0	733	855	1955	74	12	0	0	74	86
1898	564	94	0	0	564	658	1956	62	10	0	0	62	72
1899	407	68	0	0	407	475	1957	80	13	0	0	80	93
1900	331	55	0	0	331	386	1958	73	12	0	0	73	85
1901	287	48	0	0	287	335	1959	59	10	0	0	59	69
1902	367	61	0	0	367	428	1960	63	10	0	0	63	73
1903	502	84	0	0	502	586	1961	79	13	5	0	84	97
1904	332	55	0	0	332	387	1962	86	14	35	25	146	160
1905	580	97	0	0	580	677	1963	94	16	88	1	183	199
1906	542	90	0	0	542	632	1964	115	19	120	1	236	255
1907	447	74	0	0	447	521	1965	128	21	153	18	299	320
1908	891	148	0	0	891	1039	1966	110	18	110	62	282	300
1909	193	32	0	0	193	225	1967	102	17	386	26	514	531
1910	329	55	0	0	329	384	1968	74	12	193	3	270	282
1911	389	65	0	0	389	454	1969	63	10	96	9	168	178
1912	460	77	0	0	460	537	1970	52	9	67	19	138	147
1913	402	67	0	0	402	469	1971	81	13	38	0	119	132
1914	329	55	0	0	329	384	1972	63	10	37	8	108	118
1915	336	56	0	0	336	392	1973	51	8	38	0	89	97
1916	478	80	0	0	478	558	1974	46	8	29	1	76	84
1917	293	49	0	0	293	342	1975	70	12	36	0	106	118
1918	375	62	0	0	375	437	1976	58	10	33	0	91	101
1919	498	83	0	0	498	581	1977	50	8	31	0	81	89
1920	896	149	0	0	896	1045	1978	84	14	50	0	134	148
1921	689	115	0	0	689	804	1979	125	21	29	0	154	175
1922	694	115	0	0	694	809	1980	80	13	88	0	168	181
1923	508	85	0	0	508	593	1981	80	13	118	0	198	211
1924	616	103	0	0	616	719	1982	85	14	116	0	201	215
1925	843	140	0	0	843	983	1983	72	12	131	0	203	215
1926	944	157	0	0	944	1101	1984	75	12	62	0	137	149
1927	831	138	0	0	831	969	1985	61	10	57	0	118	128
1928	781	130	0	0	781	911	1986	44	7	32	0	76	83
1929	570	95	0	0	570	665	1987	27	4	23	0	50	54
1930	716	119	0	0	716	835	1988	47	8	81	0	128	136
1931	511	85	0	0	511	596	1989	13	2	65	0	78	80
1932	443	74	0	0	443	517	1990	16	3	58	0	74	77
1933	279	46	0	0	279	325	1991	30	5	58	0	88	93
1934	192	32	0	0	192	224	1992	22	4	47	0	69	73
1935	292	49	0	0	292	341	1993	15	2	50	0	65	67
1936	374	62	0	0	374	436	1994	22	4	24	0	46	50
1937	187	31	0	0	187	218	1995	11	2	8	0	19	21
1938	146	24	0	0	146	170	1996	13	2	12	0	25	27
1939	124	21	0	0	124	145	1997	14	2	14	0	28	30
1940	499	83	0	0	499	582	1998	8	1	9	0	17	18
1941	145	24	0	0	145	169	1999	12	18	8	0	20	40
1942	250	42	0	0	250	292	2000	11	16	6	0	17	36
1943	76	13	0	0	76	89	2001	11	16	11	0	22	41
1944	77	13	0	0	77	90	2002	10	15	10	0	20	37
1945	55	9	0	0	55	64	2003	17	25	14	0	31	60
1946	124	21	0	0	124	145	2004	11	16	12	0	23	42
1947	198	33	0	0	198	231	2005	17	25	9	0	26	55
1948	156	26	0	0	156	182	2006	14	21	10	0	24	48
1949	157	26	0	0	157	183	2007	22	32	30	0	52	84
1950	116	19	0	0	116	135							

Table 2. Atlantic halibut United States discards (mt) based on Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology combined ratio estimation (1989-2007). Note that average discards were used to calculate catch since several years of low observer coverage led to very low sample sizes of observed Atlantic halibut.

Year	# of Observed Hauls Encountering Halibut	US Discards (mt)	cv	US Landings (mt)		Average Discards (mt)	Total US Catch (mt)
1989	41	3.4	0.525	13		2	15
1990	64	10.2	0.578	16		3	19
1991	172	5.2	0.348	30		5	35
1992	127	1.6	0.394	22		4	26
1993	69	1.3	0.444	15		2	17
1994	75	1.4	0.474	22		4	26
1995	60	2.8	1.319	11		2	13
1996	28	0.6	0.491	13	1989-1998 Average	2	15
1997	55	0.6	0.788	14	Discards/Landings=	2	16
1998	4	0.2	1.014	8	0.166	1	9
1999	11	76.1	0.702	12		18	30
2000	40	9.3	0.352	11		16	27
2001	28	9.4	0.271	11		16	27
2002	61	16.8	0.410	10		15	25
2003	186	15.7	0.212	17		25	42
2004	263	18.2	0.207	11		16	27
2005	770	14.0	0.114	17	1999-2007 Average	25	42
2006	346	14.3	0.171	14	Discards/Landings=	21	35
2007	308	9.5	0.123	22	1.465	32	54

Table 3. Atlantic halibut stratified mean weight (kg) and numbers per tow from NEFSC spring and autumn surveys (offshore strata 13-30, 36-40) and 5-year average swept-area biomass estimates (incremental for first 4 years).

Year	Spring Survey Weight (kg) per Tow	5-Year Average Spring Swept-Area Biomass (mt)	Spring Survey Numbers per Tow	Autumn Survey Weight (kg) per Tow	5-Year Average Autumn Swept-Area Biomass (mt)	Autumn Survey Numbers per Tow
1963				0.085	282	0.039
1964				0.067	252	0.022
1965				0.032	204	0.015
1966				0.004	156	0.003
1967				0.009	131	0.003
1968	0.129	428	0.046	0.233	229	0.013
1969	0.236	606	0.028	0.494	512	0.025
1970	0.105	520	0.015	0.000	491	0.000
1971	0.033	417	0.013	0.091	549	0.011
1972	0.005	337	0.006	0.018	555	0.013
1973	0.113	327	0.015	0.131	487	0.015
1974	0.112	244	0.052	0.014	169	0.004
1975	0.000	175	0.000	0.095	232	0.017
1976	0.644	580	0.031	0.378	422	0.038
1977	0.142	671	0.052	0.059	449	0.012
1978	0.163	704	0.025	0.294	558	0.028
1979	0.357	867	0.048	0.040	575	0.015
1980	0.563	1241	0.056	0.010	518	0.007
1981	0.066	857	0.027	0.321	481	0.024
1982	0.082	817	0.011	0.115	518	0.015
1983	0.611	1115	0.035	0.000	323	0.000
1984	0.022	892	0.009	0.124	378	0.005
1985	0.063	560	0.024	0.106	442	0.015
1986	0.000	516	0.000	0.313	437	0.029
1987	0.287	653	0.009	0.033	382	0.029
1988	0.023	262	0.039	0.004	385	0.006
1989	0.000	248	0.000	0.066	347	0.046
1990	0.064	248	0.026	0.060	316	0.045
1991	0.062	289	0.034	0.243	270	0.034
1992	0.037	123	0.031	0.201	381	0.018
1993	0.006	112	0.003	0.046	409	0.013
1994	0.017	123	0.008	0.000	365	0.000
1995	0.005	84	0.008	0.066	369	0.011
1996	0.013	52	0.009	0.053	243	0.004
1997	0.063	69	0.025	0.174	225	0.046
1998	0.017	76	0.016	0.103	263	0.060
1999	0.239	224	0.012	0.015	273	0.006
2000	0.000	220	0.000	0.021	243	0.006
2001	0.163	320	0.046	0.247	372	0.030
2002	0.128	363	0.013	0.004	259	0.003
2003	0.052	386	0.037	0.049	223	0.040
2004	0.168	339	0.025	0.112	287	0.047
2005	0.025	356	0.034	0.111	347	0.030
2006	0.383	502	0.113	0.031	204	0.021
2007	0.195	546	0.109	0.077	252	0.033
2008	0.100	578	0.062			

Table 4. Input data for Atlantic halibut yield per recruit analysis**.**

Age	Selectivity on Fishing Mortality	Natural Mortality Rate	Fraction Mature	Mean Weight (kg)
0	0	0.15	0.01	0.00
1	0	0.15	0.04	0.02
2	0	0.15	0.06	0.25
3	0	0.15	0.10	0.96
4	1	0.15	0.15	2.36
5	1	0.15	0.23	4.57
6	1	0.15	0.34	7.64
7	1	0.15	0.46	11.57
8	1	0.15	0.59	16.32
9	1	0.15	0.71	21.83
10	1	0.15	0.80	28.01
11	1	0.15	0.87	34.78
12	1	0.15	0.92	42.03
13	1	0.15	0.95	49.68
14	1	0.15	0.97	57.63
15	1	0.15	0.98	65.79
16	1	0.15	0.99	74.09
17	1	0.15	0.99	82.46
18	1	0.15	1.00	90.83
19	1	0.15	1.00	99.15
20	1	0.15	1.00	107.36
21	1	0.15	1.00	115.43
22	1	0.15	1.00	123.33
23	1	0.15	1.00	131.02
24	1	0.15	1.00	138.48
25	1	0.15	1.00	145.70
26	1	0.15	1.00	152.65
27	1	0.15	1.00	159.35
28	1	0.15	1.00	165.77
29	1	0.15	1.00	171.91
30	1	0.15	1.00	177.78
31	1	0.15	1.00	183.38
32	1	0.15	1.00	188.70
33	1	0.15	1.00	193.76
34	1	0.15	1.00	198.57
35	1	0.15	1.00	203.12
36	1	0.15	1.00	207.43
37	1	0.15	1.00	211.50
38	1	0.15	1.00	215.35
39	1	0.15	1.00	218.98
40	1	0.15	1.00	222.40
41-50	1	0.15	1.00	222.40

Table 5. Mean and minimum sizes of Atlantic halibut discarded and landed from Northeast Fisheries Observer Program data.

Discarded Atlantic Halibut

Year	Mean Length (cm)	Std Err	N	Minimum Length (cm)
1992	33.0	.	1	33
1993	31.3	13.3	3	17
1994	42.4	5.1	5	24
1995	27.2	5.5	6	18
1997	36.3	2.2	3	32
1999	62.0	.	1	62
2000	57.0	4.1	13	18
2001	67.5	3.0	13	48
2002	70.2	4.8	13	38
2003	64.0	1.6	91	31
2004	57.1	1.4	87	26
2005	60.4	1.3	160	33
2006	63.0	1.5	107	38
2007	64.3	2.0	75	24

Landed Atlantic Halibut

Year	Mean Length (cm)	Std Err	N	Minimum Length (cm)
1990	46.6	2.0	6	42
1991	92.0	.	1	92
1992	67.1	5.2	11	29
1993	62.8	5.5	10	42
1994	73.3	5.1	16	46
1995	79.6	4.6	29	42
1996	69.2	10.0	5	50
1997	67.5	11.4	6	44
2001	118.0	6.0	2	112
2002	88.0	9.1	6	52
2003	81.0	5.3	29	41
2004	83.9	4.0	33	43
2005	76.4	2.6	80	40
2006	84.9	3.6	37	50
2007	90.5	4.2	33	49

Note: 1999-2007 average observed landed minimum size = 55cm
Minimum size regulation for 1999-present = 91cm

Table 6. Atlantic halibut catch and resulting biomass, replacement yield, and relative F from the Replacement Yield Model (M=0.15). Note that reported landings began in 1893, and 1800-1892 catch is assumed to be a linear increase.

Year	Total Catch (mt)	Biomass (mt)	Replacement Yield (mt)	Relative F	Year	Total Catch (mt)	Biomass (mt)	Replacement Yield (mt)	Relative F
1800	10	97018	0	0.000	1852	3320	73579	2599	0.045
1801	20	97008	1	0.000	1853	3387	72858	2653	0.046
1802	30	96990	4	0.000	1854	3454	72123	2706	0.048
1803	37	96964	8	0.000	1855	3521	71375	2758	0.049
1804	104	96935	12	0.001	1856	3588	70612	2810	0.051
1805	171	96843	26	0.002	1857	3655	69834	2861	0.052
1806	238	96698	47	0.002	1858	3722	69040	2911	0.054
1807	305	96507	74	0.003	1859	3789	68229	2960	0.056
1808	372	96276	108	0.004	1860	3856	67400	3008	0.057
1809	439	96012	146	0.005	1861	3923	66552	3055	0.059
1810	506	95718	188	0.005	1862	3990	65684	3101	0.061
1811	573	95400	233	0.006	1863	4057	64796	3146	0.063
1812	640	95060	281	0.007	1864	4124	63885	3190	0.065
1813	707	94700	331	0.007	1865	4191	62951	3232	0.067
1814	774	94324	383	0.008	1866	4258	61992	3272	0.069
1815	841	93933	437	0.009	1867	4325	61006	3311	0.071
1816	908	93529	492	0.010	1868	4392	59992	3347	0.073
1817	975	93113	548	0.010	1869	4459	58947	3382	0.076
1818	1042	92686	605	0.011	1870	4526	57870	3414	0.078
1819	1109	92249	663	0.012	1871	4593	56758	3443	0.081
1820	1176	91803	722	0.013	1872	4660	55608	3470	0.084
1821	1243	91348	781	0.014	1873	4727	54418	3493	0.087
1822	1310	90886	840	0.014	1874	4794	53185	3513	0.090
1823	1377	90416	900	0.015	1875	4861	51904	3529	0.094
1824	1444	89938	960	0.016	1876	4928	50571	3540	0.097
1825	1511	89454	1020	0.017	1877	4995	49183	3545	0.102
1826	1578	88963	1080	0.018	1878	5062	47733	3545	0.106
1827	1645	88465	1140	0.019	1879	5129	46217	3538	0.111
1828	1712	87960	1201	0.019	1880	5196	44626	3523	0.116
1829	1779	87449	1261	0.020	1881	5263	42953	3500	0.123
1830	1846	86931	1321	0.021	1882	5330	41189	3465	0.129
1831	1913	86406	1382	0.022	1883	5397	39325	3419	0.137
1832	1980	85875	1442	0.023	1884	5464	37347	3358	0.146
1833	2047	85337	1502	0.024	1885	5531	35241	3281	0.157
1834	2114	84792	1562	0.025	1886	5598	32991	3183	0.170
1835	2181	84240	1622	0.026	1887	5665	30576	3061	0.185
1836	2248	83682	1682	0.027	1888	5732	27972	2910	0.205
1837	2315	83115	1741	0.028	1889	5799	25151	2724	0.231
1838	2382	82542	1801	0.029	1890	5866	22075	2493	0.266
1839	2449	81960	1860	0.030	1891	5933	18702	2207	0.317
1840	2516	81371	1919	0.031	1892	6000	14977	1852	0.401
1841	2583	80774	1977	0.032	1893	798	10828	1406	0.074
1842	2650	80168	2036	0.033	1894	983	11437	1475	0.086
1843	2717	79554	2094	0.034	1895	4899	11929	1530	0.411
1844	2784	78931	2151	0.035	1896	5725	8559	1141	0.669
1845	2851	78298	2209	0.036	1897	855	3975	557	0.215
1846	2918	77656	2266	0.038	1898	658	3678	517	0.179
1847	2985	77004	2323	0.039	1899	475	3537	498	0.134
1848	3052	76341	2379	0.040	1900	386	3561	502	0.108
1849	3119	75668	2435	0.041	1901	335	3677	517	0.091
1850	3186	74983	2490	0.042	1902	428	3859	542	0.111
1851	3253	74287	2545	0.044	1903	586	3973	557	0.147

Table 6 (continued).

Year	Total Catch (mt)	Biomass (mt)	Replacement Yield (mt)	Relative F	Year	Total Catch (mt)	Swept-Area Biomass (mt)	Biomass (mt)	Replacement Yield (mt)	Relative F
1904	387	3944	553	0.098	1956	72		982	142	0.0737
1905	677	4110	575	0.165	1957	93		1052	152	0.0887
1906	632	4009	562	0.158	1958	85		1110	160	0.0767
1907	521	3939	553	0.132	1959	69		1186	171	0.0580
1908	1039	3970	557	0.262	1960	73		1288	186	0.0570
1909	225	3488	492	0.065	1961	97		1400	202	0.0694
1910	384	3754	528	0.102	1962	160		1505	217	0.1065
1911	454	3898	547	0.116	1963	199	282	1561	225	0.1272
1912	537	3991	559	0.134	1964	255	222	1587	228	0.1607
1913	469	4014	563	0.117	1965	320	106	1561	224	0.2052
1914	384	4108	575	0.093	1966	300	13	1465	211	0.2050
1915	392	4299	601	0.091	1967	531	30	1375	198	0.3861
1916	558	4508	628	0.124	1968	282	773	1043	151	0.2708
1917	342	4579	638	0.075	1969	178	1640	911	132	0.1959
1918	437	4875	677	0.090	1970	147	0	865	125	0.1696
1919	581	5114	708	0.114	1971	132	302	843	122	0.1571
1920	1045	5242	725	0.199	1972	118	60	833	121	0.1422
1921	804	4922	683	0.163	1973	97	435	835	121	0.1167
1922	809	4801	667	0.169	1974	84	46	859	124	0.0974
1923	593	4659	648	0.127	1975	118	315	900	130	0.1308
1924	719	4714	656	0.152	1976	101	1255	912	132	0.1103
1925	983	4652	647	0.211	1977	89	196	944	137	0.0947
1926	1101	4316	603	0.255	1978	148	976	991	143	0.1493
1927	969	3818	536	0.254	1979	175	133	986	143	0.1772
1928	911	3385	478	0.269	1980	181	33	954	138	0.1900
1929	665	2951	418	0.225	1981	211	1065	911	132	0.2319
1930	835	2705	384	0.309	1982	215	382	832	121	0.2586
1931	596	2254	322	0.264	1983	215	0	737	107	0.2916
1932	517	1980	284	0.261	1984	149	412	629	91	0.2375
1933	325	1747	251	0.186	1985	128	352	571	83	0.2244
1934	224	1672	240	0.134	1986	83	1039	526	76	0.1584
1935	341	1688	243	0.202	1987	54	110	519	76	0.1049
1936	436	1590	229	0.274	1988	136	13	540	79	0.2514
1937	218	1383	199	0.158	1989	80	219	483	70	0.1660
1938	170	1364	197	0.125	1990	77	199	473	69	0.1620
1939	145	1390	200	0.104	1991	93	807	465	68	0.1999
1940	582	1446	208	0.403	1992	73	667	440	64	0.1652
1941	169	1072	155	0.158	1993	67	153	431	63	0.1565
1942	292	1058	153	0.276	1994	50	0	427	62	0.1164
1943	89	919	133	0.096	1995	21	219	439	64	0.0474
1944	90	964	140	0.093	1996	27	176	482	70	0.0563
1945	64	1014	147	0.063	1997	30	578	525	76	0.0578
1946	145	1096	158	0.132	1998	18	342	571	83	0.0321
1947	231	1110	160	0.208	1999	40	50	636	92	0.0633
1948	182	1039	150	0.175	2000	36	70	688	100	0.0517
1949	183	1008	146	0.182	2001	41	820	752	109	0.0539
1950	135	970	140	0.139	2002	37	13	821	119	0.0449
1951	180	975	141	0.184	2003	60	163	903	131	0.0661
1952	143	937	136	0.153	2004	42	372	974	141	0.0427
1953	121	929	135	0.131	2005	55	368	1073	155	0.0509
1954	146	942	136	0.155	2006	48	103	1174	170	0.0405
1955	86	933	135	0.093	2007	84	256	1296	187	0.0650

Table 7. Residuals of NEFSC survey swept-area biomass indices to estimated swept-area biomass indices from the Replacement Yield Model.

Year	Log Z-Score Residuals
1963	-0.273
1964	-0.459
1965	-0.987
1966	-2.461
1967	-1.822
1968	0.759
1969	1.407
1970	
1971	0.227
1972	-0.949
1973	0.500
1974	-1.155
1975	0.211
1976	1.211
1977	-0.172
1978	0.966
1979	-0.489
1980	-1.478
1981	1.092
1982	0.408
1983	
1984	0.667
1985	0.623
1986	1.475
1987	-0.160
1988	-1.732
1989	0.400
1990	0.345
1991	1.380
1992	1.282
1993	0.218
1994	
1995	0.469
1996	0.241
1997	1.047
1998	0.602
1999	-0.884
2000	-0.696
2001	1.040
2002	-2.037
2003	-0.275
2004	0.273
2005	0.196
2006	-0.802
2007	-0.209

Table 8. Projected catch and biomass for Atlantic halibut under three relative F scenarios in 2009 (Fsq, $F_{rebuild}$ and Fmsy), assuming catch in 2008 equals catch in 2007.

F2009 = Fstatus quo = F2007 = 0.065

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Relative F	0.065	0.060	0.065	
Biomass (mt)	1,296	1,399	1,516	1,636
Catch (mt)	84	84	99	

F2009 = Frebuild = 0.044

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Relative F	0.065	0.060	0.044	
Biomass (mt)	1,296	1,399	1,516	1,668
Catch (mt)	84	84	66	

F2009 = Fmsy = 0.073

	2007	2008	2009	2010
Relative F	0.065	0.060	0.073	
Biomass (mt)	1,296	1,399	1,516	1,623
Catch (mt)	84	84	111	



Figure 1. Statistical areas used to define United States commercial fishing catch for the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region of the Atlantic halibut stock.



Figure 2. Atlantic halibut total catch (mt) from the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region (NAFO divisions 5Y and 5Z), 1893-2007.



Figure 3. Trends in Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass indices from Northeast Fisheries Science Center autumn bottom trawl surveys and previous index-based assessment reference points.



Figure 4. Atlantic halibut total catch (mt) by country, 1950-2007.



Figure 5. Distribution of Atlantic halibut from Northeast Fisheries Science Center autumn surveys (1963-2007) used to calculate the survey biomass time series. Halibut caught outside of NEFSC survey strata 13-30 or 36-40 were excluded due to inconsistent sampling throughout the survey time series.



Figure 6. Total numbers of Atlantic halibut caught annually in Northeast Fisheries Science Center spring and autumn surveys.



Figure 7. Northeast Fisheries Science Center spring and autumn survey trends for Atlantic halibut A) weight per tow indices and 5-year average swept-area biomass and B) number per tow indices and 5-year average number per tow from the Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank region, 1963-2008.



Figure 8. Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass verses eastern Gulf of Maine spring bottom temperature anomalies (1968-2005).



Figure 9. Female Atlantic halibut length-weight relationship.



Figure 10. Von Bertalanffy growth for female Atlantic halibut.



Figure 11. Maturity ogive for female Atlantic halibut based on Sigourney et al. (2006).



Figure 12. Yield per recruit and spawning stock biomass per recruit for Atlantic halibut.



Figure 13. Atlantic halibut biomass and ½ B_{MSY} proxy from the Replacement Yield Model (M = 0.15).



Figure 14. Atlantic halibut relative fishing mortality from the Replacement Yield Model (M = 0.15).



Figure 15. Atlantic halibut replacement yield from the Replacement Yield Model (M = 0.15).



Figure 16. Atlantic halibut swept-area biomass estimates A) from the NEFSC autumn survey and predicted survey indices from the Replacement Yield Model and B) log Z-score residuals.



Figure 17. Replacement Yield Model sensitivity analyses testing A) parabolic versus linear increase in catch prior to 1893 and B) varying natural mortality rates.



Figure 18. Alternative Maximum Sustainable Yield estimates based on Depletion-Corrected Average Catch (DCAC) A) using F_{MSY}/ M ratio = 0.487 from Replacement Yield Model and B) using F_{MSY}/ M = 1 from DCAC default.



Figure 19. Status plot for Gulf of Maine-Georges Bank Atlantic halibut.



Figure 20. Projected biomass and fishing mortality under a rebuilding scenario with a constant $F_{rebuild} = 0.044$ after 2008.



Figure 21. Experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008), and voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-present) tagging release locations (green triangles) and recapture locations (red circles) of Atlantic halibut through January 13th, 2009.



Figure 22. Minimum distance traveled of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing).



Figure 23. Days at large of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing).



Figure 24. Days at large v. distance traveled of tagged Atlantic halibut from the federal experimental halibut fishery (2000-2004), DFO longline surveys (2007-2008) and the voluntary Maine state waters tagging project (2002-ongoing).

Research Communications Branch
Northeast Fisheries Science Center
National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA
166 Water St.
Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026

MEDIA MAIL

Publications and Reports of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center

The mission of NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is "stewardship of living marine resources for the benefit of the nation through their science-based conservation and management and promotion of the health of their environment." As the research arm of the NMFS's Northeast Region, the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) supports the NMFS mission by "conducting ecosystem-based research and assessments of living marine resources, with a focus on the Northeast Shelf, to promote the recovery and long-term sustainability of these resources and to generate social and economic opportunities and benefits from their use." Results of NEFSC research are largely reported in primary scientific media (*e.g.*, anonymously-peer-reviewed scientific journals). However, to assist itself in providing data, information, and advice to its constituents, the NEFSC occasionally releases its results in its own media. Currently, there are three such media:

NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE -- This series is issued irregularly. The series typically includes: data reports of long-term field or lab studies of important species or habitats; synthesis reports for important species or habitats; annual reports of overall assessment or monitoring programs; manuals describing program-wide surveying or experimental techniques; literature surveys of important species or habitat topics; proceedings and collected papers of scientific meetings; and indexed and/or annotated bibliographies. All issues receive internal scientific review and most issues receive technical and copy editing.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document -- This series is issued irregularly. The series typically includes: data reports on field and lab studies; progress reports on experiments, monitoring, and assessments; background papers for, collected abstracts of, and/or summary reports of scientific meetings; and simple bibliographies. Issues receive internal scientific review and most issues receive copy editing.

Resource Survey Report (formerly *Fishermen's Report*) -- This information report is a regularly-issued, quick-turnaround report on the distribution and relative abundance of selected living marine resources as derived from each of the NEFSC's periodic research vessel surveys of the Northeast's continental shelf. This report undergoes internal review, but receives no technical or copy editing.

TO OBTAIN A COPY of a *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE* or a *Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document*, either contact the NEFSC Editorial Office (166 Water St., Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026; 508-495-2350) or consult the NEFSC webpage on "Reports and Publications" (http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/). To access *Resource Survey Report*, consult the Ecosystem Surveys Branch webpage (http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/femad/ecosurvey/mainpage/).

ANY USE OF TRADE OR BRAND NAMES IN ANY NEFSC PUBLICATION OR REPORT DOES NOT IMPLY ENDORSEMENT.

Procedures for Issuing Manuscripts in the *Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document* (CRD) Series

Clearance

All manuscripts submitted for issuance as CRDs must have cleared the NEFSC's manuscript/abstract/webpage review process. If any author is not a federal employee, he/she will be required to sign an "NEFSC Release-of-Copyright Form." If your manuscript includes material from another work which has been copyrighted, then you will need to work with the NEFSC's Editorial Office to arrange for permission to use that material by securing release signatures on the "NEFSC Use-of-Copyrighted-Work Permission Form."

For more information, NEFSC authors should see the NEFSC's online publication policy manual, "Manuscript/abstract/webpage preparation, review, and dissemination: NEFSC author's guide to policy, process, and procedure," located in the Publications/Manuscript Review section of the NEFSC intranet page.

Organization

Manuscripts must have an abstract and table of contents, and (if applicable) lists of figures and tables. As much as possible, use traditional scientific manuscript organization for sections: "Introduction," "Study Area" and/or "Experimental Apparatus," "Methods," "Results," "Discussion," "Conclusions," "Acknowledgments," and "Literature/References Cited."

Style

The CRD series is obligated to conform with the style contained in the current edition of the United States Government Printing Office Style Manual. That style manual is silent on many aspects of scientific manuscripts. The CRD series relies more on the CSE Style Manual. Manuscripts should be prepared to conform with these style manuals.

The CRD series uses the American Fisheries Society's guides to names of fishes, mollusks, and decapod crustaceans, the Society for Marine Mammalogy's guide to names of marine mammals, the Biosciences Information Service's guide to serial title abbreviations, and the ISO's (International Standardization Organization) guide to statistical terms.

For in-text citation, use the name-date system. A special effort should be made to ensure that all necessary bibliographic information is included in the list of cited works. Personal communications must include date, full name, and full mailing address of the contact.

Preparation

Once your document has cleared the review process, the Editorial Office will contact you with publication needs – for example, revised text (if necessary) and separate digital figures and tables if they are embedded in the document. Materials may be submitted to the Editorial Office as files on zip disks or CDs, email attachments, or intranet downloads. Text files should be in Microsoft Word, tables may be in Word or Excel, and graphics files may be in a variety of formats (JPG, GIF, Excel, PowerPoint, etc.).

Production and Distribution

The Editorial Office will perform a copy-edit of the document and may request further revisions. The Editorial Office will develop the inside and outside front covers, the inside and outside back covers, and the title and bibliographic control pages of the document.

Once both the PDF (print) and Web versions of the CRD are ready, the Editorial Office will contact you to review both versions and submit corrections or changes before the document is posted online.

A number of organizations and individuals in the Northeast Region will be notified by e-mail of the availability of the document online.