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#### Abstract

Georges Bank catches have been increasing steadily over the last 5 years from 4,336 $t$ in 1988 to $6,151 \mathrm{t}$ in 1992. Catch-rates have also improved for the same period except for a small decrease from 1991 to 1992. The 1992 stock survey recorded the highest biomass estimates since 1981. Survey results indicate that the 1988 and 1989 year classes are strong but it would appear that the 1990 year class is weak.

Biomass estimates using virtual population analysis has been rising over the last 5 years, due in part to strong 1988 and 1989 year classes. This biomass increase led to the rising trend in fishery performance. Biomass will likely decrease once the strong year classes pass out of the fishery. Different fishing scenarios are presented for 1993. Keeping the TAC at the 1992 level, 6,200 $t$, would balance production.

\section*{RESUME}

Les prises du banc Georges ont augmenté graduellement durant les 5 dernières années de $4,336 \mathrm{t}$ en 1988 a $6,151 \mathrm{t}$ en 1992. Les taux de capture se sont aussi améliorés pour la même période sauf pour une légère baisse de 1991 a 1992. L'inventaire du stock en 1992 a enregistré des estimations de biomasse les plus élevées depuis 1981. Les résultats d'inventaire indiquent que les classes d'ages de 1988 et 1989 sont robustes mais il semblerait que la classes d'age de 1990 est faible.

Les estimations de biomasse d'après les analyses de population virtuelle se sont élevées au cours des 5 dernières années, ceci est dû en partie aux fortes classes d'ages de 1988 et 1989. Cette augmentation de la biomasse explique la tendance a la hausse du rendement de la pêche. La biomasse va probablement diminuer une fois que les fortes classes d'ages auront été pêchées. Différents scénarios de péche sont présentés pour 1993. Garder le TPA au niveau de 1992, 6,200 t , permettrait de maintenir la biomasse constante.


## INTRODUCTION

Prior to the establishment of the 200 - mile fishing zone in 1977 Canadian and American vessels fished Georges Bank (NAFO SA 5Ze) for scallops. The Canadian deep-sea fleet had to restrict its fishing activities to a national zone in 1985 after the World Court decision (October 1984) on the jurisdiction for fisheries of Canada and the United States on Georges Bank. The Canadian zone, NAFO subdivision 5Zc, is the portion of Georges Bank east of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) line. During the late 1970's, the fishery peaked at 11,000 t (SA 5Zc Table 1) produced by the strong 1972 year class; but such performance deteriorated rapidly. The lack of consensus in the management of the scallop resource in the disputed area coupled with increased effort, contributed as much to the decline in landings as the vanishing 1972 year class. The year of the dispute settlement, 1984, the Canadian fleet caught only $1,945 \mathrm{t}$ of meats, its lowest catch in 25 years. The Canadian scallop industry then focused on stock rehabilitation through a better utilisation of the resource. An Enterprise Allocation (EA) regime was implemented in 1986 partly to reduce fishing effort. From 77 active license holders in 1984, the number of vessels dropped ( 25 $\%$ ) to 57 in 1989. In 1992, only 42 vessels, about half the initial number of license holders, were actively involved in the Georges Bank fishery. The meat count (size limit) was also lowered to 33 meats per 500 g in January 1986 to direct exploitation toward slightly larger scallops.

During the post -1985 period catches have stabilised in the range of $4,300-6,800 \mathrm{t}$ while catch-rates have varied between $0.4-0.7 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$. This is less variation than was experienced during the decade 1975-85 (Table 2). Figure 1 shows the monthly catches and CPUE's for the last three years. Research survey indices also suggest a dampening of the large variation previously experienced in the stock recruitment. The 1992 survey index rebounded with sizable quantities of age 4 and a strong pulse of age 3, the 1989 year class. TAC's had been increasing since 1989 (Table 1). The 6,200 t TAC set for 1992 was practically all caught ( $99 \%$ ). Figure 2 illustrates areas of different catch levels with varying shades of grey. An area along a northwest - southeast axis had catches over 10 t per one - minute ( 0.02 decimal degree) square. The next figure (Fig. 3) maps CPUE isopleths; a large area produced high to very high catch-rates, over $1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$. Catch-rates that had increased steadily since 1988 dropped slightly ( $5 \%$ ) from 1991 to 1992. The average meat weight in the catch has been fairly consistent throughout the year in 1992 (Table 3) and above the 15.15 g weight referring to the 33 count. The monthly average decreased during the last quarter (October - December) likely due to the influx of an abundant class of age 4 scallops. Table 4 values for the last quarter of 1992 also show high frequencies in the $9-13 \mathrm{~g}$ range.

## METHODS

## Fishery data

Catch and effort data are compiled from logbooks. Logs with complete effort data are called Class 1 and are used to estimate catch-rates. The Class 1 data represent more than $90 \%$ of the total (Table 2). Effort is measured in fishing days (fd), towed hours ( h ), and towed hours times the width of the 2 drags used times the number of crew (crhm). Catch-rate is presented as catch (kg) per fishing day, per hour, and per crew-hour-meter. Catch per fd is a simple concept to grasp, yet, a somewhat crude estimate. Catch per $h$ considers only the period that gear was actively fishing. It does not consider how wide the gear is to estimate how much ground is covered by the tow. Gear width may vary from 8.5 to 15.5 m . CPUE in hours is used in the cohort tuning analysis. Scallop meats caught have to be shucked at sea; the smaller the meats, the more crew needed to shuck. Common fishing practices will first change the number of crew if effort has to be modified. A freezer trawler has conducted its second year of activity on Georges Bank. The operational procedures are somewhat different from a conventional vessel and may influence the determination of catch-rates. This is under study. For both 1991 and 1992 its catch-rates have
been pro-rated to the catch-rates of the fleet.

Size distributions of meats from the commercial fleet are derived from port samples. Characteristics of monthly meat weight frequencies for selected years are given in Table 3. An experimental port sampling program was begun in July 1991 to extend the catch sampling to all the enterprises making up the deep-sea fleet. Previously, only one or two enterprises contributed information to the catch sampling database. The extended sampling may lead to a slightly different meat weight profile depending on the fishing strategies of the companies involved. Work is underway to investigate differences in meat weight distribution profiles. Canadian port sampling data were applied to the Canadian and U.S. total catch east of the ICJ line. This assumes similar fishing practices for both fleets. The meat weight frequency distribution in $2-\mathrm{g}$ intervals is given in Table 4 on a quarterly basis for the last 3 years. Table 5 lists the frequency distribution but on an annual basis.

Catch in numbers-at-age (Table 11) for the cohort analysis are derived from the port sampling data and the sum of U.S. and Canadian catches in NAFO SA 5Zc. The total catch (U.S. prior to 1985 and Canadian) from the Canadian zone is decomposed into $2-\mathrm{g}$ weight frequencies. The weights were converted to shell heights using the allometric relationship derived from 1982 -1985 research and commercial data (Robert and Lundy 1987). The values expressing meat weight as a function of shell height use the parameters $9.102^{-6}$ for the regression coefficient and 3.097 for the exponent of height. These values agree closely with those of Serchuck et al. (1982) for the same stock. Shell heights were clustered into age groups according to a Von Bertalanffy growth equation (Brown et al. 1972, cf. Table 6). The conversion of height to age was done by linear interpolation between intervals. As a check another approach was carried out where the meat weight frequencies from the catch were directly partitioned into age groups according to the meat weight - age relationship in Table 6. Results were very similar except for age 3 where a slight divergence occurred.

Traditionally, catch statistics are compiled on an annual basis and recruitment to a fishery is discussed in terms of year class strength. It is generally accepted that, in any given year the majority of Georges Bank scallops are born in October and the first annual ring is laid down the following spring. This is typically less than 10 mm and becomes difficult to discern as the animal grows. For this reason the ring, which is approximately 25 mm from the umbo is often referred to as the first annulus (Naidu 1970). The convention which we shall adopt is that animals born in the fall of a year will be of that year class and it will be further assumed that they were born on January 1 of that year (cohort ages). The deposition of the ring less than 10 mm will take place during the first year of life. The date of the deposition will be assumed to take place on April 1. A back calculation is then made to estimate the shell height for January 1 (eg. cohort age 3 has a shell height of 61 mm on January 1st, while its biological age is 2.25 years). The annual growth rates for weights, given in Table 6, are converted into rates for heights and this results in a $16 \%$ reduction of the ring size being used for the January 1 size. For example, an animal born in the fall of 1978 is of the 1978 year class and will be approximately 25 mm on its second birthday (January 1, 1980) although the ring would not be deposited for a few months. Table 6, as well as all other age data, uses this convention, with correction of ring sizes back to January 1. The actual weights used are midquarter values in age - weight analyses and projections.

## Research survey data

The annual research survey was carried out on Georges Bank during August 1992. The design of the survey was based on a stratification by commercial effort (Robert and Jamieson 1986). The logbooks of the commercial fleet in the preceding 9 months were analyzed to determine areas of very high, high, medium, low, and very low catch-rates. The areas of very high and high catch-rates were sampled more heavily as they represent the area most important to the fleet (and presumably the areas of greatest abundance). It was felt necessary in 1991 to add a very high stratum to reduce the variability of the high stratum. The range of catch-rate values encountered
has increased markedly; $41 \%$ of the total catch-rate points used were over $1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$, the minimum benchmark of the high stratum. The maximum value in the data set was over $9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$. This also reflects the steady rise in average catch-rates. The average number of scallops at age per tow is given in Table 7. The details of the survey results on a per stratum basis are given in Table 9.

In addition to establishing a stratified mean number per tow, the data are contoured to represent the spatial distribution of the scallop aggregations (Fig. 4). Data points describe a three dimensional surface with latitude, longitude, and density to be plotted. A surface is formed by defining Delaunay triangles where the data points form the vertices of triangles connecting neighbouring points. The algorithm used to define the triangles is found in Watson (1982). Collectively, the triangles form a surface. The surface between adjacent contour levels (density of scallops) is illustrated by varying shades of grey. Smoothing of the contours may be performed by interpolating over the surface using inverse weighting of gradients (perpendicular to the planes of the triangles). The interpolation points are found by dividing the sides of the triangle into equal segments. Dividing the sides into 4 segments produces 16 subtriangles. Interpolation is performed on all the new vertices. This method assumes that the data points near the point in question contribute more than distant points (Watson and Philip 1985). The summation of the volumes of all triangles (integration) under the contoured surface approximates the total volume, here the relative abundance estimate for the area covered by the survey. These estimates are presented in Table 8 a for ages 3 to 6 . The degree of interpolation will affect the volume estimates. For the Georges Bank survey data, the estimates stabilize using 16 or more subtriangles when they vary less than $5 \%$. A more complete description of the contouring method and volume estimation may be found in Black (MS 1993).

Biomass estimates (Table 8b) from aerial expansion of numbers of scallops per standard tow have been computed using weights at age for the middle of the third quarter (August) found in table 6. These estimates correspond to a minimum dredgeable biomass as they are not adjusted for the survey gear efficiency. Data prior to the establishment of the ICJ line, from 1981 to 1985 inclusive, have been recomputed (Tables 7 and 8) to provide density and biomass estimates for the Canadian side of Georges Bank only.

There is a correlation of $94 \%$ between survey biomass for recruited ages 4 to 6 determined by volume estimates and the biomass computed by aerial expansion of stratified means (Fig. 5).

## Stock analysis

In the first year of recruitment the animals experience approximately a $300 \%$ increase in weight. To reduce the magnitude of the errors caused by ignoring growth effects, the cohort analysis was carried out on a quarterly basis. This required that catch-at-age, effort distribution, and partial recruitment be determined on a quarterly basis. This was done by adjusting recent year's selectivity pattern to reflect the port sampling data for the last quarter of 1992. This pattern, multiplied by the F determined from tuning for the last quarter year ( $\mathrm{FQ}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ 1992), was used as a starting vector for the quarterly cohort analysis. Natural mortality was set at .025 per quarter ( $\mathrm{M}=$ 0.1 on an annual basis, Dickie 1955; Merrill and Posgay 1964) and no attempt was made to include a seasonal, age or time dependent effects.

The SPA is tuned against a number of independent, and sometimes contradictory, sets of observations. The most important are the commercial CPUE and the research survey estimates. F versus effort is sometimes used to aid in the tuning process. It was not generally useful. Tuning selectivity is more difficult in scallop data than for most fisheries. This is because the SPA is done on a quarterly basis and the F's on the most recent year affect only the last quarter. Thus one cannot 'dial up' the exact numbers or F's one might want for the most recent year as can be done with
annually collated data. $F$ on the oldest animals was found by multiplying the effort pattern by the mean terminal $F$ from the older ages. Because the selectivity is highly domed toward ages 4 and 5 , these values are not critical and the normal iterative determination was not undertaken. (At the 1989 CAFSAC retrospective analysis workshop it was shown that iteratively estimating the terminal $F$ from younger ages diverged rather than converged.) For the purposes of tuning, the terminal $F$ (quarterly rate) ranged from 0.08 to 0.18 (Table 10). This range of terminal F's was more than adequate to examine the best fit of the tuning variables. The maximum correlation coefficient, 0.764 , for the regression of cohort biomass on CPUE corresponded to an FQ4 of 0.10; the residual (1992) crosses the regression line of cohort biomass on research survey biomass estimates at an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ equal to 0.15 . The residuals of the last two year's data and the correlation coefficient were used as tuning criteria. Seventy-six \% of the variability could be explained by CPUE versus cohort biomass and $61 \%$ by research survey versus cohort biomass. The positive residual values in table 10 denote that the residuals are below the regression line and the negative ones, above. It should be noted that the annual CPUE values are compared to the second quarter biomasses. Q2 corresponds to the quarter where the largest catches are encountered. The research survey biomass estimates are derived from the average weights at the third quarter. These are compared to third quarter biomasses from the cohort analysis. The regression of $F$ on effort was not helpful for tuning. Contrary to the two other tuning variables, there is a poor fit for a maximum correlation coefficient under the selected FQ4's although the 1992 residual crosses the regression line at the same FQ4 than for CPUE tuning (Table 10). The correlation coefficient is also of lower value, around $50 \%$. Tuning of F on effort is not considered further.

The strongest relation between CPUE versus cohort biomass ( $R^{2}$ of 0.764 ) occurred at an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ of 0.10. The 1992 residual value crosses the regression line at an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}=0.13$. The research survey biomass via aerial expansion versus cohort biomass regression line has its maximum $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ (0.608) and the 1992 residual is slightly above the line at an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}=0.14$. It is practically on the line with almost the same $R$ at the next $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ increment. The upper part of Figure 6 illustrates the regression of cohort biomass on CPUE with the 1992 residual value just below the line while the previous two year's residuals are just a little farther but well within the spread occupied by the CPUE residual values. Extreme values, 1984 to the left and 1977 to the right fit the line quite well. The lower part of figure 6 deals with the regression of cohort biomass on research survey biomass. At an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}=0.14$ the 12 values (since 1981) show the strongest linear fit. The 1992 residual is virtually on the line at the right end. Throughout the research survey series the 1992 index is the highest encountered. A cluster of 3 survey indices are slightly below the line at the left end. The 1990 and 1991 residuals belong to a cluster of points in the middle section of the line. All these points are relatively close to the line except for 1991. Of all the survey values the 1991 residual is the farthest away from the line (outlier). Figure 7 plots residuals between cohort biomass ( COH ) and research survey biomass (RV) by age and by year. Residual values are represented by cells painted with varying shades of grey. A good fit is a medium to light shade. Poor fits i.e. black would indicate RV $\gg \mathrm{COH}$ while white shows $\mathrm{COH} \gg \mathrm{RV}$. For example, survey results do not provide a very good estimate of age 6 scallops that have been exploited for over 2 years, hence the cohort biomass for age 6 is much greater than survey estimates. The resulting residual has a large positive difference and age 6 'cells' tend to be white. Ages 3, not fished yet, tend to be relatively better represented in RV than COH , hence a tendency toward dark shades for age 3 cells. For the recent past the plot of residuals should have medium to light shades of grey. The 1991 column of cells has a very poor fit, $\mathrm{COH} \ggg$ RV, especially ages 4 and 5 (if we discount age 6), suggesting that the research survey results would have underestimated the stock. Ship time restrictions had curtailed the planned cruise tract and led to unrepresentative results. Despite the 1991 poor fit, the terminal $\mathrm{F}($ FQ4 $=0.14$ ) generated by the cohort biomass versus research survey tuning is in close agreement with the terminal $F$ generated by the cohort biomass versus CPUE tuning. Generally speaking, it might be more difficult to get a tight relationship in cohort biomass versus research survey tuning since only ages 3-7 are considered from survey results; they are the main age groups in the stock though. Also the selectivity of the research survey gear is not taken into account. The terminal FQ4 should be set at 0.13 when the relationship cohort biomass on CPUE explains $74 \%$ of the variability; the 1992 residual located very close to the regression line and the 1991 value in close proximity.

A Thompson-Bell type yield per recruit analysis with quarterly time steps is used to take into account the dynamic growth of the younger age groups of scallops. However, this method does not include the effects of blending. A change in fishing strategy to adapt to the 33 meat count regulation required a re-calculation of the yield per recruit in the 1988 stock evaluation (Mohn et al 1989) and redefinition of the partial recruitment pattern. Subsequently, the yield per recruit was reexamined but there was no need for a re-evaluation as the fishing strategy, hence partial recruitment remained practically the same. Improvements in the fishery in 1991-1992 required a re-evaluation as older age groups (>age 7) became more represented in the catch (Table 4).

The regulations in effect on the offshore fleet are that the catch should average no more than 33 meats per 500 grams which corresponds to an average weight of 15 grams per meat. Placing a limitation on the average instead of stipulating a minimum means that the fishermen may take small animals and then balance them with larger ones. Such a practice, called blending, renders the use of most yield models and stock projections inappropriate. If there are not enough larger animals to blend in, then the mortality on the small ones will have to be reduced. Thus, the partial recruitment is a function of abundance-at-age. In order to take this practice into account, a stock projection program was written (Mohn et al. 1984) in which the mortality on the animals beneath the stipulated average meat weight is adjusted until the mean weight of the catch is within $1 \%$ of the required average. The only other way in which this program differs from the normal stock projection is that the variables are updated quarterly. The annual growth is divided into quarterly components of $10,35,35$, and $20 \%$ and annual effort is partitioned into quarters by the rates of 20 , 35,30 , and $15 \%$, which reflects the 1992 fishery. The effort figure for the first quarter is twice the historical value; conversely, the second quarter usually had $50 \%$ of the annual effort. Since 1987 the annual distribution of effort has shifted markedly not only toward the beginning of the year but also in-between quarters. Selectivity for the stock projections follows the pattern of the fishery as revealed from the cohort analysis rather than that of the gear (Caddy 1972). Starting numbers-atage for the projections are derived by projecting ahead the fourth quarter cohort estimates of the present year to January of the next year.

Stock projections and fishing scenarios were carried out for different rates of $F$ including $F$ 0.1 and $\mathrm{F}_{\text {max }}$, to present TAC options and their respective implications on the stock biomass.

## RESULTS

## Research surveys

Sampling locations of the 1992 research survey are plotted in Figure 4. Station locations are indicated in the plot for age 6. No stations were allocated to the area deeper than 100 m as the catch data showed no commercial activity below this isobath. In years of good abundance, the fleet does not venture in these marginally exploitable areas. Research survey results for 1992 are high for each age (Table 7) except age 2. Age 2 scallops are not well estimated by the survey gear. Densities of ages 5, 6, and 7 have increased gradually in the recent past. Relatively speaking, 2 age 7 scallops per tow had not been observed since 1987. The strong pulse of the 1989 year class (age 3) is ranked second over the last decade. Good aggregations of age 3 are showing up over 2 main areas of the Bank (Fig. 4). Quantities of incoming age 4 are also important. All strata (Table 9) followed the same general trend on an age basis. The survey biomass of 1992 by volume estimation or aerial expansion is the highest recorded since 1981 (Tables 8a, b). On an age basis, there had been more age 4 biomass in 1986 (and more age 3 biomass in 1985). Fully recruited age groups (ages 5-6) have good biomass levels. The 1992 results cannot be compared to the previous year. The 1991 results are not representative because of the difficulties experienced in completing the survey.

## Cohort analysis

The SPA results are given in terms of numbers-at-age, biomass-at-age, and F-at-age (Tables 12 to 14); they have been combined into annual values from quarterly analysis for the terminal FQ4 level of 0.13 . In terms of numbers-at-age (Table 12), there has been improvements in the survival of older age groups (ages $7+$ ) since 1989 and it would appear that the 1988 year class be as important as the 1982 year class had been, the largest seen in the last 11 years. Stock biomass has been rising steadily over the last 5 years, up to $16,000 \mathrm{t}$ and may continue with the strong pulse of new recruits. F-at-age estimates show a shift in targeted ages from 1985 to 1986 with the drop in meat counts to 33 meats per 500 g forcing the targeted age to be of an older, bigger scallop while there is almost no fishing directed on age 3 . Age 5 is very strongly targeted; although there has been a slight reduction in 1991-92 compared to 1989-90. Over the last 5 years average $F$ values (ages $3-11$ ) have shown a certain degree of stability (range 0.32-0.37). The 1992 mean value has dropped slightly from 1991. However, the average $F$ values over the targetted ages 4 to 6 is higher, ranging between 0.62 and 0.75 over that period.

The quarterly based yield per recruit analysis uses mid-quarter meat weights and the quarterly expanded selectivity derived from the cohort analysis (See Mohn et al. 1987). The 1988 and 1989 assessments had an $F_{\max }$ which was estimated to be at an F of 0.97 and $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ at 0.59 . The 1992 estimate would be 1.097 for $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{max}}$ and 0.700 for $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$. The difference between the newly calculated values and the ones used previously should justify a recalculation of the yield per recruit model. The same selectivity is used in the cohort analysis, yield per recruit, and the stock projections (Table 15). The projections are carried out at Fo. 1 and Fmax using the numbers-at-age of the last quarter from the 1992 cohort analysis aged forward to the first quarter of 1993. The projections for a one year period assume a recruitment level of only 300 millions scallops to reflect the low densities observed in the research survey results and anecdotal information from the fleet. The partial recruitment vector used : 0.02, 0.45, 1.00, 0.43, 0.26, 0.18, 0.18, 0.16, and 0.09 compared to the vector determined in 1988:0.04, 0.52, 1.00, 0.63, 0.36, 0.21, 0.17, 0.10, and 0.05 are somewhat different (Fig. 8). The new vector is similar on the left (age 4), age 5 acting as the pivot, while the slope is steeper for ages 6 to 9 on the right side.

Projections at $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{max}}$ with a terminal $\mathrm{FQ}_{\mathrm{Q}}$ at 0.13 are $5,200 \mathrm{t}$ and $7,150 \mathrm{t}$ respectively (Table 15). The meat count will be met without difficulties; the mean weight of the catch being 16.5 g at its lowest value in the winter fishery. Under the assumed recruitment pattern, the projected biomass increases by $6 \%$ under $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ and decreases by $9 \%$ under the $\mathrm{F}_{\text {max }}$ scenario.

Other fishing scenarios are briefly presented in table 16. They encompass a wide range of catch levels and $F$ values. Keeping the TAC at the 1992 level, $6,200 \mathrm{t}$, would roughly be equivalent to the replacement yield scenario.

## CONCLUSIONS

Biomass, catches, and catch-rates have been rising steadily over the last five years (Tables 2 and 13); the 1992 CPUE decreased insignificantly. A build-up of biomass and good to strong 1988 and 1989 year classes are responsible for this rising trend in the fishery performance. Catches may still be on the rise in 1993 but it will be more difficult for the stock biomass to maintain this ascending pattern as the 1990 year class appears weak according to survey results.
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Table 1.- Estimated (pre-1985) catches (t of meats) from Georges Bank, NAFO subarea 5Zc. Since October 1984 the ICJ line separates fishing areas for both countries.

| Year | U.S.A. | Canada | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1957 | 3562 | 732 | 4294 |
| 1958 | 3024 | 1167 | 4191 |
| 1959 | 2601 | 2235 | 4836 |
| 1960 | 2008 | 2568 | 4576 |
| 1961 | 4472 | 4382 | 8854 |
| 1962 | 3200 | 5315 | 8515 |
| 1963 | 1953 | 5270 | 7223 |
| 1964 | 462 | 5034 | 5496 |
| 1965 | 24 | 3059 | 3083 |
| 1966 | 25 | 2537 | 2562 |
| 1967 | 34 | 3212 | 3246 |
| 1968 | 41 | 3904 | 3945 |
| 1969 | 97 | 3368 | 3465 |
| 1970 | 51 | 2868 | 2919 |
| 1971 | 3 | 2345 | 2348 |
| 1972 | 26 | 2746 | 2772 |
| 1973 | 5 | 1975 | 1980 |
| 1974 | 0 | 4541 | 4541 |
| 1975 | 0 | 6524 | 6524 |
| 1976 | 0 | 7809 | 7809 |
| 1977 | 77 | 11126 | 11203 |
| 1978 | 212 | 10970 | 11182 |
| 1979 | 314 | 7642 | 7956 |
| 1980 | 761 | 4751 | 5512 |
| 1981 | 2000 | 7612 | 9612 |
| 1982 | 1054 | 3918 | 4972 |
| 1983 | 714 | 2418 | 3132 |
| 1984 | 889 | 1945 | 2834 |
| 1985 | 0 | 3812 | 3812 |
| 1986 | 0 | 4900 | 4900 |
| 1987 | 0 | 6793 | 6793 |
| 1988 | 0 | 4336 | 4336 |
| 1989 | 0 | 4676 | 4676 |
| 1990 | 0 | 5218 | 5218 |
| 1991 | 0 | 5805 | 5805 |
| 1992 | 0 | 6151 | 6151 |
| Year | Recommended TAC | Set TAC | Catch |
| 1986 | --- | 4300 | 4900 |
| 1987 | 6500 | 6850 | 6793 |
| 1988 | 4800 | 5400 | 4336 |
| 1989 | 4700 | 4700 | 4676 |
| 1990 | 4800 | 5200 | 5218 |
| 1991 | 5200 | 5800 | 5805 |
| 1992 | 5800 | 6200 | 6151 |

Table 2.- Catch and effort data. Canadian catches (t of meats) in NAFO subarea 5Zc. Canadian total effort is derived from effort from Class 1 data.

|  | Catch | Effort |  |  | CPUE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | days | hours $10^{3}$ | $\operatorname{crhm}_{10^{3}}$ | $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{fd}{ }^{*}$ | kg/ $\mathrm{h}^{*}$ | $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$ |
| 1972 | 2746 | 5404 | 75 | 9220 | 508.14 | 36.61 | 0.298 |
| 1973 | 1975 | 3716 | 54 | 6333 | 531.49 | 36.67 | 0.312 |
| 1974 | 4541 | 6071 | 90 | 10810 | 747.98 | 50.46 | 0.420 |
| 1975 | 6524 | 7234 | 105 | 13389 | 901.85 | 62.13 | 0.487 |
| 1976 | 7809 | 6129 | 90 | 12222 | 1274.11 | 86.77 | 0.639 |
| 1977 | 11126 | 7386 | 82 | 11051 | 1506.36 | 135.68 | 1.007 |
| 1978 | 10970 | 7692 | 100 | 13686 | 1426.16 | 109.70 | 0.802 |
| 1979 | 7642 | 7327 | 105 | 14372 | 1042.99 | 72.78 | 0.532 |
| 1980 | 4751 | 6232 | 86 | 11785 | 762.36 | 55.24 | 0.403 |
| 1981 | 7612 | 8020 | 100 | 14484 | 949.13 | 76.12 | 0.526 |
| 1982 | 3918 | 5564 | 73 | 9977 | 704.17 | 53.67 | 0.393 |
| 1983 | 2418 | 4825 | 67 | 8690 | 501.14 | 36.09 | 0.278 |
| 1984 | 1945 | 5716 | 70 | 8598 | 340.27 | 27.79 | 0.226 |
| 1985 | 3812 | 7376 | 105 | 12644 | 516.81 | 36.31 | 0.301 |
| 1986 | 4900 | 3915 | 52 | 6957 | 1251.60 | 94.23 | 0.704 |
| 1987 | 6793 | 5736 | 78 | 10808 | 1184.27 | 87.09 | 0.629 |
| 1988 | 4336 | 5853 | 85 | 11283 | 740.82 | 51.01 | 0.385 |
| 1989 | 4676 | 5154 | 78 | 10774 | 907.26 | 59.96 | 0.434 |
| 1990 | 5218 | 4724 | 72 | 10570 | 1104.57 | 72.09 | 0.494 |
| 1991 | 5805 | 4272 | 66 | 9687 | 1358.90 | 88.40 | 0.599 |
| 1992 | 6151 | 4697 | 73 | 10957 | 1309.52 | 84.10 | 0.561 |

Table 3.- Monthly profile of the catch from NAFO Subarea 5 Zc from the frequency distribution of scallop meat weights for selected years.

| \% | catch examined <br> catch landed | meat weight (g) |  |  |  | n meats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | mean | min | max | s.e. |  |
| 1981 | 0.01306 |  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 |
| February |  | 8.96 | 3.26 | 53.21 | 0.06 | 1386 |
| March |  | 11.00 | 2.58 | 65.10 | 0.05 | 3673 |
| April |  | 10.19 | 4.70 | 54.38 | 0.08 | 402 |
| May |  | 11.56 | 3.37 | 76.60 | 0.02 | 19036 |
| June |  | 12.15 | 2.26 | 79.87 | 0.02 | 24514 |
| July |  | 11.44 | 2.55 | 73.25 | 0.02 | 16301 |
| August |  | 10.50 | 2.37 | 74.49 | 0.02 | 15204 |
| September |  | 9.90 | 2.23 | 59.09 | 0.03 | 4321 |
| October |  | 7.28 | 2.37 | 56.52 | 0.03 | 3165 |
| November |  | 8.13 | 2.10 | 54.47 | 0.03 | 4146 |
| December |  | 8.56 | 2.30 | 53.68 | 0.04 | 3004 |
| 1992 | 0.00532 |  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  | 16.81 | 6.68 | 50.99 | 0.07 | 1022 |
| February |  | 16.61 | 5.90 | 49.00 | 0.06 | 1287 |
| March |  | 16.49 | 4.33 | 49.69 | 0.04 | 2692 |
| April |  | 16.62 | 6.22 | 61.76 | 0.05 | 2480 |
| May |  | 16.71 | 5.76 | 62.80 | 0.09 | 837 |
| June |  | 17.51 | 6.85 | 43.54 | 0.08 | 817 |
| July |  | 16.91 | 8.07 | 51.74 | 0.07 | 886 |
| August |  | 16.81 | 6.08 | 58.48 | 0.05 | 2377 |
| September |  | 16.43 | 6.30 | 44.70 | 0.05 | 1323 |
| October |  | 15.94 | 5.12 | 51.62 | 0.04 | 3126 |
| November |  | 15.44 | 5.41 | 52.79 | 0.04 | 2576 |
| December |  | 15.69 | 6.91 | 47.64 | 0.08 | 535 |

Table 4- Frequencies of numbers at weight in 2-g intervals (normalized to 1000) by quarter for recent years

| Grams | 1989 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | 1990 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 |  | 15 | 7 | 0 | 28 |  | 50 | 10 | 15 | 18 |
| 9 |  | 90 | 52 | 0 | 133 |  | 161 | 57 | 76 | 83 |
| 11 |  | 191 | 157 | 0 | 208 |  | 221 | 134 | 151 | 146 |
| 13 |  | 218 | 230 | 0 | 201 |  | 195 | 178 | 178 | 158 |
| 15 |  | 159 | 211 | 0 | 154 |  | 133 | 155 | 152 | 146 |
| 17 |  | 96 | 141 | 0 | 94 |  | 86 | 128 | 123 | 117 |
| 19 |  | 67 | 78 | 0 | 67 |  | 56 | 95 | 86 | 86 |
| 21 |  | 46 | 42 | 0 | 42 |  | 37 | 79 | 63 | 71 |
| 23 |  | 36 | 28 | 0 | 26 |  | 22 | 52 | 49 | 49 |
| 25 |  | 23 | 15 | 0 | 17 |  | 13 | 39 | 36 | 36 |
| 27 |  | 17 | 13 | 0 | 11 |  | 8 | 25 | 21 | 24 |
| 29 |  | 9 | 6 | 0 | 4 |  | 4 | 14 | 16 | 19 |
| 31 |  | 8 | 6 | 0 | 5 |  | 3 | 11 | 11 | 13 |
| 33 |  | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| 35 |  | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| 37 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| 39 |  | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 41 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 43 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 45 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 47 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 49 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Grams | 1991 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | 1992 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 |  | 11 | 6 | 8 | 12 |  | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 |  | 73 | 45 | 58 | 70 |  | 41 | 60 | 43 | 59 |
| 11 |  | 147 | 140 | 150 | 121 |  | 112 | 151 | 121 | 160 |
| 13 |  | 170 | 210 | 184 | 147 |  | 188 | 201 | 176 | 218 |
| 15 |  | 148 | 177 | 167 | 139 |  | 191 | 168 | 182 | 186 |
| 17 |  | 131 | 117 | 132 | 133 |  | 158 | 106 | 147 | 128 |
| 19 |  | 105 | 76 | 95 | 114 |  | 107 | 83 | 103 | 89 |
| 21 |  | 68 | 53 | 66 | 76 |  | 68 | 47 | 80 | 49 |
| 23 |  | 41 | 39 | 50 | 53 |  | 49 | 42 | 46 | 33 |
| 25 |  | 30 | 29 | 22 | 35 |  | 26 | 34 | 33 | 18 |
| 27 |  | 19 | 20 | 16 | 20 |  | 17 | 29 | 18 | 15 |
| 29 |  | 17 | 22 | 14 | 16 |  | 13 | 18 | 15 | 8 |
| 31 |  | 12 | 13 | 6 | 12 |  | 8 | 13 | 9 | 7 |
| 33 |  | 8 | 12 | 8 | 11 |  | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| 35 |  | 5 | 10 | 4 | 6 |  | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| 37 |  | 5 | 7 | 6 | 9 |  | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 39 |  | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 |  | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 41 |  | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 43 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 45 |  | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 47 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 49 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5.- Frequencies of numbers at weight in 2-g intervals (normalized to 1000) by year.

| Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grams | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 66 | 96 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 7 | 110 | 205 | 112 | 6 | 17 | 28 | 14 | 24 | 9 | 8 |
| 9 | 118 | 169 | 211 | 41 | 79 | 98 | 83 | 96 | 60 | 51 |
| 11 | 125 | 108 | 197 | 125 | 150 | 163 | 179 | 164 | 139 | 137 |
| 13 | 111 | 69 | 136 | 209 | 175 | 179 | 219 | 177 | 181 | 197 |
| 15 | 190 | 55 | 87 | 225 | 168 | 152 | 182 | 146 | 159 | 182 |
| 17 | 70 | 46 | 57 | 160 | 129 | 104 | 117 | 113 | 127 | 135 |
| 19 | 53 | 41 | 42 | 96 | 89 | 75 | 72 | 80 | 95 | 95 |
| 21 | 44 | 37 | 30 | 55 | 59 | 54 | 43 | 62 | 64 | 60 |
| 23 | 36 | 30 | 21 | 28 | 44 | 36 | 30 | 43 | 44 | 42 |
| 25 | 27 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 29 | 27 | 18 | 30 | 29 | 27 |
| 27 | 23 | 20 | 13 | 11 | 18 | 22 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| 29 | 18 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 13 |
| 31 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 9 |
| 33 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 6 |
| 35 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| 37 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| 39 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 41 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 43 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 45 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 47 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 49 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 51 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 53 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 55 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 57 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 59 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 61 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 65 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 69 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 73 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 6.- Shell height (mm), meat weight ( g ) and meat count per 500 grams at age, biological and cohort. Height and weight as of first day of quarter.

| Biological age | Cohort age | Shell height | Meat weight | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Count } \\ & \text { /500g } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.25 | 3.00 | 61.23 | 3.11 | 161 |
| 2.50 | 3.25 | 63.22 | 3.44 | 145 |
| 2.75 | 3.50 | 74.57 | 5.73 | 87 |
| 3.00 | 3.75 | 83.13 | 8.03 | 62 |
| 3.25 | 4.00 | 87.30 | 9.34 | 54 |
| 3.50 | 4.25 | 89.23 | 10.00 | 50 |
| 3.75 | 4.50 | 96.26 | 12.64 | 40 |
| 4.00 | 4.75 | 102.35 | 15.29 | 33 |
| 4.25 | 5.00 | 105.51 | 16.80 | 30 |
| 4.50 | 5.25 | 107.02 | 17.55 | 28 |
| 4.75 | 5.50 | 111.60 | 19.99 | 25 |
| 5.00 | 5.75 | 115.81 | 22.42 | 22 |
| 5.25 | 6.00 | 118.08 | 23.81 | 21 |
| 5.50 | 6.25 | 119.18 | 24.50 | 20 |
| 5.75 | 6.50 | 122.23 | 26.49 | 19 |
| 6.00 | 6.75 | 125.13 | 28.49 | 18 |
| 6.25 | 7.00 | 126.72 | 29.63 | 17 |
| 6.50 | 7.25 | 127.50 | 30.20 | 17 |
| 6.75 | 7.50 | 129.55 | 31.73 | 16 |
| 7.00 | 7.75 | 131.54 | 33.26 | 15 |
| 7.25 | 8.00 | 132.65 | 34.13 | 15 |
| 7.50 | 8.25 | 133.19 | 34.57 | 14 |
| 7.75 | 8.50 | 134.58 | 35.69 | 14 |
| 8.00 | 8.75 | 135.94 | 36.82 | 14 |
| 8.25 | 9.00 | 136.70 | 37.47 | 13 |
| 8.50 | 9.25 | 137.08 | 37.79 | 13 |
| 8.75 | 9.50 | 138.03 | 38.60 | 13 |
| 9.00 | 9.75 | 138.96 | 39.41 | 13 |
| 9.25 | 10.00 | 139.48 | 39.88 | 13 |
| 9.50 | 10.25 | 139.74 | 40.11 | 12 |
| 9.75 | 10.50 | 140.39 | 40.68 | 12 |
| 10.00 | 10.75 | 141.02 | 41.26 | 12 |
| 10.25 | 11.00 | 141.38 | 41.58 | 12 |
| 10.50 | 11.25 | 141.56 | 41.75 | 12 |
| 10.75 | 11.50 | 142.00 | 42.15 | 12 |
| 11.00 | 11.75 | 142.44 | 42.55 | 12 |

Table 7.- Total weighted average (by stratum) number of scallops at age per tow.

| Sampling dates |  | Age (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | $10^{+}$ |
| 1981 | 177 | 191 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1982 | 26 | 49 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1983 | 44 | 31 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1984 | 271 | 35 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1985 | 104 | 206 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1986 | 198 | 136 | 145 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1987 | 94 | 98 | 63 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1988 | 98 | 110 | 52 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1989 | 117 | 131 | 71 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1990 | 105 | 89 | 39 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1991 | 359 | 103 | 49 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1992 | 83 | 195 | 108 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 8a.- Indices of abundance of scallop age-classes by volume estimates: numbers-at-age $\left(10^{6}\right)$, minimum dredgeable biomass at survey time ( t of meats).

| Sampling <br> dates |  | Age (years) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Biomass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 279.47 | 53.60 | 9.34 | 3.48 | 2965 |  |
| 1982 | 121.76 | 56.95 | 15.47 | 3.43 | 2056 |  |
| 1983 | 99.32 | 50.76 | 14.31 | 5.28 | 1841 |  |
| 1984 | 85.74 | 30.32 | 8.08 | 2.21 | 1245 |  |
| 1985 | 557.64 | 45.29 | 5.88 | 1.26 | 4628 |  |
| 1986 | 309.16 | 225.53 | 26.46 | 3.81 | 5942 |  |
| 1987 | 214.58 | 145.50 | 41.78 | 11.27 | 4704 |  |
| 1988 | 238.53 | 105.06 | 23.45 | 5.05 | 3744 |  |
| 1989 | 266.38 | 161.01 | 31.79 | 5.24 | 4899 |  |
| 1990 | 188.70 | 72.16 | 31.18 | 8.72 | 3207 |  |
| 1991 | 158.67 | 89.56 | 29.10 | 7.79 | 3174 |  |
| 1992 | 347.56 | 188.88 | 40.19 | 11.89 | 6209 |  |

Table 8b.- Minimum dredgeable biomass at age (t of meats) using aerial expansion as per number of scallops per standard tow. Weights at age for the middle of the third quarter (August) are used.

| Sampling | Age (years) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Total biomass |
| 1981 | 3,435.56 | 876.56 | 277.26 | 143.74 | 4,733.12 |
| 1982 | 881.37 | 840.04 | 332.71 | 71.87 | 2,126.00 |
| 1983 | 557.60 | 657.42 | 277.26 | 71.87 | 1,564.15 |
| 1984 | 629.55 | 511.33 | 166.36 | 71.87 | 1,379.11 |
| 1985 | 3,705.36 | 657.42 | 110.90 | 35.94 | 4,509.63 |
| 1986 | 2,446.25 | 5,295.89 | 665.36 | 71.75 | 8,479.25 |
| 1987 | 1,762.72 | 2,301.00 | 942.78 | 359.29 | 5,365.79 |
| 1988 | 1,978.62 | 1,899.22 | 554.43 | 143.77 | 4,576.04 |
| 1989 | 2,356.33 | 2,593.11 | 720.93 | 143.77 | 5,814.14 |
| 1990 | 1,600.84 | 1,424.38 | 831.86 | 287.55 | 4,144.63 |
| 1991 | 1,852.68 | 1,789.70 | 720.93 | 215.52 | 4,578.83 |
| 1992 | 3,507.50 | 3,944.53 | 1,275.39 | 431.22 | 9,158.65 |

Table 9.- Stratified average number of scallops at age per tow and stratified total number of scallops per tow, N .

| Stratum | Sampling dates | Age (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $N$ | s.e. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10+ |  |  |
| Very low | 1988 | 39 | 104 | 67 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 104 |
|  | 1989 | 50 | 55 | 95 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 64 |
|  | 1990 | 40 | 41 | 33 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 34 |
|  | 1991 | 132 | 15 | 21 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 121 |
|  | 1992 | 22 | 105 | 86 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 143 |
| Low | 1988 | 50 | 116 | 57 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 52 |
|  | 1989 | 44 | 68 | 73 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 77 |
|  | 1990 | 70 | 39 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 61 |
|  | 1991 | 411 | 49 | 40 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 532 | 165 |
|  | 1992 | 32 | 86 | 72 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 74 |
| Medium | 1988 | 17 | 45 | 37 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 39 |
|  | 1989 | 155 | 143 | 88 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 96 |
|  | 1990 | 105 | 142 | 21 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 116 |
|  | 1991 | 378 | 95 | 53 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 555 | 166 |
|  | 1992 | 56 | 167 | 92 | 44 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 372 | 67 |
| High | 1988 | 141 | 113 |  | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |  |
|  | 1989 | 138 | 161 | 57 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 51 |
|  | 1990 | 131 | 99 | 47 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 32 |
|  | 1991 | 305 | 68 | 43 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 | 153 |
|  | 1992 | 85 | 171 | 104 | 19 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 47 |
| Very high | 1991 | 408 | 157 | 58 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 672 | 142 |
|  | 1992 | 111 | 263 | 127 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 521 | 74 |

Table 10. - Tuning criteria for the regressions of cohort biomass on CPUE's and on research survey biomass estimates and of
fishing mortality on effort for selected $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$, from 0.08 to 0.18 .

|  | CPUE(hour) |  |  | Research Survey Biomass |  |  | Effort (hours) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {Q4 }}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1991* | 1992* | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1991* | 1992* | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1991* | 1992* |
| 0.08 | 0.742 | -570 | -5888 | 0.522 | -6182 | -5071 | 0.542 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| 0.09 | 0.759 | 223 | -4100 | 0.545 | -5315 | -3876 | 0.533 | -0.01 | 0.07 |
| 0.10 | 0.764 | 857 | -2669 | 0.565 | -4621 | -2920 | 0.523 | -0.02 | 0.05 |
| 0.11 | 0.762 | 1376 | -1499 | 0.583 | -4054 | -2138 | 0.511 | -0.03 | 0.03 |
| 0.12 | 0.754 | 1809 | -523 | 0.597 | -3581 | -1487 | 0.498 | -0.04 | 0.01 |
| 0.13 | 0.743 | 2175 | 302 | 0.606 | -3181 | -936 | 0.484 | -0.05 | 0.00 |
| 0.14 | 0.732 | 2488 | 1009 | 0.608 | -2838 | -463 | 0.468 | -0.06 | -0.02 |
| 0.15 | 0.720 | 2760 | 1622 | 0.604 | -2541 | -54 | 0.451 | -0.07 | -0.03 |
| 0.16 | 0.708 | 2998 | 2158 | 0.592 | -2281 | 304 | 0.434 | -0.08 | -0.05 |
| 0.17 | 0.696 | 3207 | 2631 | 0.572 | -2052 | 620 | 0.416 | -0.09 | -0.07 |
| 0.18 | 0.685 | 3394 | 3052 | 0.547 | -1848 | 901 | 0.398 | -0.09 | -0.08 |

*Residual value with respect to regression line

Table 11.- Catch-at-age in numbers $\left(10^{6}\right)$ east of the ICJ line.

| Ages | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12.- Population numbers (at beginning of the first quarter) ( $10^{6}$ ) east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ of 0.13 .

|  | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 438 | 619 | 556 |
| 4 | 428 | 385 | 549 |
| 5 | 185 | 224 | 205 |
| 6 | 38 | 51 | 71 |
| 7 | 37 | 22 | 29 |
| 8 | 33 | 26 | 15 |
| 9 | 15 | 25 | 18 |
| 10 | 14 | 12 | 17 |
| 11 | 5 | 12 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1194 | 1377 | 1467 |

Table 13.- Biomass Q2 (t of meats) east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{O} 4}$ of 0.13 .

| Ages | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 2145 | 2324 | 3250 | 5298 | 5574 | 3447 | 2184 | 1838 | 3909 |
| 4 | 1733 | 2210 | 3424 | 4858 | 7394 | 10227 | 5449 | 3383 | 3217 |
| 5 | 1997 | 1208 | 2007 | 1963 | 2852 | 4937 | 5481 | 2741 | 1879 |
| 6 | 251 | 1778 | 1131 | 1540 | 1320 | 1591 | 3032 | 2700 | 1181 |
| 7 | 341 | 184 | 1851 | 1074 | 1467 | 1037 | 1333 | 1488 | 1815 |
| 8 | 51 | 303 | 165 | 1813 | 1025 | 1305 | 897 | 608 | 827 |
| 9 | 32 | 32 | 286 | 145 | 1735 | 914 | 1190 | 455 | 331 |
| 10 | 16 | 22 | 23 | 262 | 124 | 1549 | 812 | 791 | 241 |
| 11 | 13 | 9 | 16 | 14 | 237 | 67 | 1396 | 473 | 563 |
| Total | 6579 | 8070 | 12154 | 16968 | 21729 | 25074 | 21773 | 14477 | 13963 |


| Ages | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 2891 | 1038 | 909 | 1941 | 2779 | 1895 | 1542 | 1938 | 2191 |
| 4 | 6637 | 3224 | 1534 | 1718 | 3620 | 5476 | 4021 | 3134 | 3873 |
| 5 | 1854 | 2345 | 1852 | 1125 | 1433 | 2868 | 4067 | 2818 | 2197 |
| 6 | 768 | 707 | 1048 | 1068 | 689 | 893 | 967 | 1742 | 1356 |
| 7 | 723 | 422 | 450 | 737 | 660 | 433 | 679 | 736 | 1301 |
| 8 | 1447 | 518 | 255 | 345 | 525 | 361 | 343 | 624 | 601 |
| 9 | 574 | 1259 | 397 | 168 | 282 | 378 | 277 | 278 | 577 |
| 10 | 200 | 425 | 1089 | 291 | 113 | 224 | 326 | 171 | 227 |
| 11 | 126 | 109 | 299 | 892 | 224 | 64 | 202 | 253 | 92 |
| Total | 15220 | 10048 | 7834 | 8287 | 10325 | 12594 | 12424 | 11695 | 12416 |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1956 | 2767 | 2486 |
| 5 | 4023 | 4027 | 5847 |
| 6 | 2383 | 3292 | 2916 |
| 7 | 870 | 1161 | 1620 |
| 8 | 1058 | 625 | 813 |
| 9 | 1103 | 830 | 484 |
| 10 | 546 | 894 | 640 |
| 11 | 541 | 464 | 631 |
|  | 202 | 491 | 341 |
| Total | 12682 | 14551 | 15778 |

Table 14.- Annualised fishing mortality east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{O} 4}$ of 0.13 .

| Ages | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 0.73 | 0.36 | 0.33 | 0.42 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.17 |
| 4 | 0.85 | 0.52 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.78 | 0.97 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 0.92 |
| 5 | 0.35 | 0.29 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.98 | 1.17 | 1.10 |
| 6 | 0.43 | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.36 | 0.24 | 0.84 | 0.52 | 0.56 |
| 7 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.84 | 0.63 | 0.24 |
| 8 | 0.46 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.69 | 0.60 | 0.31 |
| 9 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.39 | 0.60 | 0.39 |
| 10 | 0.45 | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.50 | 0.28 | 0.51 |
| 11 | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.30 | 0.37 | 0.15 |
| Mean | 0.45 | 0.25 | 0.32 | 0.29 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.65 | 0.60 | 0.48 |
| Ages | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 |
| 3 | 0.65 | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| 4 | 1.44 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.59 | 0.62 | 0.49 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 0.60 |
| 5 | 1.21 | 1.11 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.68 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 0.92 | 1.26 |
| 6 | 0.72 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.35 | 0.46 | 0.37 | 0.39 |
| 7 | 0.39 | 0.57 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.63 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.22 |
| 8 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.09 |
| 9 | 0.30 | 0.11 | 0.23 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.43 | 0.17 | 0.02 |
| 10 | 0.62 | 0.29 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0.54 | 0.07 |
| 11 | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.43 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.27 |
| Mean | 0.69 | 0.52 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.42 | 0.29 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.33 |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| 4 | 0.55 | 0.53 | 0.43 |
| 5 | 1.18 | 1.04 | 1.09 |
| 6 | 0.46 | 0.49 | 0.47 |
| 7 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.29 |
| 8 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.18 |
| 9 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 0.19 |
| 10 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.25 |
| 11 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.15 |
| Mean | 0.32 | 0.37 | 0.34 |

Table 15 .-Stock projections at $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}(0.700)$ and at $\mathrm{F}_{\max }$ (1.097) using starting numbers from cohort analysis with a terminal $F_{Q 4}$ of 0.13 .

| $\mathrm{F}=0.700$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 1}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 2}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 3}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate on smalls | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mean Wgt. Catch | 16.54 | 17.23 | 18.70 | 22.91 |
| Catch (Mill.) | 62.01 | 103.93 | 85.78 | 34.66 |
| Catch (t) | 1,026 | 1,791 | 1,604 | 794 |
| Cum. Catch (t) | 1,026 | 2,817 | 4,421 | 5,215 |
| Biomass | 16,360 | 16,641 | 16,364 | 17,058 |


| $\mathrm{F}=1.097$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 1}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 2}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 3}$ | $1993_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate on smalls | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mean Wgt. Catch | 16.52 | 17.14 | 18.49 | 22.73 |
| Catch (Mill.) | 94.41 | 147.59 | 113.58 | 43.13 |
| Catch (t) | 1,560 | 2,529 | 2,100 | 980 |
| Cum. Catch (t) | 1,560 | 4,089 | 6,189 | 7,169 |
| Biomass | 15,783 | 15,170 | 14,250 | 14,754 |

Table 16.- Fishing scenarios established for 1993 given different options of fishing mortality rate. Biomass figures are for the end of 1993. Catch figures are rounded off to the nearest 50 t .

| No. | Options | Fvalues | Biomass (t) | Catch (t) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ | 0.70 | 17,058 | 5,200 |
| 2 | Freplacement yield | 0.86 | 16,044 | 6,100 |
| 3 | $\begin{array}{r} F_{1992} \\ \text { TAC } \end{array}$ | 0.89 | 15,880 | 6,200 |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & F_{1992} \\ & \text { effort } \end{aligned}$ | 1.09 | 14,790 | 7,150 |
| 5 | $F_{\text {max }}$ | 1.10 | 14,754 | 7,150 |




Figure 1.- Monthly CPUE (filled square) and catch in tons of meats (open square) for the deep-sea fleet fishing Georges Bank.


Figure 2.- Isopleths of catch levels on Georges Bank for 1992. The scale of grey shades is ascending up to $10+t$ of meats per one-minute square.


Figure 3.- Catch-rates encountered on Georges Bank in 1992. The scale of grey shades represents an ascending catch-rate up to $2+\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$.
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Figure 4.- Scallop distribution according to age from the research survey of August 1992. Location of sampling stations is indicated on the graph for age 6 scallops. The shading scale represents number of scallops per standard tow.


Figure 5.- Relationship between survey biomass for recruited ages 4-6 computed by aerial expansion and by volume estimates for the period 1981 to 1992.


Figure 6.- Cohort biomass ( t of meats) versus CPUE ( $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{h}$ ) and cohort biomass versus research survey biomass ( $t$ of meats) using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q4}}$ as shown.


Figure 7.- Plot of residuals between cohort biomass ( COH ) and research survey biomass (RV) by year and by age. On the x-axis, values 1 to 12 corresponds to 1981 survey to 1992 survey. On the y-axis, values 1 to 4 corresponds to ages 3 to 6 . Each age in each survey year is represented by a cell painted a different shade of grey depending on the difference of residuals. (See text)

## Sel vector



Figure 8.- Comparison of the partial recruitment vector from the 1988 stock assessment, "old" (data 1986-88) and the "new" vector established from the 1992 stock assessment data (1990-92).

