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#### Abstract

Georges Bank 1993 catches were similar to 1992 catches ( 6,183 vs 6,151 t); the TAC was kept at the same level ( $6,200 \mathrm{t}$ ). The set TAC was not the highest available option. Industry considered it more appropriate given the potential weakness of the 1990 and 1991 year classes and such effects on future catches. The relatively abundant 1988 and 1989 year classes are the main components of the catch and are reflected in the above average catch-rates encountered throughout 1993. Research survey results indicate that the 1989 year class might not be as strong as first indicated. It would also appear that the 1991 year class (age 2 prerecruits) occurs at very low densities in the southern portion of the Bank.

According to VPA, fishing mortality rates on the targetted age group (ages 4-6) are quite high, averaging 0.77 over the last 5 years. Given the likelihood of decreasing recruitment, $F$ could increase to maintain catches at the 1992-93 levels, one of the possible options. The stock biomass which had been rising gradually since 1989, will decline due to low recruitment and fishing pressure.


## RESUME

Les prises du banc Georges en 1993 furent similaires a celles de 1992 ( 6,183 vs 6,151 t); le TPA demeura le méme ( $6,200 \mathrm{t}$ ). Des options disponibles, le TPA établi n'était pas le plus élevé. L'Industrie jugea cette option plus approprié étant donné la possibilité de classes d'age faibles en 1990 et en 1991 et les effets sur les prises futures. Les classes d'ages de 1988 et 1989, relativement abundantes, sont les principales composantes des captures et se refletent dans les taux de capture au-dessus de la normale tout au cours de 1993. L'inventaire du stock indique que la classe d'age de 1989 n'est peut-être pas aussi robuste qu'observee précédemment. II semblerait de plus que la classe d'age de 1991 (prérecrues d'age 2) est de tres faible densité dans la région sud du Banc.

D'apres l'APV, les taux de mortalité dú a la pêche sur le groupe d'age ciblé (ages 4-6) sont quelque peu élevés, en moyenne 0.77 durant les 5 dernieres années. F pourrait augmenter pour garder les prises au niveau de 1992 - 1993, une des options disponibles, vu la possibilité de recrutement moins fort. La biomasse du stock qui avait agrandi graduellement depuis 1989 va diminuer a cause du bas recrutement et de l'intensité de la péche.

## 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 (Fig. 1). 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 $11,000 \mathrm{t}$ (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. There were 77 active license holders in 1984. In 1993, 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.

Over the last 3 years, TAC's and catches have been maintained around 6,000 t; 1993 recorded the second highest catches since 1986 (Table 1). Although TAC options presented to industry went up to 7,150 t for 1993 (Robert et al. MS 1993), the offshore scallop fleet sector recommended a $6,200 \mathrm{t}$ TAC, the same level as in 1992. A cautious approach was based on indications from survey results of potentially poor recruitment from the 1990 and 1991 year classes. The 1993 TAC was set at $6,200 \mathrm{t}$.

A fairly large portion of catches, $25 \%$, came from the first quarter of 1993. This is the second time in recent years that winter catches are more than double the traditional levels for the first quarter. Concurrently, catch-rates are excellent; on an annual basis, values for the 1990's are in the medium to high range (Table 2). The 1993 rates, $15 \%$ higher than 1992, recovered from the slight dip from 1991 to 1992. Monthly variations have been relatively moderate. From record values during the summer of 1992, CPUE's experienced a seasonal drop in the fall related to spawning (Fig. 2). The biomass present allowed for a strong rebound which maintained rates above $0.6 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$ throughout the winter of 1993. Catch-rates declined smoothly for the remainder of 1993. A closer look at the geographical distribution of the 1993 CPUE's (Fig. 3) shows the area with rates over $1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$ extending farther to the east and south than in 1992 (Robert et al. MS 1993); it is also more fragmented. The monthly profile of scallop meat weight is very uniform in 1993 (Table 3). The drop in meat weight, when a new year class recruits to the fishery is not noticeable in the fall of 1993. The reduced presence of small meats is shown by the remarkably low frequencies in the 7 and $9-g$ interval in the quarterly distribution of meat weights from the catch (Table 4). The abundant 1989 year class is located in the $15-\mathrm{g}+$ interval.

## 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 $(\mathrm{kg})$ per fishing day, per hour, and per crew-hour-meter. Catch per fd is 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 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{h}$ 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. High catch-rates encountered recently are not necessarily suitable for comparison with high values of the late 1970's. Technological changes in the localisation of scallop beds and operational procedures at sea coupled with quite different management regimes, especially meat count and limit on removals, influence the conduct of the fishery compared to 15 years ago.

Size distributions of meats from the commercial fleet are derived from port samples. Only one or two company fleet(s) have regularly contributed the information. An experimental program is under way to determine if there would be a difference in catch meat weight profile with sampling extended to all companies given their different fishing strategies. 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. Table 5 lists the frequency distribution on an annual basis. There has been a gradual shift toward larger meats in the catch over the last 10 years, reflecting the implementation of a lower meat count in 1986. More recently, it would appear that the 1993 catch was focussed on fewer size groups with very few meats under 10 g and considerably fewer meats over 30 g .

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 MS 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).

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 1 st , 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 1993. 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. Both in 1992 and 1993, $40 \%$ 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 $10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{crhm}$. This 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).

The area surveyed varies to some extent from year to year, given the spatial distribution of scallop beds exploited. Figure 5 plots survey locations on an annual basis from 1981 to 1993. Each map also shows an area (dashed line polygon) represented by locations surveyed every year; this area of common coverage is defined as a minimum polygon. Over the 13 -year period, the minimum polygon area (Fig. 6) covered $50 \%$ of the total area surveyed at one point or another. Relative abundance estimates (volume estimates) may also be computed for the minimum polygon (Table 8b) as for each annual survey area (Table 8a).

Biomass indices (Table 8c) 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 $93 \%$ between survey biomass indices for recruited ages 4 to 6 determined by volume estimates of area surveyed and the biomass computed by aerial expansion of stratified means (Fig. 7).

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 1993. This pattern, multiplied by the F determined from tuning for the last quarter year ( $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q4}}$ 1993), was used as a
starting vector for the quarterly cohort analysis.
Since analytical assessments have been carried out for Georges Bank scallops (Mohn et al. MS 1984), natural mortality had been set at .025 per quarter ( $M=0.1$ on an annual basis) and no attempt was made to include a seasonal, age or time dependent effects. It was felt appropriate to investigate other possible estimates for natural mortality. The rationale behind its present value lies in fieldwork investigations undertaken by Dickie (1955) in the Bay of Fundy, Merrill and Posgay (1964) for Georges Bank and more recently, MacDonald and Thompson (1986) in Newfoundland. The last authors established that $M$ was levelling off at 0.1 for adult age groups to rise slowly at age 11 and older. Several indirect methods of estimating M are reviewed in Rivard (1988), Sinclair et al. (1990), and Vetter (1988). A number of methods revolve around the analysis of catch data while others try to correlate $M$ with other life history parameters. Catch curve analyses can seriously bias the estimation of $M$ when some assumptions (recruitment, random sample, catchability, $M$ independent of age) are not met. Analyses of commercial and research survey catch data from Georges Bank were not successful. Too many assumptions could not be adhered to: recruitment is far from uniform; constant catchability does not apply to the catch; M according to field investigations varies with age, to mention a few. Research survey data show fluctuations in recruitment of more than 10 fold. The targeting of specific size groups in the scallop fishery most seriously violate the assumption of catchability. Using molluscan data Hoenig (1983) has correlated mortality rate with maximum observed age for unexploited or lightly exploited stocks. Following his method and estimating 25 to 30 years for maximum age would put $M$ at 0.18 to 0.15 respectively. The figure for maximum age is derived from the catch-at-age data where under $1 \%$ of meats sampled would reach that age. Pauly (1980) predicts M from growth parameters and mean water temperature for finfish. For temperatures around 10-12 C and Browns (1972) growth equation for Georges Bank scallops would give values for M of 0.7 and 1.5. Pauly's empirical equation may apply to finfish but not necessarily to shellfish. Orensanz et al. (1991) cautions that these equations can only provide very rough estimates. By using indirect derivatives, a $Z$ value is arrived at, but $Z$ has still to be partitioned between F and M. Furthermore, Vetter (1988) warns about the complex effects of different estimations of $M$ and their assumptions on fishery models. The effects were generally a function of both the values of $F$ and $M$. We concluded that a $M$ value of 0.1 , as established by field investigations of several researchers, was more appropriate than theoritical estimations relying on assumptions that could not be met.

The SPA is tuned against a number of independent, and sometimes contradictory, sets of observations. The most important are the commercial CPUE and research survey estimates. $F$ versus effort is sometimes useful in the tuning process.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 (Fig. 8), 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.) In addition to tuning for cohort biomass (ages 3-11), iterations were carried out on cohort numbers ages 4 to 6 and biomass for those 3 ages. Since 1986, ages 4 to 6 represent $50 \%$ or more of the animals in the stock compared to the other ages. Fishable biomass was also tuned against CPUE.

For the purposes of tuning, the terminal $F$ (quarterly rate) ranged from 0.05 to 0.15 (Table 10). If fishable biomass were excluded from the tuning process, the minimum terminal $F$ value used could have been increased from 0.05 to 0.08 . Tuning of cohort biomass on research survey biomass within the minimum polygon was also excluded. It gave a poorer fit than survey biomass estimates over the survey area. Depending on the year, a scallop bed or portion thereof may contribute to the stock biomass under exploitation but not be included in the minimum polygon. Regression of cohort biomass on CPUE: the maximum correlation coefficient, 0.772 , for the regression of cohort biomass on CPUE corresponded to an FQ4 of 0.07; the residual (1993)
crosses the regression line closer to 0.08 . Cohort ages 4-6 on CPUE: cohort numbers and biomass for ages 4 to 6 regressions have higher correlation coefficient, 88 and $89 \%$ for very similar terminal F's. Residual points come very close to the line at $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}=0.10$. Cohort biomass on research survey biomass: the maximum correlation coefficient is only of the order of 0.62. While the 1992 residual crosses the line at 0.10 , the 1993 residual is at 0.15 . F versus effort: contrary to the tuning variables presented so far, there is a poor fit for a maximum correlation coefficient under the selected FQ4's but the 1993 residual is right on the regression line at the same FQ4 than for cohort ages 4 to 6 vs CPUE tuning (Table 10). The correlation coefficient is then of lower value, around 47 \%. Fishable biomass on CPUE: the correlation coefficient is somewhat intermediate when residual points come near the line at a low FQ4 (0.05) compared to the other tuning variables. The residual points of the last two year's data and the correlation coefficient were used as tuning criteria. The highest variability, close to $90 \%$, could be explained by CPUE versus specific ages in the cohort. High values were also maintained when the residual points for the last two years were very small. The positive residual values in table 10 denote that the residual points 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. This also holds true for regression of ages 4 to 6 and for fishable biomass 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.

Strong correlations between CPUE and different cohort variables occurred at an FQ4 in the vicinity of 0.10 . When all ages were considered in the cohort analysis, $76 \%$ of the variability could be explained when the last two residual points were very small at a terminal $F$ equal to 0.08 (Table 10 and Fig. 9). More of the variability could be explained when focussing on the ages targeted by the fishery, namely ages 4 to 6 . In terms of biomass, almost $90 \%$ of the variability related to CPUE as the tuning factor and the 1993 residual comes very close to the regression line at an FQ4 equal to 0.10 (Fig. 9 middle). This value for a terminal $F$ is supported when the cohort biomass is regressed against the research surveys and with F versus effort. At an FQ4 of 0.10 in the cohort versus research biomass, the 1992 residual crosses the line but not the 1993 residual. Plotting residuals between cohort biomass and research survey biomass for 1993, shows the underrepresentation of ages 4 and under in the survey; confirming suspicions that the survey gear was, at times, not fishing properly. Tuning with the 1993 residual as prime factor would also mean that the 1991 point would go below the line (positive residual). It has been established previously (Robert et al. MS 1993) that the 1991 survey had in all probabilities underestimated the stock biomass at the time. Generally speaking, it might be more difficult to get a tight relationship in cohort biomass versus research survey tuning since only ages 3-6 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 data also applies to the third quarter of the year. Although less than $50 \%$ of the variability between $F$ and effort could be explained by the regression, it too was placing the most recent residual point on the line with an FQ4 of 0.10 (Fig. 9). Given the low value for terminal $F(0.05)$ generated by the regression fishable biomass on CPUE compared to the other tuning variables used, it is not considered further in the analysis.

A sequential population analysis using Non Linear Least Square Regression (NLLS) (ADAPT, Gavaris 1988) was also attempted. Data used are identical to data used in the linear regressions. Residuals were log transformed. The independent estimates selected to carry out NLLS were annual and quarterly values of CPUE and research surveys indices. At times NLLS would not find a solution to minimise residual(s), especially when estimating multiples parameters ( $F$ for different ages for example). A Partitioned Search was then used. NLLS would be computed for value(s) incremented over small intervals within a preset narrow range of values for the parameters to be estimated. This was not necessarily helpful in all situations.

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

MS 1989) and redefinition of the partial recruitment pattern. Subsequently, the yield per recruit was re-examined 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. MS 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 25 , 40,20 , and $15 \%$, which reflects the fishery in the last four years. Although the first half of the year has traditionally experienced $50 \%$ or more of the annual effort, the effort in the first quarter used to be in the order of $10 \%$. In recent years the effort figure for the first quarter has been twice to three times the historical value. With the implementation of EA's in 1986, the annual distribution of effort has shifted markedly not only toward the beginning of the year but also in-between quarters. Companies are aligning fishing plans more closely to particular market demands. 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-at-age for the projections are derived by projecting ahead the fourth quarter cohort estimates of the present year to January of the next year. Recruitment is estimated according to the relative densities of prerecruits observed in the stock survey.

Stock projections and fishing scenarios under the current meat count were carried out for different rates of $F$ including $F 0.1$ and $F$ max, to present TAC options and their respective implications on the stock biomass.

## RESULTS

Research surveys

Sampling locations of the 1993 research survey are plotted in Figure 4. Station locations are indicated in the plot for age 6. As in 1992 all reported catch activity took place above 100 m ; therefore, no stations were allocated to the area deeper than 100 m . In years of good abundance, the fleet does not venture in these marginally exploitable areas. The 1993 survey shows that the abundance of recruited ages (4+) is good to excellent (Table 7). Recent rebuilding of the stock has allowed the observation of age 8 scallops in 3 of the 5 strata (Table 9); numbers at age 7 are also on the rise. The 1988 year class (age 5) of moderate to high abundance in previous surveys suffered an important decrease; nevertheless the number of age 5 left is comparatively high. Previous surveys were indicating that the 1989 year class (age 4) was strong. The 1993 survey contradicts that somewhat. It is possible that aggregations (total or partial) of age 4 scallops might not have been sampled. The abundance-at-age for prerecruits is abnormally low. Because of difficulties with the survey gear at times, it is questionable whether prerecruit abundance is representative. However, it is indicative of a declining trend in recruitment following the 1988 and 1989 year classes. The presence of age 2 scallops was not observed throughout the southern portion of the Bank, representing $37 \%$ of the sampling locations. Biomass indices derived from volume estimation or aerial expansion (Tables $8 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{c}$ ) also reflects the decrease in biomass of commercial ages related to exploitation and declining recruitment.

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 $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ level of 0.10 . From a population numbers point of view (Table 12), the last 3 years see the passage of the 1988 and 1989 year classes into the population, the 1989 year class being larger than 1988. Relatively speaking, both would be comparable to the 1978 and 1982 year classes. The biomass profile has been increasing over the last 6 years (Table 13) although within a small range. Table 14 presents a series of annualised fishing mortality. The series is decomposed into segments in Fig. 10. The fishing mortality at age 3 (F3) had peaked in 1981 when the meat count regulation had been relaxed and the strong 1978 year class was recruiting to the fishery. Nowadays, F3 has come down to very low levels with the targetting of older ages. The mean F on all ages (F3-11) has varied little since 1986. The average value for 1987 to 1993 equals 0.36 . The drop in F for 1993 might not be as important, 1993 being the last data point in the cohort generating exercise. The same is true for F 4-6. Ages 4 to 6 are the main age groups in the catch matrix. F4-6 is much higher generally speaking; after a dip in 1988, it has averaged 0.77 over the last 5 years.

Selected results of sequential population analysis using NLLS are given in the appendix. Quite often, NLLS cannot find a minimum residual given the independent estimates and parameters to be estimated. The estimation of multiple parameters may generate invalid values, see the very high coefficients of variation in the first example. According to the correlation matrix, there are very strong relationships between the parameters. It would appear that NLLS may work better when estimating a single parameter, F at age 5 in selected examples. In this case a partitioned search did not improve the estimated value of $F$ at age 5 by much, from 0.098 to 0.096 , with annual CPUE as independent estimate. Yet, with CPUE and research survey indices as independent estimates, NLLS could not estimate a single parameter. Results from the NLLS iterations would indicate that NLLS has difficulties fitting the present set of data.

Population variables were also iterated with annualised values of $M$ equal to 0.15 and 0.18 . The same tuning criteria were used to establish a terminal $F$ for the last quarter. Biomass at the end of 1993 are given as a comparative point. The biomass corresponding to $\mathrm{FQ}_{\mathrm{Q}}=0.10$ is included for reference.

| $M_{Q,(\text { annual })}$ | FQ4 | Biomass (t) at the end of 1993 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0.025,(0.10)$ | 0.10 | 15,009 |
| $0.038,(0.15)$ | 0.09 | 16,732 |
| $0.045,(0.18)$ | 0.09 | 16,793 |

For a same value of $F$, a larger $M$ rate has the net effect of generating a higher stock biomass figure. The differences in biomass referring to a higher M, derived from life history parameters, are 11 and $12 \%$ larger compared to the biomass with $M$ equal to 0.10 .

The quarterly based yield per recruit analysis uses mid-quarter meat weights and the quarterly expanded selectivity derived from the cohort analysis (See Mohn ef al. MS 1987). The 1988 and 1989 assessments had an Fmax which was estimated to be at an $F$ of 0.97 and $F_{0.1}$ at 0.59 . The 1992 estimate was 1.097 for $F_{\max }$ and 0.700 for F0.1. The difference between the newly calculated values and the ones used previously justified a recalculation of the yield per recruit
model. The exercise was repeated in 1993. Estimated values were highly similar to 1992; no changes were brought to $\mathrm{F}_{\max }$ and $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$. The same selectivity is used in the cohort analysis, yield per recruit, and the stock projections (Table 15). The projections are carried out at $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\max }$ using the numbers-at-age of the last quarter from the 1993 cohort analysis aged forward to the first quarter of 1994. The projections for a one year period assume a recruitment level of only 250 millions scallops to reflect the low densities observed in the research survey results and anecdotal information from the fleet. Average recruitment would be 400 millions approximately. The partial recruitment vector used : $0.02,0.41,1.00,0.49,0.32,0.22,0.19,0.15$, and 0.07 ; last year was: 0.02 , $0.45,1.00,0.43,0.26,0.18,0.18,0.16$, and 0.09 . The new vector is highly similar on the left (age 4), age 5 acting as the pivot, while the slope of the 1992 vector was slightly steeper for ages 6 and 7 on the right side.

Considering the patterns of high fishing mortality rates on ages 4 to 6 in recent years, an average of 0.77, and the probability that the 1989 year class is not as strong as first indicated, yet the main target at age 5 in 1994, catch projections at $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\max }$ with a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ at 0.13 were run for 1994. They are $4,100 \mathrm{t}$ and $5,550 \mathrm{t}$ respectively (Table 15). The meat count will be met without difficulties; the mean weight of the catch being 17.7 g at its lowest value in the winter fishery. The mean weight of the catch is on the rise as year classes coming into the fishery are not as abundant. Under the assumed recruitment pattern, the projected biomass increases by $7 \%$ under $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}$ and decreases by $3 \%$ under the Fmax scenario. This also reflects the declining trend in recruitment.

Other fishing scenarios are given in table 16. They encompass a wide range of catch levels ( 4,100 to $6,200 \mathrm{t}$ ) and $F$ values ( 0.70 to 1.32). Some options are fairly similar to each other; namely, the 1993 scenario, same TAC or same effort. These 2 options produced the highest catch projections.

## CONCLUSIONS

Stock biomass and catches have been rising gradually over the last five years from 12,000 to $15,000 \mathrm{t}$ (Tables 2 and 13). A build-up of biomass and significant contributions from the strong 1988 and 1989 year classes were responsible for this rising trend in the fishery performance. It would appear that the process might have peaked. The outlook for 1994 is of a slow decline in performance since the main age classes available are the leftovers of the 1988 year class and the 1989 year class which at age 5 is fully exploited. 1995 will deal with the leftovers of the 1989 year class but the bulk of the biomass will come from the weaker 1990 year class. The stock biomass will adopt a declining trend; so far, there has been no observations of a strong recruitment to reverse this trend.
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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 |
| 1993 | 0 | 6183 | 6183 |
| 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 |
| 1993 | 6200 | 6200 | 6183 |

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.

| Year | Catch | Effort |  |  | CPUE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | days | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hours } \\ & 10^{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { crhm }^{*} \\ & 10^{3} \end{aligned}$ | kg/ fd* | kg/ ${ }^{*}$ | kg/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 |
| 1993 | 6183 | 4043 | 64 | 9868 | 1529.18 | 96.76 | 0.627 |

[^0]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 |
| 1993 | 0.00485 |  |  |  |  |  |
| January |  | 16.40 | 7.64 | 44.20 | 0.04 | 1740 |
| February |  | .--- | , | - | --- | 0 |
| March |  | 16.84 | 5.43 | 51.04 | 0.05 | 1204 |
| April |  | 16.35 | 6.44 | 58.27 | 0.04 | 2158 |
| May |  | 17.07 | 6.51 | 55.99 | 0.04 | 2353 |
| June |  | 15.90 | 7.00 | 37.00 | 0.05 | 943 |
| July |  | 16.74 | 7.51 | 36.10 | 0.06 | 898 |
| August |  | 16.69 | 7.21 | 44.49 | 0.05 | 1807 |
| September |  | 16.26 | 5.67 | 39.13 | 0.04 | 2163 |
| October |  | 16.28 | 5.36 | 46.89 | 0.04 | 2166 |
| November |  | 15.97 | 5.88 | 47.33 | 0.04 | 2201 |
| December |  | 16.54 | 6.85 | 37.66 | 0.08 | 585 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grams | 1990 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | 1991 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Count } \\ & \text { /500a } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |
| 1993 | 10 | 42 | 46 | 24 | 7 | 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 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 |
| 1993 | 94.79 | 72.29 | 37.79 | 12.77 | 2814 |

Table 8b.- 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) from tow data inside a minimum polygon.

| Sampling <br> dates | Age (years) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 5 | 6 | Biomass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 275.70 | 48.38 | 7.46 | 3.22 | 1445 |
| 1982 | 90.38 | 33.94 | 13.34 | 4.47 | 770 |
| 1983 | 36.19 | 30.50 | 11.44 | 5.36 | 546 |
| 1984 | 73.41 | 16.65 | 6.13 | 1.79 | 470 |
| 1985 | 645.15 | 48.84 | 5.69 | 1.32 | 2705 |
| 1986 | 186.67 | 279.18 | 33.69 | 3.58 | 3074 |
| 1987 | 177.77 | 95.77 | 46.90 | 16.35 | 2053 |
| 1988 | 307.43 | 96.69 | 22.93 | 5.87 | 2108 |
| 1989 | 349.41 | 128.73 | 24.31 | 5.13 | 2490 |
| 1990 | 195.88 | 98.80 | 36.81 | 9.66 | 1934 |
| 1991 | 208.26 | 112.10 | 36.92 | 10.34 | 2084 |
| 1992 | 443.25 | 275.57 | 52.10 | 15.27 | 4318 |
| 1993 | 165.58 | 102.58 | 57.21 | 19.61 | 2217 |

Table 8c.- 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 |
| 1993 | 755.46 | 1,680.08 | 1,330.84 | 503.09 | 4,269.47 |

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


Table 10. - Tuning criteria for the regressions of cohort biomass, cohort numbers ages 4-6, and cohort biomass ages 4-6 on CPUE (upper section of table); of cohort biomass on research survey biomass estimates, of fishing mortality on effort, and fishable biomass on CPUE (middle section); of cohort biomass on survey biomass estimates from inside a minimum polygon (lower section) for selected $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$.

|  | Coh Biom vs CPUE |  |  | Coh N vs CPUE |  |  | Biom 4-6 vs CPUE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {Q4 }}$ |  | 1992* | 1993* | $R^{2}$ | 1992* | 1993* | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1992* | 1993* |
| 0.05 | 0.735 | -3352 | -6841 | 0.777 | -21 | -498 | 0.803 | -382 | -6218 |
| 0.06 | 0.769 | -1874 | -3774 | 0.835 | 9 | -339 | 0.858 | 83 | -4127 |
| 0.07 | 0.772 | -819 | -1583 | 0.864 | 29 | -225 | 0.885 | 416 | -2634 |
| 0.08 | 0.759 | -28 | 60 | 0.876 | 45 | -140 | 0.894 | 665 | -1514 |
| 0.09 | 0.739 | 587 | 1337 | 0.878 | 57 | -74 | 0.893 | 859 | -643 |
| 0.10 | 0.717 | 1080 | 2359 | 0.873 | 67 | -20 | 0.886 | 1014 | 54 |
| 0.11 | 0.694 | 1482 | 3196 | 0.865 | 75 | 23 | 0.876 | 1141 | 624 |
| 0.12 | 0.673 | 1818 | 3892 | 0.856 | 81 | 59 | 0.865 | 1247 | 1099 |
| 0.13 | 0.653 | 2102 | 4482 | 0.845 | 87 | 90 | 0.853 | 1336 | 1501 |
| 0.14 | 0.635 | 2345 | 4987 | 0.835 | 92 | 116 | 0.842 | 1413 | 1845 |
| 0.15 | 0.619 | 2556 | 5425 | 0.825 | 96 | 139 | 0.831 | 1480 | 2144 |
|  | Coh Biom vs Res Biom |  |  | F vs Effort |  |  | Fish Biom vs CPUE |  |  |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {Q4 }}$ | R2 | 1992* | 1993* | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1992* | 1993* | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | 1992* | 1993* |
| 0.05 | 0.235 | -3104- | 14747 | 0.567 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.679 | 1077 | 595 |
| 0.06 | 0.286 | -2116- | 11060 | 0.553 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.645 | 1434 | 1432 |
| 0.07 | 0.342 | -1410 | -8427 | 0.535 | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.617 | 1689 | 2030 |
| 0.08 | 0.401 | -880 | -6453 | 0.514 | -0.03 | 0.04 | 0.594 | 1879 | 2478 |
| 0.09 | 0.462 | -469 | -4917 | 0.491 | -0.04 | 0.02 | 0.576 | 2027 | 2826 |
| 0.10 | 0.518 | -139 | -3688 | 0.466 | -0.06 | 0.00 | 0.561 | 2144 | 3104 |
| 0.11 | 0.565 | 130 | -2683 | 0.440 | -0.07 | -0.02 | 0.548 | 2240 | 3332 |
| 0.12 | 0.598 | 355 | -1846 | 0.414 | -0.08 | -0.03 | 0.537 | 2320 | 3521 |
| 0.13 | 0.616 | 545 | -1137 | 0.388 | -0.10 | -0.05 | 0.528 | 2387 | 3681 |
| 0.14 | 0.620 | 708 | -530 | 0.362 | -0.11 | -0.07 | 0.520 | 2445 | 3818 |
| 0.15 | 0.610 | 849 | -4 | 0.336 | -0.12 | -0.08 | 0.513 | 2494 | 3936 |

Coh Biom vs Min.Polygon

| FQ4 $^{2}$ | $R^{2} 1992^{*} 1993^{*}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0.05 | 0.362 | $-1038-13600$ |  |
| 0.06 | 0.410 | -529 | -10079 |
| 0.07 | 0.461 | -166 | -7565 |
| 0.08 | 0.511 | 107 | -5680 |
| 0.09 | 0.556 | 319 | -4213 |
| 0.10 | 0.590 | 488 | -3040 |
| 0.11 | 0.612 | 627 | -2080 |
| 0.12 | 0.617 | 743 | -1281 |
| 0.13 | 0.607 | 840 | -604 |
| 0.14 | 0.584 | 924 | -24 |
| 0.15 | 0.551 | 997 | 479 |

[^1]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 |  |  | 192 | 381 |  |  | 115 | 65 | 127 |
| 4 | 97 | 84 | 199 | 273 | 366 | 568 | 320 | 201 | 177 |
| 5 | 32 | 17 | 45 | 50 | 93 | 144 | 198 | 114 | 69 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 70 | 44 | 20 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 25 | 23 | 12 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 6 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 |  |  |
| Total | 374 | 253 | 446 | 717 | 656 | 908 | 767 | 469 | 420 |


| Ages | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 6 |
| 4 | 173 | 151 | 180 | 180 |
| 5 | 124 | 140 | 133 | 158 |
| 6 | 13 | 19 | 26 | 19 |
| 7 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Table 12.- Population numbers (at beginning of the first quarter) ( $10^{6}$ ) east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{O} 4}$ of 0.10 .

| Ages | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 492 | 527 | 730 | 1191 | 1248 | 772 | 489 | 411 | 878 |
| 4 | 177 | 215 | 334 | 473 | 709 | 968 | 528 | 331 | 309 |
| 5 | 113 | 68 | 116 | 113 | 170 | 294 | 333 | 173 | 109 |
| 6 | 10 | 72 | 46 | 63 | 55 | 66 | 130 | 114 | 49 |
| 7 | 11 | 6 | 62 | 36 | 49 | 35 | 47 | 51 | 61 |
| 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 53 | 30 | 38 | 27 | 18 | 24 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 47 | 25 | 33 | 12 | 9 |
| 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 39 | 21 | 20 | 6 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 35 | 12 | 14 |
| Total | 807 | 899 | 1301 | 1940 | 2317 | 2238 | 1644 | 1143 | 1459 |
| Ages | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 |
| 3 | 652 | 232 | 211 | 448 | 622 | 421 | 337 | 424 | 472 |
| 4 | 672 | 309 | 167 | 160 | 343 | 500 | 379 | 284 | 363 |
| 5 | 112 | 145 | 118 | 66 | 80 | 173 | 276 | 164 | 142 |
| 6 | 33 | 30 | 43 | 46 | 28 | 37 | 54 | 74 | 58 |
| 7 | 25 | 15 | 15 | 26 | 22 | 15 | 23 | 34 | 46 |
| 8 | 43 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 18 | 26 |
| 9 | 16 | 34 | 11 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| 10 | 6 | 11 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Total | 1563 | 794 | 607 | 790 | 1126 | 1173 | 1102 | 1017 | 1132 |
| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 426 | 522 | 705 | 379 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 412 | 375 | 462 | 623 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 177 | 210 | 195 | 246 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 32 | 44 | 58 | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 35 | 17 | 22 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 34 | 24 | 10 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 22 | 26 | 16 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1158 | 1248 | 1500 | 1371 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13.- Biomass Q2 (t of meats) east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ of 0.10 .

| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ages | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 2891 | 1038 | 909 | 2002 | 2780 | 1883 | 1505 | 1895 |  |
| 4 | 6637 | 3224 | 1534 | 1718 | 3755 | 5479 | 3993 | 3052 | 3776 |
| 5 | 1854 | 2345 | 1852 | 1125 | 1433 | 3072 | 4071 | 2776 | 2074 |
| 6 | 768 | 707 | 1048 | 1068 | 689 | 893 | 1218 | 1747 | 1304 |
| 7 | 723 | 422 | 450 | 737 | 660 | 433 | 679 | 1011 | 1306 |
| 8 | 1447 | 518 | 255 | 345 | 525 | 361 | 343 | 624 | 884 |
| 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 | 8348 | 10462 | 12787 | 12614 | 11808 | 12354 |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1905 | 2334 | 3153 | 1694 |
| 5 | 3846 | 3914 | 4861 | 6619 |
| 6 | 2238 | 3027 | 2665 | 3359 |
| 7 | 719 | 982 | 1279 | 1150 |
| 8 | 1002 | 459 | 613 | 801 |
| 9 | 1109 | 772 | 312 | 434 |
| 10 | 824 | 900 | 581 | 237 |
| 11 | 541 | 730 | 634 | 455 |
|  | 202 | 491 | 590 | 470 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Table 14.- Annualised fishing mortality east of the ICJ line from cohort analysis using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ of 0.10 .

| 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 | 0.04 |
| 4 | 1.44 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.49 | 0.74 | 0.59 | 0.62 |
| 5 | 1.21 | 1.11 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.68 | 1.06 | 1.22 | 0.94 | 1.38 |
| 6 | 0.72 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.40 |
| 7 | 0.39 | 0.57 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.63 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.21 |
| 8 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| 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 | 0.28 | 0.38 | 0.34 | 0.34 |


| Ages | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| 5 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.53 | 0.36 |
| 6 | 1.29 | 1.18 | 1.24 | 1.09 |
| 7 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.48 |
| 8 | 0.28 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.29 |
| 9 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.18 |
| 10 | 0.07 | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.15 |
| 11 | 0.03 | 0.16 | 0.25 | 0.11 |
|  | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 0.34 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.31 |

Table 15 .-Stock projections at $\mathrm{F}_{0.1}(0.70)$ and at $\mathrm{F}_{\max }(1.10)$ using starting numbers from cohort analysis with a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{O} 4}$ of 0.13 .

| $F=0.70$ | $1994^{\text {Q1 }}$ | $1994{ }_{02}$ | $1994{ }_{\text {Q3 }}$ | $1994{ }_{\text {Q4 }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate on smalls | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mean Wgt. Catch | 17.77 | 18.09 | 19.91 | 23.25 |
| Catch (Mill.) | 59.13 | 90.14 | 40.04 | 26.13 |
| Catch (t) | 1,051 | 1,630 | 797 | 607 |
| Cum. Catch (t) | 1,051 | 2,681 | 3,478 | 4,085 |
| Biomass | 11,624 | 11,433 | 11,596 | 12,440 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $F=1.10$ | 199401 | $1994_{\text {O2 }}$ | $1994{ }_{\text {O3 }}$ | $1994_{04}$ |
| Rate on smalls | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Mean Wgt. Catch | 17.77 | 17.98 | 19.68 | 23.10 |
| Catch (Mill.) | 89.16 | 124.47 | 51.24 | 31.85 |
| Catch (t) | 1,585 | 2,238 | 1,009 | 736 |
| Cum. Catch (t) | 1,585 | 3,823 | 4,832 | 5,568 |
| Biomass | 11,051 | 10,125 | 9,976 | 10,686 |

Table 16.- Fishing scenarios established for 1994 given different options of fishing mortality rate. Biomass figures are for the end of 1994. Catch figures are rounded off to the nearest 50 t .

| No. | Options | Fvalues | Biomass $(t)$ | Catch (t) |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $F_{0.1}$ | 0.70 | 12,440 | 4,100 |
| 2 | Freplacement $_{\text {yield }}$ | 0.85 | 11,720 | 4,700 |
| 3 | $F_{\text {max }}$ | 1.10 | 10,686 | 5,550 |
| 4 | F $_{1993}$ | 1.29 | 10,015 | 6,150 |
| 5 | effort | F $_{1993}$ | 1.32 | 9,917 |



Figure 1.- Georges Bank and surrounding areas. The dashed line represents the international boundary between Canada and USA waters, the International Court of Justice line. The grey box refers to the area shown in figures 3 to 6 .


Figure 2.- Monthly CPUE (filled square) and catch in tons of meats (open square) for the deep-sea fleet fishing Georges Bank.


Figure 3.- Catch-rates encountered on Georges Bank in 1993. 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 1993. Location of sampling stations is indicated on the graph for age 6 scallops. The shading scale represents number of scallops per standard tow.



Figure 6.- Mapping of all locations surveyed east of the ICJ line (dashed) between 1981 and 1993. Locations within the polygon are the only ones surveyed every year. A fairly large area of Georges Bank lays outside the polygon.


Figure 7.- Relationship between survey biomass for recruited ages 4-6 computed by aerial expansion and by volume estimates for the period 1981 to 1993.








Figure 8.- Profile of selectivity-at-age from 1972 to 1993.

Cohort Biomass vs CPUEH F $=0.08$


Cohort Biomass 4 to 6 vs CPUEH F $=0.10$

$F$ vs Effort $F=0.10$


Figure 9.- Cohort biomass ( $t$ of meats), cohort biomass for ages $4-6$ versus CPUE ( $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{h}$ ), and F versus effort (hours) using a terminal $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{Q} 4}$ as shown.


Figure 10.- Annualised fishing mortality rates. F3 is $F$ at age 3. F3-11 is the average value for ages 3 to 11 . F4-6 is the average for ages 4,5 , and 6.

## Appendix

## NLLS - ADAPT Methodology

Sequential Population Analysis was also carried out using non linear least square regression (ADAPT). The model is running on a quarterly basis. Data relating to catch-at-age, weights-at-age, and natural mortality rate are identical to the ones used in the VPA via linear regression. Data used are from the period 1981 onward. A log transformation has been applied to the residuals. Independent estimates selected are annual value of CPUE, quarterly values for CPUE, and research survey abundance indices.

Independent estimate: Annual CPUE allocated in Q2
Multiple estimated parameters


Single estimated parameter
Mean square of the residuals: $0.048 \quad$ Correlation Matrix

Estimated parameter s.e. c.v.
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Age } 5 & 0.098 & 0.026 & 0.267\end{array}$

Age 5
Age $5 \quad 1$

Partitioned Search established a minimum residual (0.585) for a parameter value of 0.096 . See graph A1.

Independent estimates: CPUE in Q3 and Research survey index (volume)
Multiple estimated parameters

| Mean square of the residuals: 0.087 |  |  | Correlation Matrix |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated parameter | s.e. | c.v. |  | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 |
| Age 40.129 | 0.161 | 1.251 | Age 4 |  | -0.794 | 0.173 |
| Age 50.104 | 0.343 | 3.304 | Age 5 | -0.794 | 1 | -0.700 |
| Age 60.105 | 0.516 | 4.924 | Age 6 | 0.173 | -0.700 | 1 |

Single estimated parameter

Mean square of the residuals: 0.081
Estimated parameter $\begin{aligned} & \text { s.e. }\end{aligned}$ c.v.
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Age } 5 & 0.147 & 0.030 & 0.203\end{array}$
Optimising terminal f changes F 5 from 0.14691 to 0.14688 .

Independent estimates: CPUE quarterly values in each $Q$ and Research survey indices
Multiple estimated parameters

| Mean square of the residuals: 0.088 |  |  | Correlation Matrix |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated parameter | s.e. | c.v. |  | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 |
| Age 40.135 | 0.121 | 0.896 | Age 4 | 1 | -0.742 | 0.175 |
| Age 50.072 | 0.143 | 2.003 | Age 5 | -0.742 | 1 | -0.764 |
| Age 60.043 | 0.142 | 3.315 | Age 6 | 0.175 | -0.764 | 1 |

Single estimated parameter
Mean square of the residuals: 0.105
Estimated parameter s.e. c.v.
Age 5 Inner Loop Limit
Partitioned Search established a minimum residual (6.7043) for a parameter value of 0.1176 . See graph A2.


Figure A1.-F at age 5 versus residuals from a partitioned search with annual CPUE as independent estimate. The vertical line marks the $F$ value corresponding to the minimum residual.


Figure A2.- $F$ at age 5 versus residuals from a partitioned search with CPUE quarterly values in each $Q$ and research survey indices as independent estimates. The vertical line marks the $F$ value corresponding to the minimum residual.


[^0]:    * crew-hour-meter; fishing day; hour

[^1]:    *Residual value with respect to regression line

