



Fisheries and Oceans  
Canada

Pêches et Océans  
Canada

Ecosystems and  
Oceans Science

Sciences des écosystèmes  
et des océans

**Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat (CSAS)**

---

**Research Document 2025/080**

**Newfoundland and Labrador Region**

**Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab (*Chionoectes opilio*) in  
2023**

J. Pantin, D. Mullaney, K. Baker, K. Lefort, W. Coffey, F. Cyr, H. Munro, and M. Koen-Alonso

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
P.O. Box 5667  
St. John's, NL A1C 5X1

---

## Foreword

This series documents the scientific basis for the evaluation of aquatic resources and ecosystems in Canada. As such, it addresses the issues of the day in the time frames required and the documents it contains are not intended as definitive statements on the subjects addressed but rather as progress reports on ongoing investigations.

### Published by:

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat  
200 Kent Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0E6

<http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/>  
[DFO.CSAS-SCAS.MPO@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:DFO.CSAS-SCAS.MPO@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)



© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 2025

This report is published under the [Open Government Licence - Canada](#)

ISSN 1919-5044

ISBN 978-0-660-79889-9 Cat. No. Fs70-5/2025-080E-PDF

### Correct citation for this publication:

Pantin, J., Mullaney, D., Baker, K., Lefort, K., Coffey, W., Cyr, F., Munro, H., and Koen-Alonso, M. 2025. Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab (*Chionoectes opilio*) in 2023. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2025/080. vi + 152 p.

### ***Aussi disponible en français :***

*Pantin, J., Mullaney, D., Baker, K., Lefort, K., Coffey, W., Cyr, F., Munro, H. et Koen-Alonso, M. 2025. Évaluation du crabe des neiges (Chionoectes opilio) à Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador en 2023. Secr. can. des avis sci. du MPO. Doc. de rech. 2025/080. vi + 161 p.*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
ABSTRACT .....	vi
INTRODUCTION .....	1
SPECIES BIOLOGY.....	1
FISHERY .....	2
METHODOLOGY.....	4
FISHERY LOGBOOK DATA .....	4
OBSERVER CATCH-EFFORT AND AT-SEA SAMPLING DATA.....	5
MULTISPECIES TRAWL SURVEY DATA .....	6
DFO INSHORE TRAP SURVEYS.....	9
TORNGAT JOINT FISHERIES BOARD POST-SEASON TRAP SURVEY .....	10
COLLABORATIVE POST-SEASON (CPS) TRAP SURVEY .....	10
EXPLOITABLE BIOMASS INDICES .....	11
Model-Based Exploitable Biomass Indices .....	11
Delury-Adjusted Biomass Estimates and Exploitation Rate Indices .....	14
ECOSYSTEM INDICES .....	16
PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH .....	18
COMBINING 3L INSHORE AND 3LNO OFFSHORE .....	19
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	20
BROAD-SCALE TRENDS: DIVISIONS 2HJ3KLNOP4R .....	20
Fishery .....	20
Biomass .....	22
Recruitment.....	23
Females .....	25
Environment.....	25
Mortality.....	27
Size-at-Maturity .....	30
Precautionary Approach.....	30
CONCLUSIONS.....	31
Assessment Division 2HJ.....	31
Assessment Division 3K.....	31
Assessment Division 3LNO.....	32
Assessment Division 3Ps.....	32
Assessment Division 4R3Pn .....	32
REFERENCES CITED.....	32
FIGURES .....	38
APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 2HJ DETAILS .....	89
APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3K DETAILS .....	98

---

APPENDIX 3: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3LNO DETAILS .....	111
APPENDIX 4: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3PS DETAILS.....	135
APPENDIX 5: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 4R3PN DETAILS .....	145

---

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Shellfish Section technicians and biologists (D. Sullivan, S. Quilty, M. Hurley, B. Wells, C. Malayny, K. Morrissey, R. Morrison, J. Costello, K. Charmley, E. Coughlan, and N. Le Corre) and many technicians from other Sections in the Science Branch helped with data preparation and collection on surveys throughout the year. Fisheries Sampling Section personnel (M. Simpson, P. Higdon, T. Paddle, K. Fitzpatrick, T. Inkpen, C. Peters, and A. Storch) helped organize the Collaborative Post-Season crab survey and compile data, as well as oversee the collection of the observer program and data. D. Maddock-Parsons helped with the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey program delivery. C. Barry and K. Fitzpatrick key-punched observer data and DFO Policy and Economics Branch personnel compiled and key-punched the logbook data.

---

## ABSTRACT

The status of the Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*) resource (Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization [NAFO] Divs. 2HJ3KLNOP4R) is assessed using a variety of metrics. The resource is assessed at large-scale Assessment Divisions (ADs), which are comprised of combinations of NAFO Divisions or Subdivisions. Former ADs 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore were combined into one AD (3LNO) in the current assessment. Resource status was evaluated based on trends in survey exploitable ( $\geq 95$  mm carapace width [CW] male Snow Crab) biomass indices, fishery catch per unit effort (CPUE), fishery recruitment prospects, and mortality indices. Information was derived from multiple sources: multispecies bottom trawl surveys conducted during the fall in ADs 2HJ, 3K, and 3LNO and in the spring in AD 3Ps, two collaborative trap surveys covering all ADs, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) inshore trap surveys in ADs 3K, 3LNO, and 3Ps, fishery data from logbooks, landings from the dockside monitoring program, at-sea observer catch-effort data, and oceanographic surveys. Conversion factors to calibrate DFO trawl survey catches for Snow Crab between new and outgoing vessels were estimated and applied across the survey area. Snow Crab landings remained near 50,000 t from 2007 – 15, but steadily declined to a 25-year low of 26,400 t in 2019. Landings have continued to increase since then and were over 51,000 t in 2023. Overall effort increased to near 3.8 million trap hauls in 2023. Overall standardized fishery CPUE was at a time-series low in 2018, but increased to near the time-series high in 2022 and decreased slightly in 2023. The trawl and trap survey exploitable biomass indices have increased from historic lows in 2016 – 18 but remained at a similar level in 2023 as 2022. Fishery Exploitation Rate Indices (ERIs) were moderate to low in most ADs in recent years. Status quo removals would maintain the moderate exploitation rates in most ADs in 2024. Pre-recruit ( $>70$  mm CW adolescent males) and small ( $<45$  mm CW) crab indicators as well as model predictions of exploitable biomass based on climate variables indicate that resource growth may be limited in the short-term. In 2024, all ADs are projected to remain in the Healthy Zone of the Precautionary Approach (PA) Framework, except AD 2HJ, which is projected to remain in the Cautious Zone. These projections assume status quo removals. Recent and ongoing data deficiencies resulted in the exclusion of AD 4R3Pn from the PA Framework.

---

## INTRODUCTION

This document assesses the status of the Newfoundland and Labrador (NL) Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*) resource in Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) Divisions (Divs.) 2HJ3KLNOP4R (Figure 1, Figure 2). The information presented follows from a formal scientific assessment and Regional Peer Review process conducted during February 2024 that focused on identifying the exploitable biomass of Snow Crab available to the fishery. Additional objectives for this meeting were to examine available data to evaluate the scientific appropriateness of combining ADs 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore into one AD, and to present results of comparative fishing completed for the NL multispecies trawl survey as they specifically relate to Snow Crab in Divs. 2HJ3KLNOP.

## SPECIES BIOLOGY

Snow Crab are sexually dimorphic, with mature males normally achieving larger sizes than females. The Snow Crab life cycle features a spring hatching followed by a planktonic larval period that involves several stages before settlement. Small benthic stages of both sexes molt multiple times annually, but molt frequency slows as crab grow (Comeau et al. 1998). Females cease molting during their ninth or tenth molt at the same time that sexual maturity is achieved at approximately 40–75 mm carapace width (CW) (Alunno-Bruscia and Sainte-Marie 1998). Males enter puberty at their eighth or ninth molt and, during this sexually mature adolescent stage, will generally continue to molt near-annually until their terminal molt, when they develop enlarged claws (becoming adults) that likely enhance their competitive ability in mating. Males can molt to adulthood at any size greater than approximately 40 mm CW, but terminal molt typically occurs after 10 to 13 molts over a size range spanning about 55–135 mm CW (Sainte-Marie et al. 1995).

The minimum legal size in the NL Snow Crab fishery is 95 mm CW and therefore females and a portion of adult males are excluded from the fishery and remain available for reproduction. Age determination methods remain exploratory, but at present, male Snow Crab are believed to recruit to the fishery at 9–13 years of age across the stock range, with the majority of legal-size Snow Crab being 9–11 years of age (Mullowney et al. 2023b). Skip-molting, when a crab does not undergo a molt in a given year, leads to delays in when a crab recruits to the fishery. It is most common in cold temperatures (Dawe et al. 2012; Mullowney and Baker 2021), however, population density also affects molt frequency with more frequent molting (lower incidence of terminal molt at small size) under high density conditions, at least in males (Mullowney and Baker 2021). Adult legal-sized males remain soft- or new-shelled with less-than-full meat yield for almost a year following their terminal molt and are not likely to efficiently contribute to the fishery (i.e., render maximum meat yield) until the following year when their shells are fully hardened and are full of meat. Crab are commonly believed to be more susceptible to handling and discard mortality when in this soft-shell condition. Males may live a maximum of six to eight years as adults after their terminal molt (Fonseca et al. 2008) but such prolonged longevity is not thought to be common in the presence of commercial fisheries.

Snow Crab typically inhabit a narrow range of temperatures and variation in temperature has a profound effect on production, early survival, and subsequent recruitment to the fishery (Foyle et al. 1989; Dawe et al. 2008; Marcello et al. 2012). Cold conditions during early to mid-ontogeny are associated with increased survey biomass and fishery catch per unit effort (CPUE) indices several years later (Marcello et al. 2012; Baker et al. 2021). While growth rates are positively affected by temperature, with overall higher molt frequency and molt increments occurring in warm regimes, the overriding positive benefits of cold water on early to mid-life

---

stages appears stronger than the dampening effects on growth rates, with highest productivity occurring in cold areas.

Along the NL Shelf, cold and most productive conditions for Snow Crab are generally found at shallow to intermediate depths (Baker et al. 2021; Cyr et al. 2024). Historically, the most productive fisheries have been associated with intermediate-depths and slope edges of offshore banks and inshore bays. Snow Crab typically undertake ontogenetic movements from shallow cold areas with hard substrates during early ontogeny to warmer deep areas featuring softer substrates as they grow (Mullowney et al. 2018a). The largest males are most commonly distributed on mud or mud/sand, while small Snow Crab are more common on harder substrates. Some Snow Crab also undertake an upslope migration in winter or spring for mating and/or molting (Mullowney et al. 2018a).

Snow Crab diet includes fish, clams, polychaete worms, brittle stars, shrimp, Snow Crab, and other crustaceans (Squires and Dawe 2003). Predators of Snow Crab include various groundfish, seals, and other Snow Crab.

Snow Crab in NL are part of a larger genetic stock unit in Canadian Atlantic waters, ranging from southern Labrador to the Scotian Shelf (Puebla et al. 2008). However, large-scale movements of individuals within the stock are thought to be limited, therefore assessments are conducted at the Assessment Division (AD) level, where some NAFO Divisions are combined (Figure 1). Accordingly, ADs differ from both NAFO Divisions and the small spatial scale Crab Management Areas (CMAs) used to manage the fishery. The spatial scale of the assessment approach accommodates different types and amounts of available information among ADs and better conforms with broad-scale resource status indicators than the CMAs, which have no biological basis. While the assessment does not consider processes at the CMA level, partition by CMA is of utility and interest to managers and industry; therefore some CMA-level results are included in the Appendices. Crab movements across divisional boundaries may affect survey indices resulting in uncertainties in distributions and the extent to which modes of growth progression can be followed from one year to the next. For example, in the 2019 Snow Crab assessment, there was evidence presented of a large redistribution of exploitable Snow Crab out of AD 3K and into AD 2HJ during the previous year and back into AD 3K the following year (Baker et al. 2021). This situation highlights the difficulties in assessing a stock based on delineations (ADs and CMAs) that are not set based on biological criteria as much as resource management considerations. Particle drift simulations by Dawe et al. (2010b) highlighted the importance of circulation patterns in regulating the distribution of larval crab and pathogens. Particle release from various locations off the Labrador Shelf slope showed different patterns in resulting southern distribution in conjunction with the Labrador Current, emphasizing connectivity processes in this ecosystem. With respect to Snow Crab, this may suggest a disconnect between management (CMA), assessment (AD), and biological scales.

## **FISHERY**

The NL Snow Crab fishery began in Trinity Bay (CMA 6A) in 1967. Initially, Snow Crab were taken as gillnet bycatch, but within several years a directed trap fishery developed in inshore areas along the northeast coast of Divs. 3KL. Until the early 1980s, the fishery was prosecuted by approximately 50 vessels limited to 800 traps each. In 1981, fishing became restricted to the NAFO Division adjacent to where the license holder resided. The fishery expanded throughout all areas of the province from the 1970s – 2000s, especially following groundfish stock and fishery collapses in the early 1990s. Between 1982–87, there were major declines in the Snow Crab resource in traditional areas in Divs. 3K and 3L, while new fisheries started in Div. 2J, Subdiv. 3Ps, and offshore Div. 3K. A Snow Crab fishery began in Div. 4R in 1993. Management of the increasingly diverse and complex fishery during the expansion years led to progressive

---

development and refinement of the many quota-controlled areas (CMAs), with approximately 3,500 active license holders representing various vessel-size fleet sectors participating in the fishery in the mid-2000s. Resource declines and rationalization measures have led to reduced participation during the past two decades. The fishery was prosecuted by approximately 2,200 license holders representing three dominant fleet sectors defined by vessel length in 2023.

The fishery typically spans from the fringes of the Makkovik Bank off central Labrador in the north to the far offshore slope edges of the Grand Bank in Divs. 3LNO in the south, to near the border of Québec in the westernmost portions of Div. 4R. The AD 2HJ fishery occurs in offshore regions of central and southern Labrador (Figure 1). The bathymetry of the region is characterized by a series of shallow water offshore banks separated by deep channels (Figure 2). The bottom water temperature in the two dominant fishing grounds in these channels is warmer than the surrounding shallow banks. The AD 3K fishery occurs off the northeast coast of Newfoundland, predominately within a network of deep trenches located between nearshore shallow water plateaus and the Funk Island Bank in the offshore (i.e., St. Anthony Basin and Funk Island Deep) (Figure 2). Bottom temperatures are cooler in the shallow nearshore areas and on the Funk Island Bank and warmer in the Funk Island Deep area. The AD 3LNO fishery occurs in coastal bays and near-to-shore regions off the east coast of Newfoundland and offshore on and surrounding the Grand Bank off Newfoundland's southeast coast (Figure 2). This is a massive, shallow, cold, and productive environment for Snow Crab. Virtually the entire AD consists of cold bottom temperatures, with the exception of the southwest slope of the bank which is affected by the Gulf Stream current, as well as the deepest peripheries of the slope edges surrounding the bank. The AD 3Ps fishery occurs off the south coast of Newfoundland (Figure 1). Relative to other ADs along the NL continental shelves, AD 3Ps is shallow. The shallow areas of the AD, where the bulk of the fishery occurs, are cold, but temperatures increase abruptly at the slope edges. The AD 4R3Pn fishery occurs along the west and southwest coasts of Newfoundland in and adjacent to the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Figure 1). The bathymetry off the west coast is characterized by a shallow water nearshore plateau that borders the deep Esquiman Channel, while the bathymetry off the south coast is characterized by the presence of the Burgeo Bank (Figure 2). Bottom temperatures in this AD are the warmest along the NL Shelf.

In the late 1980s, quota control was initiated in all CMAs of each NAFO Division. Current management measures include trap limits, individual quotas, spatial and temporal closures within divisions, and differing seasons. Annual management decisions are made following a consultation and recommendation process with harvester groups and other industry stakeholders. Mandatory use of the electronic vessel monitoring system was fully implemented in mid-shore and offshore fleet sectors in 2004 to ensure compliance with regulations regarding area fished. The fishery is prosecuted using conical baited traps set in longlines ('fleets'), typically with a trap spacing of approximately 45 m. The minimum legal mesh size is 135 mm to allow small crab to escape. Undersized and soft-shelled crab that are captured in traps are returned to the sea, however rates of damage or discard mortality are unknown.

The fishery was traditionally prosecuted during summer and fall, but has shifted earlier over the past decade and is now primarily prosecuted during spring and summer. The fishery can be delayed in northern NAFO Divisions (Divs. 2HJ3K) due to ice conditions or fleet preferences in some years. The fishery can also be delayed (or extended) for other reasons such as price disputes or difficulties in capturing quotas. The 2023 fishery was delayed until mid-May due to price disputes. Late fishing seasons are often associated with a high incidence of soft-shelled immediate pre-recruits in the catch, particularly under high fisheries exploitation rates (Mullowney et al. 2021). A soft-shell protocol for at-sea observers (ASOs) was initiated in 2004 to protect soft-shelled immediate pre-recruits from handling mortality by closing localized areas

---

(70 nm<sup>2</sup> grids in the offshore and 18 nm<sup>2</sup> grids in inshore areas of ADs 3LNO, 3K, 3Ps, and 4R3Pn) for the remainder of the season when a threshold level of 20% soft-shell crab in the legal-sized catch is reached. That threshold has since been reduced to 15% in AD 3LNO, and grids have been partitioned into quarters in some inshore areas in recent years. It became evident during 2010–12 that this protocol, as implemented, was not effective in controlling handling mortality. Among other issues, this reflects very low observer coverage to monitor thousands of grid cells. Approximately <0.1–0.2% of the catch has been sampled in recent years. Beyond coverage capacity, there has been a failure to invoke the protocol even when it was clear that the level of soft-shelled crab had exceeded the threshold, due to small sample sizes of measurements within a given cell associated with low fishery catch rates in recent years (DFO 2020; Mullowney et al. 2020).

## METHODOLOGY

### FISHERY LOGBOOK DATA

Data on commercial catch (kg) and fishing effort (number of trap hauls) were obtained from vessel logbooks. These data were compiled by the Statistics Division, Policy and Economics Branch, NL Region of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). Return of complete and accurate fishing logbooks is a condition of license in this fishery. Logbook return rates are calculated as the percentage of the fishery landings accounted for in the logbook data in comparison to landings recorded by the dockside monitoring program. During the past decade, the dataset is normally most incomplete in the current assessment year (Figure 3), resulting from a time lag associated with compiling data from the most recent fishery, thus the terminal points are considered preliminary. In most years, the logbooks account for between 80–95% of the landings at the time of the assessment in all ADs, except 4R3Pn which typically has lower returns. The reliability of the logbook data can be suspect with respect to effort (i.e., under-reporting) and areas fished. However, logbook data provide the broadest coverage and, therefore, the most representative fishery performance index.

Trends in the timing of the fishery over the time series were investigated by plotting the fishery start and end weeks, the median week of the fishery, and the lower and upper quantiles depicting 25–75% completion of the fishery.

Because the logbook dataset is incomplete, annual fishing effort (number of trap hauls) within any given AD was estimated based on annual dockside monitored landings (kg) divided by unstandardized CPUE (kg/trap).

Standardized logbook CPUE (kg/trap) was calculated by year and AD, as well as by CMA. Annual fishery CPUE estimates are standardized for time and space using a linear mixed model (Eq. 1). The model regresses the response variable of square-root transformed CPUE (catch/trap haul) from individual observations (normally on a per set basis) against fixed effects of time and gear soak time. Random effects were used to model square-root CPUE: calendar day\*year\*AD\*CMA groupings. The model has a random intercept for CMA within AD within year and a random slope for scaled day, so that the relationship between day and square-root CPUE is allowed to vary by year:AD:CMA. The AD:CMA parameter accounts for spatial variation across multiple management areas within any AD. The positively-skewed response variable was square-root transformed to normalize it, as stronger transformations such as logarithms were found to produce negatively-skewed distributions in some cases. Finally, the model is weighted by consistency of fishing (i.e., cumulative number of years fished within 10 x 10 nm cells). This model was used to predict average annual CPUE by averaging set-specific predicted values (as well as 95% lower and upper confidence estimates) for each AD and year.

---

Eq. 1

$$\sqrt{CPUE_{y,t,D}} = \alpha_{y,D} + \beta_{Day,y,D} \cdot Day_{y,t,D} + \beta_{Soak} \cdot Soak_{y,t,D} + \epsilon_{y,t,D}$$
$$\alpha_{y,D} \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2_{intercept})$$
$$\beta_{Day,y,D} \sim N(\overline{\beta_{Day}}, \sigma^2_{Day})$$
$$\epsilon_{y,t,D} \sim N(0, \frac{\sigma^2_{error}}{effort})$$

Here,  $y$  indicates a given year,  $t$  indicates a given day, and  $D$  indicates a given AD.  $\alpha$  terms indicate intercepts,  $\beta$  terms indicate coefficients for specific covariates, the  $\epsilon$  term indicates unmodelled error around predicted CPUE, and  $\sigma^2$  terms indicate variances on random effects or the error term.  $Day$  indicates binned five-day intervals and  $Soak$  indicates gear soak time measured in hours. Late season data (November and December) were omitted because of their sporadic presence in the dataset. Entries of CPUE equal to 0 were also removed because it was unclear if they represented real catch rates or other practices such as dumping traps once quotas were subscribed.

Catch per unit effort is used as an index of latent biomass, but it is recognized that it can be biased by variation in fishing practices such as soak time, trap mesh size, bait type, bait quantity, bait quality, bait jars, high-grading, gear spacing, artificial lighting, and presence or absence of escape mechanisms. Fishery CPUE is characterized by both a lag in response to changes in stock size and an asymptotic curve indicative of trap saturation which affects its ability to measure exploitable biomass. However, one factor supporting the interpretation of CPUE as an index of relative latent biomass is the consistent broad-spatial coverage of the fishery each year generated by the numerous CMAs.

Standardized annual logbook CPUEs were mapped in 10 x 10 nm cells, encompassing the entire fishery distribution each year, and used to qualitatively assess spatial fishery performance within each AD. Further, time-binned (five-day increment) CPUEs were plotted for individual ADs and CMAs within each AD for a six-year timespan to assess fishery performance over a prolonged continuous timescale. The five-day estimates were fit with least squares loess regression curves to visually depict changes occurring in the fishery over time.

## OBSERVER CATCH-EFFORT AND AT-SEA SAMPLING DATA

At-sea sampling data by ASOs have been collected since 1999. For each trip, ASOs sampled entire catches of males for CW (mm) and shell condition for as many traps as time allowed. Overall levels of sampling have been generally highest in the offshore CMAs of AD 3LNO and consistently low in inshore CMAs. Overall, ASO coverage has decreased in recent years, particularly since 2020 (Figure 4, Figure 5). Considering the increases in total allowable catch (TAC) during this time, this has resulted in a reduction in the percentage of landings observed. Due to low ASO coverage in certain years in some ADs, they have been excluded from analyses.

Various catch rate indices were developed from shell condition staging conducted by ASOs. A three-stage assessment of shell condition is used, whereby ASOs classify crab as soft-shelled, new hard-shelled, or old hard-shelled. The total catch rate of legal-sized Snow Crab by shell condition for each AD was calculated as an index of in-season exploitable biomass from the fishery. Similarly, size frequency distributions of catch rates of male Snow Crab by shell condition and size, binned to 3 mm CW intervals, were constructed to interpret the composition

---

of the catch. Size frequency distributions were presented and examined at both the AD and CMA level where data were sufficient.

Observer sampling data formed the basis for estimating fishery discards. Total discard rates as well as the percentage of the catch discarded in the fishery were examined, with undersized (<95 mm CW) and soft-shelled crab measured during commercial fishing activities deemed to have been discarded. A generalized linear mixed model was used to standardize discard percentages. The binomial model (Eq. 2) with a logit link function regressed raw data from observations of discarded weights from individual fishing sets:

Eq. 2

$$\text{logit}(p_i) = \beta_0 + \text{Day} + \text{Soak} + \gamma_i$$

$$Y_i \sim \text{binomial}(n_i, p_i)$$

$$E(Y_i) = p_i \times n_i$$

$$\text{var}(Y_i) = n_i \times p_i \times (1 - p_i)$$

where,  $Y_i$  is the weight of discarded Snow Crab observed in each fishing set in a particular AD, CMA, day, and year,  $n_i$  is the total number of Snow Crab observed in each fishing set in a particular AD, CMA, day, and year,  $p_i$  is percentage discarded,  $\beta_0$  is the intercept,  $\text{Day}$  is the calendar day when the fishing set occurred,  $\text{Soak}$  is the soak time (hours) of the fishing set, and  $\gamma_i$  is a random intercept for soak time in each combination of AD, CMA, and year. As per the CPUE standardization model (Eq. 1), the interacting AD:CMA term accounts for the multiple management areas within each AD.

Annual percentages of discards were related to fishery CPUE, with both indices standardized to mean = 0 and standard deviation = 1, to assess the relationship between the two variables. Bubble plots of weekly catch rates and percentages of soft-shell crab captured in the fishery were also constructed and examined for each AD. Soft-shell crab prevalence is interpreted as both an index of mortality and wastage because it is assumed that the majority of crab discarded as soft-shell die. Soft-shell prevalence can also be used to infer the relative strength of recruitment potential for forthcoming fisheries. For example, under the scenario of high catch rates of large residual crab (i.e., most competitive) and a high discard rate of soft-shell crab, it would be inferred that recruitment prospects for the forthcoming fishery are favourable. However, a high incidence of soft-shell crab in the catch during a period of low residual biomass would be indicative of wastage.

There are concerns regarding the utility of ASO data from at-sea sampling during the fishery due to low and inconsistent spatiotemporal coverage. There is concern that current coverage introduces bias in interpreting trends in catch rates at broad spatial scales and introduces high uncertainty in interpreting indices of biomass, recruitment, and mortality. ASO-based indices are also biased by inconsistent sampling methods and levels resulting from changing priorities. There are also concerns relating to variability in experience of ASOs in subjectively assigning shell stages. Measures should be taken to ensure representative ASO coverage to improve data quality from this program.

## MULTISPECIES TRAWL SURVEY DATA

Data on total catch numbers and weights were derived from depth-stratified multispecies bottom trawl surveys. These surveys were conducted during fall in NAFO Divs. 2HJ3KLNO and spring in Divs. 3LNO and Subdiv. 3Ps. The fall (post-season) survey has occurred annually in all but Div. 2H where it was executed each year from 1996–99, bi-annually from 2004 – 08, and annually from 2010 to present. Data north of 56° latitude in Div. 2H are omitted from the stock

---

assessment because of consistently low capture of Snow Crab and sporadic frequency of survey coverage in Div. 2H throughout the time series. Sampling of Snow Crab during spring Subdiv. 3Ps surveys began in 1996 and in Divs. 3LNO in 1999. Standard depth-stratified multispecies bottom trawl surveys were not conducted in Subdiv. 3Ps in 2020 and 2023, Divs. 2HJ3K in 2022, and Divs. 3LNO in 2021 and 2022. However, there are comparative fishing survey data available for some areas and years during 2021–23 where standard Snow Crab sampling was conducted, but the station allocation was not depth-stratified (Figure 6, Figure 7).

The survey trawl was changed to a Campelen 1800 shrimp trawl in 1995. This trawl proved to be more efficient in capturing crab than the previously used Engels 145 Hi-rise groundfish trawl that featured larger footgear. Therefore, the trawl survey time series for Snow Crab starts in 1995.

The catchability of the survey trawl for Snow Crab is known to be low, particularly at the smallest sizes, but even at the largest sizes efficiency is below 100% (Dawe et al. 2010a). Trawl efficiency is also affected by substrate type, depth, diurnal cycle and season (Dawe et al. 2010a; Benoît and Cadigan 2014; 2016). Efficiency is lower and more variable on hard (typically shallow) substrates than on soft (typically deep) substrates, and higher during dark periods when crab appear most active. Based on comparative data from Divs. 3LNO, where both a spring and fall survey occur, fall trawl surveys are deemed to have a higher catchability for Snow Crab. Spring surveys are considered less reliable because some population components are believed to be relatively poorly sampled during this time, when mating and molting typically occur. For this reason, fall data are used for assessing AD 3LNO in the assessment.

Trawl catchability can differ by vessel and gear configuration. With the retirement of the Canadian Coast Guard ship (CCGS) Alfred Needler and impending retirement of the CCGS Teleost and introductions of the CCGS Capt. Jacques Cartier and CCGS John Cabot, a comparative fishing program (i.e., direct side-by-side comparison between old and new vessels) was conducted from 2021 – 23 to determine differences in catchability due to vessel changes and associated modifications to the Campelen trawl gear. Comparative fishing success varied by year, NAFO division, and vessel combinations. Details on methodology and results of the comparative fishing program can be found in Trueman et al. (2025) and DFO (2024). From these analyses, conversion factors were developed for CCGS Teleost to new vessels for Spring Subdiv. 3Ps and Fall Divs. 2HJ3KL and CCGS Alfred Needler to new vessels for Fall Divs. 3KL. Exploratory analyses were conducted to determine whether comparative fishing conversion factors could be extended into vessel and area combinations not covered by the comparative fishing program. To inform whether potential vessel differences have a significant impact on the estimation of indices derived for Snow Crab in 3Ps, various spatiotemporal models were applied to the unconverted survey data to determine whether there was a vessel effect (see Trawl-Based Estimates, AD 3Ps section below). This was done for density (standardized catches) of exploitable and pre-recruit Snow Crab (Wheeland et al. In prep.<sup>1</sup>). Conversions between the new vessels and Needler were not developed for Divs. 3NO in the fall due to lack of comparative tows in those divisions for that season. To investigate if accepted conversions across Divs. 3KL for the CCGS Alfred Needler (DFO 2024) could be extended into Divs. 3NO, a qualitative examination of habitat characteristics for areas occupied in Snow Crab throughout AD 3LNO was undertaken and detailed in Wheeland et al.<sup>2</sup>. Conversion factors were applied to

---

<sup>1</sup> Wheeland, L., Trueman, S., Pantin, J., and Baker, K. In prep. On the Relative Catchability of Snow Crab in the Newfoundland and Labrador Multispecies Trawl Surveys. DFO Can. Sci. Adv. Sec. Res. Doc.

---

the previous time series (1995–2023) to rescale indices into units equivalent to the new vessels going forward. The conversion factors for Snow Crab data from the trawl surveys conducted by the CCGS Teleost and CCGS Alfred Needler included uncertainty estimates which were not considered in this assessment. Further, the majority of the sampling used to determine conversion factors for the CCGS Alfred Needler series in Divs. 3KL, which was extended into Divs. 3NO, was conducted in Div. 3K and any uncertainty associated with this cannot be directly quantified.

Snow Crab catches from each survey set were sorted, weighed, and counted by sex. Catches were sampled in their entirety or sub-sampled by sex. Sampling of individual crab of both sexes included determination of CW (mm) and shell condition. Shell condition was assigned one of five categories:

1. soft-shelled - recently molted with a carapace that is very pliable. Shell filled with water and virtually no meat content.
2. new-shelled - molted within the past year. Carapace becoming rigid and still generally clean. Low meat content.
3. intermediate-shelled - molted over a year ago. Carapace lightly fouled and meat content high.
4. old-shelled - molted two or more years ago. Carapace moderately to heavily fouled and meat content high.
5. very old-shelled - molted several years (i.e.,  $\geq 4$  years) ago. Carapace heavily fouled and turning black.

Males were sampled for chela (claw) height (CH, 0.1 mm). Males develop enlarged chelae when they undergo their terminal molt, which may occur at any size larger than approximately 40 mm CW. Therefore, only males with small chelae will continue to molt and subsequently recruit to the fishery. To standardize data capture, only the right chelae of males were measured. A model which separated males into two ‘clouds’ based on the relationship between CH and CW (Eq. 3) was applied (Dawe et al. 1997) to classify each individual as either adult (‘large-clawed’) (above the modelled line) or adolescent (‘small-clawed’) (below the modelled line).

Eq. 3

$$CH = 0.0806 * CW^{1.1999}$$

Maturity status was determined for females based on visual examination of the abdominal flap (small = immature, enlarged = mature) and the relative fullness and stage of egg clutches and development were subjectively assessed. Both sexes were also visually assessed for the presence of Bitter Crab Disease (BCD), a fatal affliction and source of natural mortality. In cases of unclear external characteristics, crab were dissected and classified based on observation of the hemolymph (i.e., ‘blood’). Observation of cloudy or milky hemolymph supported the classification of such specimens as infected. Mortality was inferred from levels of BCD observed in new-shelled males.

In the absence of separate biomass estimates for recruits and residual crab in the current assessment, the proportion of recruit and residual exploitable males in the catch was calculated for each year and AD as a consideration of trends in recruitment.

Indices of small Snow Crab (<45 mm CW), adolescent (small-clawed) male Snow Crab (45–70 mm CW), pre-recruit Snow Crab (>70 mm CW adolescent males), and mature female Snow Crab were calculated by the annual number/tow for each Snow Crab group divided by the

---

2018–23 time-series mean for that group. These indices were restricted to directed survey tows and did not include comparative fishing data. Theoretically, pre-recruits would be expected to begin contributing to the exploitable biomass in the following one to three years and to the fishery in the following two to four years. For example, a pre-recruit captured in either the 2021 spring or fall survey that undergoes a terminal molt to exploitable size in the subsequent winter or spring (i.e., 2022) would be identified as a recruit into the exploitable biomass in the 2022 survey(s), and should begin contributing to the fishery in 2023. However, a portion of pre-recruits would molt but remain adolescent, which would further delay their contribution to the exploitable biomass and fishery by a year. The issue of transition rate of crab into the fishery is further complicated by the presence of skip-molting, whereby not all identified pre-recruits will molt in the following winter or spring and their arrival into the exploitable biomass and fishery would be delayed even further. Skip-molting is most common in mid- to large-sized adolescent males in cold areas (Dawe et al. 2012) and under high population density conditions, whereby skip-molting is more common than terminally molting for crab not undergoing a regular molt in any given year (Mullowney and Baker 2021). Small Snow Crab would be expected to begin contributing to the exploitable biomass in four to seven years.

The spatial distributions of mature females, pre-recruits, exploitable males, and small crab were mapped and examined using catch rates for each survey set. Data for Snow Crab smaller than pre-recruits in AD 3Ps could not be analyzed as conversion factors had not been identified at the time of the assessment.

To examine demographic size compositions of both sexes, crab were grouped by maturity and partitioned into 3 mm CW bins. A square root of mean numbers per tow for each maturity-size grouping was plotted. A square root transformation was applied simply for visual aid as trawl size frequency distributions often exhibit a ‘trough’ pattern, with crab ranging from 30 to 70 mm CW poorly represented in the sample population. In relative terms, the square root transformation visually dampens the magnitude of the dominant modes of smallest and largest crab and elevates the magnitude of the sparsely captured intermediate-sized groups of crab.

## **DFO INSHORE TRAP SURVEYS**

Data were available from DFO inshore trap surveys in ADs 3K, 3LNO and 3Ps (Figure 8, Figure 9). In AD 3K, surveys were carried out in White Bay (CMA 3B), Green Bay (CMA 3C), and Notre Dame Bay (CMA 3D) during 1994–2023. These surveys have consistently occurred in late August to mid-September, and occupy five of the depth strata developed for multispecies trawl surveys. In AD 3LNO, long-term trap surveys in Bonavista Bay (CMA 5A) and Conception Bay (CMA 6B) occurred during 1979–2023. Historically, the Bonavista and Conception Bay surveys covered only the deepest stratum in each bay where the fishery was concentrated. However, shallower strata have been occupied in the surveys since 2013. Depth stratified surveys have been conducted in Trinity Bay (CMA 6A) and St. Mary’s Bay (CMA 9A) since 2013, covering virtually the entire vertical distribution of each bay. The St. Mary’s Bay surveys have occurred during early to mid-June, the Bonavista Bay surveys have occurred during late July, the Trinity Bay surveys have occurred during early August, and the Conception Bay surveys have occurred during late September or early October. In AD 3Ps, a trap survey was conducted in Fortune Bay (CMA 11E) in late May to early June during 2007–23 and encompassed the entire vertical distribution of the bay.

All surveys follow a depth-stratified survey design with set locations randomly distributed within each stratum, and stratum-specific set allocations weighted by area. All surveys utilize large-mesh (135 mm) and small-mesh (27 mm) traps intermittently placed within each ‘fleet’ of gear, with traps spaced approximately 45 m (i.e., 25 fathoms) apart. Each fleet includes six baited traps, with two additional end traps not baited. Squid (*Illex* spp.) hung on skivers is

---

attached to the inner entry cone of each trap as bait, with approximately 2–3 pounds of squid on each skiver. Although soak times are intended to be standardized to 24–48 hours, weather and other factors can affect the surveys and soak times are ultimately variable. Biological sampling is conducted at-sea from all traps at each station. Sampling of males includes determination of CW and CH, shell condition (same categories as trawl survey), and presence of BCD. Females are sampled from small-mesh traps for the same morphometrics as males, with examination of the abdomen rather than CH used to determine maturity, and the relative fullness and stage of egg clutches estimated. Occurrence of visually detectable incidence of BCD was determined as per protocols on the trawl surveys and mortality was inferred from levels of BCD observed in new-shelled males.

For each survey series, catch rate indices of legal-sized Snow Crab by shell condition from large-mesh traps (i.e., comparable to fishery index) and size frequency distributions of males by maturity status from small-mesh traps were produced for the assessment.

### **TORNGAT JOINT FISHERIES BOARD POST-SEASON TRAP SURVEY**

Data were examined from a collaborative trap survey between the Torngat Joint Fisheries Board (TJFB) and DFO which takes place in CMA 1 (N5440) in AD 2HJ (Figure 10, Figure 11). This survey was initiated in 2013 and has occurred each year from late-August to early-September. The survey is conducted by technicians or observers onboard a commercial fishing vessel and consists of 20 fixed stations. At each station, nine large-mesh (133–140 mm mesh) and two small-mesh traps are set in a fleet. Prior to 2017, the fleets consisted of ten large-mesh and one small-mesh trap. Biological sampling is conducted at sea from all traps at each station. Sampling of males includes determination of CW and CH, shell condition (soft, new, or old), leg loss, and presence of BCD. Females are sampled from small-mesh traps as per protocols on the DFO inshore trap surveys. From 2013– 2022 the same 20 stations were surveyed every year, however two stations were not in the same location during the 2023 survey.

Catch rate indices of legal-sized Snow Crab by shell condition and size frequency distributions by shell condition from large-mesh traps, and size frequency distributions by maturity from small-mesh traps were produced for the assessment. All analyses were limited to males, with sizes partitioned into 3 mm CW bins. This survey uses the same three-stage scale as the ASO sampling. In 2022, shell conditions were incorrectly identified, therefore proportions of residual (intermediate to old-shelled male) and recruit (new-shelled male) exploitable crab could not be determined.

### **COLLABORATIVE POST-SEASON (CPS) TRAP SURVEY**

Data were examined from a CPS survey in all ADs (Figure 10, Figure 11). These surveys were initiated in 2003 and have occurred annually following the fishery, typically beginning in late August or early September and ending in November. They are conducted by Snow Crab harvesters accompanied by ASOs and historically focused on commercial (i.e., deep) fishing grounds within individual CMAs. Thus, at localized spatial scales these surveys were more vertically-limited than the multispecies trawl surveys in the offshore or the DFO inshore trap surveys in select inshore CMAs. The CPS survey began transitioning to a partly random-stratified design in 2017. Since 2018, approximately 50% of survey stations are randomly allocated while 50% remain fixed (referred to as core stations). The changes were invoked to increase both vertical and horizontal coverage in areas beyond prime commercial fishing grounds to encompass a more representative depiction of all population components in the assessment.

---

Historical survey stations generally followed a grid pattern, with a maximum station spacing of 10 x 10 nm, while newer randomized stations follow no systematic spatial design. At each station, six (inshore) or ten (offshore) large-mesh (133–140 mm mesh) traps were set in a fleet. Biological sampling of male Snow Crab was conducted by ASOs from a single large-mesh trap at each station, however in 2020, sampling expanded to include two large-mesh traps. Inshore stations with a small-mesh trap used a fleet of seven traps and offshore stations with a small-mesh trap used a fleet of eleven traps. The biological measurements described for the TJFB trap survey were used in this survey, however due to larger catches and time restrictions, ASOs were required to measure at least 75 males and 25 females caught in the small-mesh traps and count any additional Snow Crab caught.

Stemming from the temporal and spatial inconsistencies and limitations in the distribution of small-mesh traps, indices are not available for all areas in all years. Furthermore, small-mesh traps have not adequately sampled small crab in some areas because the survey design focused near-exclusively on capturing exploitable crab and had limited sampling in shallow water, which tends to be associated with small-crab distribution in many areas. To address concerns about the limited utility of small-mesh traps in the survey, more small-mesh traps were incorporated in the survey starting in 2016 (Figure 11). All stations surveyed had a small-mesh trap in 2023.

The same analyses described for the TJFB trap survey for catch rate indices and size frequencies from the large-mesh and small-mesh traps were performed on the CPS survey data. Catch rate indices from all stations were used for science advice, however indices from just the core stations were also produced at the CMA-level and are available in the Appendices. Only the core stations have been consistently surveyed in AD 4R3Pn, therefore only the core stations time series is presented for that AD.

Indices of small Snow Crab, adolescent male Snow Crab, pre-recruit Snow Crab, and mature female Snow Crab were examined by combining all trap survey data to calculate the annual number/trap for each Snow Crab group divided by the 2018–22 time-series mean for that group in each AD. These were evaluated beside similar trawl survey indices (see MULTISPECIES TRAWL SURVEY DATA section). Catches of exploitable males from all trap surveys were used to estimate trap-based exploitable biomass.

## **EXPLOITABLE BIOMASS INDICES**

The exploitable biomass indices were calculated from the survey catch of legal-sized ( $\geq 95$  mm CW) males, regardless of shell condition or maturity. The exploitable biomass index generated from spring survey data includes a component of soft- or new-shelled males that would not actually be retained by the fishery in the immediate year, but would be fully recruited to the fishery in the following year.

### **Model-Based Exploitable Biomass Indices**

Model-based estimates of trawl- and trap-based exploitable biomass were introduced into the present assessment. Model-based approaches offer the ability to incorporate more covariates, including environmental, survey, and ecological variables (Anderson et al. 2024; Punt 2023), that the previous spatial expansion platform used in NL Snow Crab assessments (Ogive Mapping [OgMap], Evans et al. 2000) did not. They also provide flexibility to include multiple data sources and hindcast, interpolate, or extrapolate into areas with patchy or missing survey coverage (Anderson et al. 2022; Baker et al. 2024). These benefits enabled the estimation of a cohesive time series of exploitable biomass in lieu of the myriad of fully or partially missing trap and trawl surveys in recent years.

---

Spatiotemporal models were developed to predict exploitable Snow Crab density using available trap and trawl survey data in the R package ‘*sdmTMB*’ (Anderson et al. 2022), which has been used in other recent stock assessments in the DFO NL Region (e.g., NAFO Subdiv. 3Ps orange-footed sea cucumber – *Cucumaria frondosa* and Shrimp Fishing Area 4 striped shrimp – *Pandalus montagui*) (Baker et al. 2024) and is in-line with the NAFO Standing Committee on Research Coordination (STACREC) recommendation to explore application of this approach for species within the NAFO Regulatory Area (NAFO 2022).

*sdmTMB* modelling combines Template Model Builder (TMB, Kristensen et al. 2016) and stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) matrices to fit spatiotemporal models. A SPDE mesh using Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation (INLA) was constructed for each dataset (fall trawl data, spring trawl data, and trap data) (Figure 12, Figure 13). For each model (i.e., separate trap and trawl as well as spatial iterations depending on AD), both spatial and spatiotemporal autocorrelation were included as Gaussian random fields estimated by Delaunay triangulation over the mesh. These random fields accounted for static (spatial) and variable (spatiotemporal) unmeasured or latent habitat suitability. The spatiotemporal random fields were assumed to be independent across years. Anisotropy (directional dependence in data) was explored for both shared and separate model components, and a depth covariate (with and without a spatial-varying coefficient), as well as various data distributions (Tweedie, delta-gamma, and delta log-normal) were considered for each model formulation. The best models for final estimation of density in any given data series and area were chosen based on model diagnostic checks and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (Akaike 1973). Diagnostic checks followed Anderson (2023) and Anderson et al. (2024) and included the ability of the models to converge and application of a “sanity” function to ensure maximum gradient log-likelihood with respect to all fixed effects was <0.001, the Hessian matrix was positive definite, and no random field marginal standard deviations were less than 0.01. Residuals were checked to ensure they met assumptions of normality and had no spatiotemporal patterns.

Density (kg/km<sup>2</sup>) of exploitable Snow Crab was predicted across a gridded depth surface, constructed using GEBCO data (GEBCO Compilation Group 2021). Annual biomass estimates were calculated using the predicted density surface. In most situations, more complex models (e.g., inclusion of multiple set types) were used to calculate the final exploitable biomass indices, thereby providing additional data for predictions and therefore additional annual estimates and possible changes in the area of interest. The best-fitting models are described in Eq. 4-6, using notation from the R package ‘*mgcv*’ (Wood 2017).

For spring surveys, the indices represent biomasses for the immediately upcoming (or ongoing) fishery, whereas for fall (post-season) surveys, they represent biomasses for the fishery in the following calendar year.

The present assessment estimated exploitable biomass for trawl (multispecies survey and comparative fishing experiments) and large-mesh trap (CPS, DFO inshore, TJFB) data separately, with further exploration of ability to estimate a fully-integrated biomass estimate incorporating all sources of data together planned for future assessments.

### **Trawl-Based Estimates, AD 3Ps**

The best model for predicting exploitable Snow Crab density within AD 3Ps from the spring trawl survey is described in Eq. 4.

Eq. 4

$$Density_{expTRAWL} = s(\text{Scaled depth}) + 0 + as.factor(\text{Year})$$

where,  $Density_{expTRAWL}$  was the standardized biomass (kg/km<sup>2</sup>) of exploitable Snow Crab in a standard trawl survey set during spring DFO trawl surveys,  $Scaled\ depth$  was the average depth (m) during each trawl scaled  $[(set\ depth - mean(depth)) / sd(depth)]$ , and  $Year$  was the year of the survey, represented as a factor. Depth was scaled because the best-fitting model included a spatial-varying coefficient for depth. Anisotropy was included with separate Matérn ranges (distance correlations) estimated for the spatial and spatiotemporal random fields. The best-fitting model used a Tweedie distribution with log link. Density predictions were made on a 5.421 km<sup>2</sup> gridded surface restricted to depths between 32 and 500 m from 1995–23. Available data included all regular trawl sets through the time series and comparative fishing sets in 2021–23. The inclusion of set type as factor in the model was tested during model development, but the best model did not include set type; the inclusion of set type did not improve model performance.

Exploration of a vessel effect was undertaken on the 3Ps dataset to determine whether the conversion factors developed for converting the CCGS Teleost data to the new vessel time series could also be applied to the CCGS Alfred Needler data, as there was not enough comparative fishing undertaken by the CCGS Alfred Needler in 3Ps to calculate conversion factors. The entire spring 3Ps time series was used, which included surveys conducted by CCGS Teleost, CCGS Alfred Needler, CCGS Wilfred Templeman, and CCGS John Cabot. Survey vessel as a factor and scaled calendar day were tested for inclusion in the above model (Eq. 4) to evaluate whether the different vessels, as well as timing of the survey, had an effect on the estimated biomass of exploitable Snow Crab. The models were tested for their ability to converge and the “sanity” function was applied (as described above). Residuals and the conditional effects of the vessel were examined. The inclusion of survey vessel and/or calendar day did not improve model performance, there were no patterns upon examination of residuals, and no significant difference was evident in evaluation of the conditional effect of the vessel (Wheeland et al.<sup>2</sup>). Therefore, the conversion factors developed to convert the CCGS Teleost data to the new vessel time series were applied to the CCGS Alfred Needler time series.

### **Trawl-Based Estimates, NAFO Divisions 2HJ3KLNO**

The best model for predicting exploitable Snow Crab density within NAFO Divs. 2HJ3KLNO from the fall trawl survey is described in Eq. 5.

Eq. 5

$$Density_{expTRAWL} = s(Scaled\ depth) + 0 + as.factor(Year)$$

where,  $Density_{expTRAWL}$  was the standardized biomass (kg/km<sup>2</sup>) of exploitable Snow Crab in a standard trawl survey set during fall DFO trawl surveys,  $Scaled\ depth$  was the average depth (m) during each trawl scaled  $[(set\ depth - mean(depth)) / sd(depth)]$ , and  $Year$  was the year of the survey, represented as a factor. Anisotropy was included with separate Matérn ranges estimated for the spatial and spatiotemporal random fields. The best model was a hurdle (two-part) model, represented by a binomial model predicting the presence of Snow Crab and a log-normal model predicting the density at positive locations. Density predictions were made on a 13.89 km<sup>2</sup> gridded surface restricted to depths between 32 and 750 m from 1995–2023. Available data included all standard trawl sets through the time series and comparative fishing sets in 2021–23. The inclusion of set type as factor in the model was tested during model development, but did not improve model performance and was not included in the best model. Depth was scaled to allow for the inclusion of a depth-specific spatially-varying coefficient. Annual biomass indices were estimated for each AD.

To determine whether the conversion factors developed for the CCGS Alfred Needler data in Divs. 3KL could be extended into Divs. 3NO, qualitative examination of habitat characteristics

---

for areas occupied in Snow Crab throughout Divs. 3LNO was undertaken and is detailed in Wheeland et al.<sup>2</sup>. Distributions of bottom temperature and depth across the most productive Snow Crab areas showed tight conformity and connectivity demonstrated in tagging studies (Mullowney et al. 2020) inferred a homogenous unit and therefore the conversion factors developed to convert the CCGS Alfred Needler data to the new vessel time series in Divs. 3KL were applied to Divs. 3NO.

### **Trap-Based Estimates, NAFO Divisions 2HJ3KLNOP4R**

The best model for predicting exploitable Snow Crab density in NAFO Divs. 2HJ3KLNOP4R from trap-based surveys is described in Eq. 6.

Eq. 6

$$Density_{expTRAP} = s(Scaled\ depth, k = 5) + s(Day) + 0 + as.factor(Survey) + as.factor(Year)$$

where,  $Density_{expTRAP}$  was the standardized biomass (kg/km<sup>2</sup>) of exploitable Snow Crab per large-mesh trap during the DFO inshore, TJFB, and CPS trap surveys,  $Scaled\ depth$  was the average depth (m) during each set scaled [(set depth - mean(depth)) / sd(depth)],  $Day$  was the calendar day that trap was hauled,  $Survey$  was a factor representing the trap survey (CPS, TJFB, or DFO inshore), and  $Year$  was the year of the survey, represented as a factor.  $Depth$  was scaled because the best-fitting model included a spatial-varying coefficient for depth. The effective fishing area of a crab trap was set at 0.01 km<sup>2</sup>. This effective fishing area parameter represents an intermediate value from estimates reported by Miller (1977), Brêthes et al. (1985), and Dawe et al. (1993). Nonetheless, because uncertainties remain regarding the accuracy of the effective fishing area parameter, biomass estimates developed from this survey remain as indices and are assessed in a relative sense. Anisotropy was included with separate Matérn ranges estimated for the spatial and spatiotemporal random fields. The best-fitting model was a hurdle model represented by a binomial model predicting the presence of Snow Crab and a model with a gamma distribution predicting the density at positive locations. Density predictions were made on a 13.29 km<sup>2</sup> gridded surface restricted to depths between 32 and 750 m from 2017–23. Densities were predicted using “CPS” as  $Survey$  because the CPS survey has the broadest coverage in comparison to the other trap surveys, and  $Day$  was set to 1 October, representing a day near the middle of the CPS survey. Annual biomass indices were estimated for each AD.

### **Delury-Adjusted Biomass Estimates and Exploitation Rate Indices**

The model-based exploitable biomass estimates were calculated from raw survey data. However, neither trawl- nor trap-based estimates are deemed absolute. This is due to unknown catchabilities for both gear types. Although not explicitly known, the catchability of crab by the survey trawl (i.e., trawl efficiency) is lower than 1, even for the most efficiently captured large males (Dawe et al. 2010a), and raw trawl and trap survey biomass estimates are underestimated to variable extents across ADs (Mullowney et al. 2017). Accordingly, the raw exploitable biomass estimates were scaled to more realistic values using catchability scalars ( $S$ ) developed through fishery Delury depletion regression analysis on catch rate data from logbooks.

The depletion analysis used five-day unstandardized CPUEs in each AD beginning in the year 1999. Prior data were omitted due to less evidence of strong seasonal depletion in the fishery, with rapid expansion and substantial increases in removals occurring throughout the 1990s to a peak in 1999. To estimate biomass, five-day CPUEs were natural log transformed and regressed on cumulative pots. Catch data associated with the first and last 5% of the effort (measured by number of pots), and data later than July in any given AD and year were omitted

to control for small sample size effects potentially associated with atypical fishing practices such as high levels of searching at the beginning of the season, dumping of excess catches near the end of the season, or recruitment of exploitable males at the end of season. A linear mixed model (Eq. 7) was fit to log-catch rate versus cumulative effort (i.e., number of pots) data by AD and year, with the predicted intercept used to calculate the beginning of the season biomass:

Eq. 7

$$\ln CPUE_i = \alpha + pot\_cum_i + a_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{error}^2)$$

where,  $\ln CPUE$  is the natural log of fishery catch per unit effort (kg/trap) and  $pot\_cum$  is the cumulative number of pots.

A limitation associated with biomass estimation based on depletion methods is that a resource must be depleted for the method to work. For example, no depletion occurred in catch rates during the 2019 fishery in AD 3Ps and a usable depletion-based biomass estimate could not be calculated. Therefore, years where there was no depletion were removed from the analysis. To account for other variability resulting from sporadic depletion patterns, a centered three-period moving average was used to smooth annual logbook-based biomass estimates prior to making comparisons for survey biomass conversion.

For the trawl time series, the depletion catchability scalars ( $S$ ) represented the median difference between logbook and survey-based biomass estimates in each AD over the time series (Eq. 8):

Eq. 8

$$S = \sum_{y=2000}^{2023} (Ty/Dy * 1/n)$$

where,  $T$  is the raw model-based exploitable biomass estimates,  $D$  is the depletion biomass estimates from logbooks,  $y$  is the year beginning in 2000, and  $n$  is the number of years in the analysis.

A constant  $S$  was applied to the trawl time series for each AD, calculated as the median. Standardized biomass indices were calculated as  $T/S$ . Although more realistic, these standardized biomass estimates are not absolute and remain interpreted as relative indices. The Delury fisheries depletion biomass estimates are applicable to the beginning of the season (spring), therefore a one-year lag was applied to survey estimates in Divs. 2HJ3KLNO in calculating the annual scalars, as these surveys occur in the fall.

As with the trawl survey exploitable biomass estimates, the trap survey exploitable biomass indices were scaled using  $S$  developed through fishery depletion regression analysis on catch rate data from logbooks. For the shorter trap surveys, there has been variability in the  $S$  which have been influenced by a contracting fishery distribution in some ADs in since 2018. Consequently, for ADs with trawl surveys (all but AD 4R3Pn), the trap survey biomass estimates were scaled to the trawl survey estimates based on average ratios over the 2017–23 period. For AD 4R3Pn, where there is no trawl survey, the depletion scalar was determined from a linear regression over the time series. The Delury fisheries depletion biomass estimates are applicable to the beginning of the season (spring), therefore for surveys occurring in late-summer or fall, a one-year lag was applied to survey estimates in calculating the annual  $S$ .

An annual exploitation rate index (ERI) for each AD was calculated as the ratio of dockside-monitored landings to the most recent depletion-adjusted exploitable biomass index

---

for both trawl and trap time series (where they exist). As exploitable biomass indices are not absolute, neither are ERIs. Given evidence to suggest exploitable biomass is slightly over-estimated (Baker et al. 2021), ERIs likely slightly underestimate absolute harvest rate. Nonetheless, long-term trends in ERIs provide a useful indication of trends of relative effects from fishing.

For provision of advice, exploitable biomass and ERIs based on smoothed two-period average biomass indices were calculated. This smoother was applied to account for annually variable survey performance and the possibility of year effects in biomass estimates, a feature typically raised during annual assessments. It is anticipated that, if successful, ongoing work to fully integrate all trawl and trap data into a single estimate of exploitable biomass could diminish concerns about year effects in individual data series moving forward and eliminate the need to safeguard against them in calculating exploitation rates.

## ECOSYSTEM INDICES

Spring and fall bottom temperature climatological maps (1991–2020 average) and spring and fall 2023 observations and anomalies were determined using the methodology described in Cyr and Galbraith (2021). Spring temperature indices are preferred because they are more closely associated with critical life history events in Snow Crab, such as mating and molting.

Several atmospheric teleconnection patterns have been related to Snow Crab productivity either in short-, mid-, or long-term scales, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) (Szuwalski and Punt 2013), the Arctic Oscillation (AO) (Szuwalski et al. 2021), the El-Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO), and the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) (Baker et al. 2021). These teleconnections are believed to affect Snow Crab at different life stages through regulation of ocean climate conditions over large geographic scales (e.g., sea ice extent, thermal and gas exchanges at the sea surface, and impacts of water exchanges within and among ocean current systems). A correlation analysis was performed with all teleconnections cited above, however, the assessment analysis ultimately focused on the AO as per Mullaney et al. (2023a). The AO is the first mode of variability of atmospheric pressure over the Arctic. It is constructed from the anomaly in the height of the 1000 mb pressure above the Northern Hemisphere (20–90°N). Monthly values of the AO since 1951 were obtained from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Climate Prediction Center. Beyond direct forcing from atmospheric teleconnection systems, sea ice extent and in-turn spatiotemporal distribution of the Cold Intermediate Layer (CIL) of bottom water have also been shown to be related to recruitment strength in Snow Crab (Szuwalski et al. 2021; Mullaney et al. 2023a). The CIL is a body of <0°C water that sits intermediate in the water column and covers shallow areas of the Newfoundland and Labrador Shelf. It represents a proxy for thermal crab habitat. The data for monthly sea ice extent extending back to 1978 were available from the National Sea and Ice Data Center (Stroeve and Meier 2018).

A predictive model of total stock-level (Divs. 2HJ3KLNOPs) exploitable biomass was developed using a three life-stage approach of explanatory variables affecting Snow Crab at long-, mid-, and short-term stages using the inputs described in Mullaney et al. (2023a). Sea ice extent was used as the explanatory variable for the long-term life stage with a 12–13 year lag. For the mid-term life stage, the AO with a 7–8 year lag was used, with the AO at lags of zero and one years used to model short-term stock drivers. The prediction model was fit as a generalized additive model, assuming a Gaussian family distribution and identity link. Tensor product interaction smooths ( $te$ ) were used on thin-plate splines for explanatory variables for each life stage. Each interaction term was set to a low number of basis knots ( $k=3$ ) to allow the model to converge. The long- and mid-term model (Eq. 9) and the full model (short-, mid-, and long-term)

---

(Eq. 10) were plotted to forecast short-term exploitable biomass prospects, with each defined as:

Eq. 9

$$eBIOt \sim te(Ice12, Ice13) + te(A07, A08) + \varepsilon t$$

Eq. 10

$$eBIOt \sim te(Ice12, Ice13) + te(A07, A08) + te(A00, A01) + \varepsilon t$$

where, *eBIO* refers to survey exploitable biomass, *t* refers to the year, *Ice* refers to cumulative February to April sea ice extent, *AO* refers to annual Arctic Oscillation Index, numerics with each explanatory term refer to lag years (12, 13), and  $\varepsilon$  represents white noise error.

Relative predation mortality was examined with estimates of Snow Crab consumed by fish predators generated by combining three sources of information: biomass estimates for fish predators, estimations of total food consumption by unit of biomass for those predators, and fractionation of that consumption using diet compositions to estimate the proportion of Snow Crab in the diet. As each step involves assumptions and generalizations, the resulting index is not a precise estimate of consumption, but intended to generate a plausible envelope for the order of magnitude for consumption.

Among all fish species recorded in multispecies trawl surveys, only those classed as piscivores and large benthivores were considered Snow Crab predators due to gape limitation of smaller fishes and the available evidence from stomach contents. The total biomass of fish predators was approximated from multispecies trawl survey random stratified biomass estimates, assuming the sample populations reflect fish community composition. However, as species-specific estimates were not corrected for gear catchability they likely reflect minimum estimates of predator biomass.

Estimation of consumption rates per unit of biomass were derived using two separate approaches:

1. Allometric methods. Two different models were used:
  - a. bioenergetic-allometric consumer-resource modelling framework, based on empirical allometric scaling relationships (Yodzis and Innes 1992)
  - b. an allometric framework derived from growth principles based on the von Bertalanffy equation and rationale (Wiff and Roa-Ureta 2008).
2. Daily ration. These estimates are based on assuming daily consumption as a percent fraction of body weight. Two daily ration scenarios of 1% and 2% were assumed based on the typical range of values from literature reports (Macdonald and Waiwood 1987; Adams and Breck 1990).

These approaches estimate average food requirements and assume that all predators achieve their food requirements. Using these estimates of consumption rates together produce a plausible envelope for consumption that likely contains the actual consumption rate.

Diet composition data were only available since 2008 for fall trawl series and 2013 for spring trawl series and for a small subset of Snow Crab predators (American Plaice [*Hippoglossoides platessoides*], Atlantic Cod [*Gadus morhua*], and Greenland Halibut [*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides*]). Estimates of the overall fraction of Snow Crab in their diets, as well as relative contributions of these species to the overall biomass of the Snow Crab predator assemblage, were used to approximate the fraction of Snow Crab consumed by all piscivore and large benthivore fishes. Since these predator species are a major component of the

biomass of the corresponding fish functional groups, using their diets to represent the functional groups is a reasonable proxy. The mean diet data from 2008–10 (in the fall) and 2013–15 (in the spring) are used for the earlier time periods when diet composition data were not available. Estimates of consumption of Snow Crab by piscivores and large benthivores were presented as the median (point estimate) and range from all consumption models considered, along with a predation mortality index (predation estimate / total Snow Crab survey biomass). Predation mortality indices should be interpreted with caution as they are calculated using total Snow Crab biomass; however the influence of predation is exerted primarily on small-sized crab. Unpublished work has shown trends across methods using total Snow Crab biomass versus small-sized Snow Crab biomass as the denominators tightly correspond to one another (D. Mullowney, unpublished data). As conversion factors for outgoing to new vessels were not available for all species used in these analyses, consumption and predation mortality indices used unconverted data.

## PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH

In 2018, DFO Science held a [CSAS Regional Peer Review process](#) to develop a Precautionary Approach (PA) Framework for Snow Crab in the NL Region. The PA Framework for the NL Snow Crab resource and fishery was based on three key metrics of stock health:

1. predicted CPUE ( $pCPUE$ ),
2. predicted discards ( $pDIS$ ), and
3. proportion of females with full egg clutches (Mullowney et al. 2018b).

Limit Reference Points, as set by the peer-review process, are  $pCPUE = 5$  kg/trap,  $pDIS = 20\%$ , and proportion of females with full egg clutches = 0.6.

Predicted CPUE ( $pCPUE$ ) was estimated based a generalized additive mixed model (Eq. 11):

Eq. 11

$$pCPUE_i = \alpha + f_{1k}(ERI_i) + f_{2k}(CBI_i) + f_{3k}(NAO7_i) + a_i + \zeta_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$a_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{AD}^2)$$

$$\zeta_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{year}^2)$$

$$\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{error}^2)$$

where,  $ERI$  is the exploitation rate index based on a 2-period exploitable biomass index,  $CBI$  is the combined exploitable biomass index from trawl and trap surveys in the previous year (i.e., an average of the trawl and trap survey exploitable biomass indices and scaled within AD), and  $NAO7$  is the index of the annual NAO lagged 7 years, with the annual index based on the mean of monthly data values.

Predicted discards ( $pDIS$ ) were estimated based a generalized additive mixed model (Eq. 12):

Eq. 12

$$pDIS_i = \alpha + f_{1k}(wCPUE_i) + f_{2k}(medFD_i) + f_{3k}(EP_i) + a_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$a_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{AD}^2)$$

$$\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_{error}^2)$$

where,  $wCPUE$  is the cell-weighted catch per unit effort (with the number of years a 5 x 5 nm cell was occupied used as the weighting factor),  $medFD$  is the median fishing day based on effort

---

(i.e., pots),  $EP$  is the ratio of exploitable to pre-recruit Snow Crab in the previous year, and  $AD$  is the Assessment Division.

The percentage of the catch discarded is based on ASO data, but due to low ASO coverage levels in recent years, the predictive model used in the PA Framework is only fit to observation data up to 2019. Therefore conditioning of predicted outcomes for 2020–23 is based on responses to fishery CPUE, median fishing day, and the exploitable to pre-recruit abundance ratio that occurred over the 2004–19 period. The predicted values over 2020–23 are plotted against an estimate of percent discarded based on averaging data from two sources, the limited available ASO data and a reference fleet of anonymous vessels (based on Vessel Registration Numbers) identified as consistently and accurately reporting total discards in logbooks prior to 2019. The determination of accurate reporting of discards by a vessel is defined as a significant correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ) with annual total discards reported by ASOs over the time series in any given AD.

Both the CPUE and discard predictive models project one year based on scenarios of various exploitation rates in the forthcoming fishery, with the zonation for each metric in the PA Framework for the forthcoming year based on an assumption of status quo landings from the most recent fishery.

As presented in Mullowney et al. (2018b), egg clutches are calculated directly based on visual assessment (as a 2-year moving average). Prior to 2022 only trawl survey data were used to calculate egg clutch fullness levels. However with improved coverage of small-mesh traps in the CPS surveys in recent years, data from all trap surveys from 2018 to present are now used. Given projections of egg clutch fullness are not possible, the zonation of the egg clutch metric in the PA Framework is based on the current year's estimate.

The Upper Stock References and Harvest Control Rules were developed over several years and approved in 2023. To determine stock status, the three assessment metrics are combined into an integrated stock health score (Mullowney and Baker 2023) through a weighted scoring matrix that produces a range of outcomes for the integrated health score. The scoring matrix was established collaboratively between industry, management, and Science, and among other considerations, weightings reflect the ability of management measures to directly affect outcomes of each metric (i.e., most direct effect on  $pCPUE$ ), as well as dynamic data ranges within historical time series for each metric (i.e., most stability in the egg clutch index). Upon summation, the integrated health score index is differentiated into either the Healthy, Cautious, or Critical Zone.

## **COMBINING 3L INSHORE AND 3LNO OFFSHORE**

Following the 2023 stock assessment for Snow Crab in NL, DFO committed to reviewing the possibility of combining the 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore ADs. These two ADs have been assessed separately due to differences in data availability in both trawl and trap surveys. The trawl survey does not currently extend into inshore bays and ceased surveying some of the AD 3L Inshore strata as early as 2005 and as late as 2013. As noted in the COLLABORATIVE POST-SEASON (CPS) TRAP SURVEY Section, the CPS survey underwent a significant survey design change in 2017–18 whereby prior to redesign, station allocation was very dense in 3L Inshore and restricted solely to prime fishing grounds in 3LNO Offshore. Following the redesign, the station allocation was significantly expanded in 3LNO Offshore to cover an area more similar to the footprint of the trawl survey. Station allocation was thinned out slightly in 3L Inshore, but coverage remains extensive.

The approach for combining ADs 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore included consideration of exploration of trend consistency following the CPS survey redesign and the new model-based

---

approach to estimate exploitable biomass indices (see Model-Based Exploitable Biomass Indices section). It is expected that the new spatiotemporal models can accommodate the differences in trap survey coverage and type with the inclusion of survey type and calendar day in the final model for the trap time series. The previous inshore trawl surveys provided estimates of spatial random effects in 3L Inshore. This, in combination with the inclusion of depth and year as covariates in the model, allows for prediction throughout 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore as a homogenous unit.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### BROAD-SCALE TRENDS: DIVISIONS 2HJ3KLNOP4R

#### Fishery

Landings for Divs. 2HJ3KLNOP4R increased steadily from 1989 to a peak of 69,100 t in 1999, largely due to the expansion of the fishery to offshore areas. Landings decreased by 20% to 55,400 t in 2000 and changed little until they decreased to 44,000 t in 2005, primarily due to a sharp decrease in landings in AD 3K. Landings remained near 50,000 t from 2007–15 but steadily declined to a 25-year low of 26,400 t in 2019. Landings have increased since then and were over 51,000 t in 2023 (Figure 14).

In AD 2HJ, landings remained near 1,700 t from 2014–19 but have since declined due to TAC reductions. Landings were around 880 t in 2023 (Figure 15). In AD 3K, landings have increased from a time-series low of around 5,500 t in 2017 to around 10,400 t in 2023. In AD 3LNO, landings were at the lowest level in two decades in 2019 (around 15,600 t), but have since increased to around 31,700 t in 2023. In AD 3Ps, landings have been particularly variable throughout the time series. Landings continued to increase from a time-series low of around 1,200 t in 2017 to a time-series high of around 8,100 t in 2023. In AD 4R3Pn, landings have increased from a time-series low of around 160 t in 2020 to around 450 t in 2023.

Fishery timing transitioned from summer-fall to spring-summer throughout the 2000s in most ADs (Figure 16). In recent years, the fishery has generally begun in early April for all but AD 2HJ, where it usually starts in early to mid-May due to ice cover in the spring. The 2023 fishery was delayed until mid-May due to price disputes. Consequently, median fishing weeks ranged from early June in AD 4R3Pn and late June to early July for the rest of the ADs. The delayed start of the fishery also resulted in a later end to the fishery, particularly in AD 3LNO, where fishing activity extended into the end of August.

Fishing effort, as indicated by estimated trap hauls, increased by a factor of five throughout the 1990s as the fishery grew (Figure 17). Overall effort remained at approximately 3.5 to 4.5 million trap hauls per year over that time period, but decreased to around 2.5 million trap hauls in 2020, the lowest level in over two decades. Overall effort has increased since then to near 3.8 million trap hauls in 2023. Spatially, the distribution of fishing has remained relatively broad, but there have been notable changes in some ADs in recent years (Figure 18). In the north, effort in the northernmost portion of AD 2HJ has gradually dissipated since 2011, with NAFO Div. 2H virtually abandoned since then as the Cartwright and Hawke Channels have near-exclusively become the two areas of fishing activity. The abandonment of the northernmost fishing grounds reflects both resource shortages and a regulation change after the 2012 fishery whereby vessels previously restricted to Div. 2H were allowed access to the northern portion of the Cartwright Channel, inside Div. 2J, at the southernmost portion of CMA 1. In AD 2HJ, effort remained relatively consistent for the last decade, at around 200,000 trap hauls per year, but declined in the last two years and was 93,000 trap hauls in 2023 (Figure 17). In AD 3K, effort

---

decreased to a 25-year low in 2019, with about 600,000 trap hauls, but increased to around 1.1 million trap hauls in 2023. From 2017–22, effort contracted primarily into the Funk Island Deep and areas west, with the furthest offshore portions of this AD appearing to have been abandoned (Figure 18). However, fishing activity expanded farther offshore again in 2023. In AD 3LNO, effort expanded rapidly from 1992 to the mid-2000s and thereafter oscillated between two and three million trap hauls per year until decreasing to under 1.5 million trap hauls in 2020. Effort has since increased and was just over 2 million trap hauls in 2023 (Figure 17). A substantial reduction in fishing effort was seen in CMA 3N200 (eastern edge of the Grand Bank) in the last five years, with virtually no activity along the southern slope edge (tail of the Grand Bank) (Figure 18). In AD 3Ps, effort reached a 25-year low in 2020, but has since increased and was over 520,000 trap hauls in 2023 (Figure 17). Since around 2017 and 2018, there has been a reduction in effort in the most southerly portions of CMA 10B and along the southwest edge of CMA 11S. There was virtually no fishing activity in these areas in 2021–23 (Figure 18). The change in fishing activity in CMA 10B corresponds with a regulation change whereby a management line was removed and some harvesters were no longer restricted to the southern portion of the CMA. In AD 4R3Pn, effort has remained at a low level relative to other ADs and decreased to around a three-decade low in 2020. Effort has increased since and was over 43,000 trap hauls in 2023 (Figure 17), however, it is mainly occurring in a few CMAs. There has been a substantial reduction in fishing activity in the offshore area (CMA OS8) of this AD and fishing is primarily focused in CMAs 12C, 12D, 12E, and 12F (Figure 18). Trends in fishing activity do not solely represent trends in the resource, as fishery dynamics such as fuel costs, processing capacity and timing, and other socio-economic factors may influence fishing operations.

Fishery CPUE tends to lag behind survey biomass trends by one to two years in most ADs, thus the fishery is typically delayed in reflecting stock status, indicative of hyperstability in the CPUE index. From 2015–19, there was considerable spatial contraction of high levels of fishery CPUE; however, increases have been seen in many areas since then (Figure 18). Fishery CPUE is typically highest in NAFO Div. 3L; however, in recent years, ADs 3K and 3Ps have also had high levels of fishery CPUE. Throughout the past 25 years, overall fishery CPUE has shown a great deal of variability (Figure 19), both across and within ADs (Figure 20).

Overall, the fishery performed poorly in 2017 and 2018, with standardized CPUE at a historical low (Figure 19). The overall standardized CPUE has greatly increased since then and was near the time-series high in 2022. While the fishery CPUE remains high, there was a decrease in catch rates from 2022–23, primarily due to decreases in catch rates in ADs 3K and 3Ps (Figure 20). In AD 2HJ, standardized CPUE increased to near 9 kg/trap in 2023. In AD 3K, standardized CPUE decreased from a recent peak in 2022 but remains high for the time series at 9 kg/trap in 2023. In AD 3LNO, standardized CPUE continued to increase from the time-series low in 2018 to around 15 kg/trap in 2023. In AD 3Ps, standardized CPUE was at a time-series high of around 19 kg/trap in 2022, but decreased in 2023 to around 15 kg/trap. However, the standardized CPUE remains at a high level. In AD 4R3Pn, standardized CPUE was at a time-series high near 10 kg/trap in 2023.

Overall, the combination of landings, spatial patterns, and spatial distribution of catch rates from the various sources of fishery data suggest the fishery remains strongest in an aggregated area along the northern Grand Bank in AD 3LNO, with some declines from very high levels emerging in ADs 3K and 3Ps.

At-sea observer data on shell composition are used to infer dynamics of recruitment into the biomass. Observer coverage has been poor in recent years, and consequently, some ADs have been excluded from analyses in those years. In AD 2HJ, there have been periods of inconsistent ASO coverage, however there have been improvements in recent years. Catch

---

composition tends to be dominated by recruits in this AD, which was particularly evident in 2022 and 2023 (Figure 21, Figure 22). The observed catch composition in AD 3K has been fairly consistent throughout most of the time series; however, catches of recruits was exceptionally low in 2023. There was a decrease in overall catch rate in 2023 with a return to catch levels consistent with levels prior to 2019. In AD 3LNO, the compilation of recruit and residual crab were at a time-series low in 2018, however, observed catch rates have since increased to near the time-series high in 2022–23. The catch composition has been fairly consistent throughout the time series with a mostly even mix of new- and old-shelled crab. In AD 3Ps, both the recruitment and residual components of the biomass observed in the fishery decreased by more than half from 2011–17. In 2018, there was a sharp increase in the observed catch rates and it has remained around that level, with a further increase in 2023. This initially included a sharp increase in recruits which was followed by higher levels of residual crab, but there were very low catch rates of recruits in 2023. In AD 4R3Pn, ASO coverage has habitually been poor and inconsistent, with particularly low coverage over the last six years.

In the early years following the fishery expansion, catch rates were variable or steady throughout the season in most ADs. However, starting in the late 1990s, patterns of early to mid-season depletion began to emerge, which progressed to season-long depletion patterns beginning in the early 2000s. By the mid- to late 2000s, consistent progressive depletion patterns throughout the season occurred in most ADs in most years (Figure 23).

In AD 2HJ, there has been relatively consistent depletion throughout the season in recent years, but there has been replenishment between seasons (Figure 24). Start-of-season and end-of-season catch rates were slightly higher in 2022 and 2023 than the previous two years. Assessment Division 2HJ was unaffected by the delayed start to the 2023 fishing season as this AD traditionally starts fishing later due to ice conditions. In AD 3K, start-of-season catch rates increased from 2020–22, nearing 20 kg/trap in 2022. This period was characterized by high start-of-season catches, steep depletion throughout the season, and strong replenishment between seasons. Start-of-season catch rates were lower in 2023, but it is uncertain whether the delayed start of fishing may have been the cause. A precipitous depletion throughout the season has not always been as evident in AD 3LNO as in some of the other ADs. There have been particularly high start-of-season catch rates in the last four years (near 15 kg/trap). The pattern in catch rates does not appear to have been affected by the delayed start of the season in 2023. In AD 3Ps, there has been a pattern of a quick increase in catch rates shortly after the start of the season and then depletion, with end-of-season catch rates similar to start-of-season catch rates. This pattern was not evident in 2023, likely due to the delayed start of the fishery. End-of-season catch rates were lower in 2023 than the previous year, however catch rates were still above 10 kg/trap. In AD 4R3Pn, there have been some periods of rapid depletion of the biomass, however in recent years there has not been much evidence of depletion as the catch rates were more variable throughout the relatively short fishing season. This may reflect the more opportunistic nature of the fishery in this AD.

The relatively consistent within-year depletion in most years across ADs allowed for the calculation of Delury-based exploitable biomass estimates that could be used as scaling factors (Figure 25–Figure 30), as described in the Delury-Adjusted Biomass Estimates and Exploitation Rate Indices section. Start-of-season fishery-based exploitable biomass indices used to calculate scalars for trawl and trap exploitable biomass time series in each AD are depicted by the centered 3-year moving average Delury-adjusted biomass line plots in Figure 30.

## **Biomass**

Past multispecies trawl survey data from outgoing research vessels were adjusted to account for conversion factors of catchability with new vessels used for these surveys going forward.

---

Multispecies trawl surveys indicate that the exploitable biomass was highest at the start of the survey series (1995–98) (Figure 31). The annual index declined from a peak exceeding 400 kt in the late 1990s to about 150 kt in 2003 and then varied without trend until 2013. From 2013 to 2016, the annual exploitable biomass index declined by 70% to a historical low of about 42 kt. The overall low exploitable biomass level in 2016–18 was coupled with the concentration of exploitable Snow Crab into localized areas in all ADs (Figure 32). The redesign of the CPS survey and subsequent incorporation of stations over a much larger area (Figure 10) has resulted in the trap-based exploitable biomass index becoming more temporally aligned with the trawl-based exploitable biomass index, rather than lagging behind the trawl trends as was evident with the previous survey design. The trawl and trap survey exploitable biomass indices increased from historic lows in 2016–18 but remained around 200 kt over the last three years (Figure 31)

Overall trends in trawl and trap survey exploitable biomass indices mask spatiotemporal variability among ADs (Figure 31–Figure 33), as well as potential confounding factors occurring within any given area. In AD 2HJ, the exploitable biomass indices have remained low for many years, however there were slight increases in these indices in the last two years (Figure 33). In AD 3K, the exploitable biomass indices increased to high levels since 2018, but declined significantly over the last two years. In AD 3LNO, the exploitable biomass indices have increased since 2017, but remained near similar levels from 2022–23. In AD 3Ps, the exploitable biomass indices have increased to high levels since 2017, but remained near similar levels from 2022–23. In AD 4R3Pn, the trap survey exploitable biomass index has increased since 2017, but remained near a similar level from 2022–23.

Although almost 50% of the sampling locations have been randomly determined since 2018, the prior spatially restricted coverage of the CPS survey core stations essentially measured the exploitable biomass on primary fishing grounds and constituted an analog of fishery CPUE. The concentrated distribution on strongest aggregations of exploitable biomass in the CPS survey and fishery created hyperstability in both data sources (DFO 2022). Accordingly, the spatially all-encompassing trawl survey generally detected changes in the biomass prior to them being detected in the CPS survey core stations or fishery for most of the time series (Pantin et al. 2022). This lag between measuring signals of change in biomass among metrics likely reflects the inclusion of marginal grounds in the trawl survey, where, operating under an assumption of some degree of density-dependent regulation, signals of change in stock size would be expected to occur first. The inclusion of the random stations since 2018 in the current stock assessment has shifted the CPS survey to a distribution more similar to that of the trawl survey, however a one-year lag in trends can still be seen in some areas.

Collectively, the survey and fishery metrics are consistent in showing an exploitable biomass that has improved in recent years, but is starting to show some signs of a decline. This is particularly evident in AD 3K, but there have been slight decreases in exploitable biomass indices in ADs 3LNO and 3Ps and fishery CPUE in AD 3Ps in the last 1–2 years as well. While a two-year moving average is used in providing advice on the exploitable biomass index to account for potential year effects in individual time series, slight declines in the annual estimates can be seen in both the trawl and trap surveys as far back as 2021 in some ADs.

## **Recruitment**

There were no separate biomass estimates for recruit and residual exploitable Snow Crab from the trawl surveys generated in the present stock assessment, however immediate recruitment into the exploitable biomass could be inferred from catch rates of new-shelled exploitable Snow Crab from the CPS survey. As well, the proportion of residual and recruit crab in catches from the trawl surveys was considered. Snow Crab captured as soft- or new-shelled in the current

---

survey represented recruitment into the exploitable biomass, while the residual biomass was comprised of intermediate- to very old-shelled crab. Predicting recruitment is complicated by variations in the proportion of pre-recruits that molt in any given year. Molt frequency is inversely related to body size and directly related to temperature such that growth is slower under cold regimes (e.g., Divs. 3LNOPs) than under warm regimes (e.g., Divs. 2J3K4R). Molt frequency is also affected by the density of large males, with terminal molt at small sizes more common at lower densities (Mullowney and Baker 2021). Catch rates of recruit crab in the CPS survey have been fairly consistent in ADs 2HJ, 3LNO, and 3Ps in the last four years, however there was no value for ADs 3LNO or 3Ps in 2023 due to incomplete trap survey coverage in those ADs (Figure 34, Figure 35). Catch rates of recruit crab in ADs 3K and 4R3Pn declined after a peak in 2021, with the catch rates in AD 3K reaching a time-series low. The proportion of recruits in the catches of exploitable Snow Crab in the trawl surveys was at a low point in ADs 3K and 3Ps in 2023 (Figure 36), signaling potential concern for upcoming fishery prospects.

Toward inferring prospects beyond 2024, trends in pre-recruitment were examined from catch rates of pre-recruits in the trawl and trap time series and provide an indication of recruitment prospects for the next two to four years (Figure 37, Figure 38). However, the proportion of these adolescents measured in the surveys that reach the exploitable biomass depends on several factors including natural mortality and the size at which crab terminally molt. The distribution of pre-recruit Snow Crab follows that of exploitable Snow Crab closely and changes seen in exploitable Snow Crab distribution are reflected in the pre-recruits as well (Figure 38). Recent declining trends in catch rates of pre-recruits from the trawl and trap surveys in some areas suggest limited resource growth in the short term (Figure 37). The catch rates of these pre-recruit Snow Crab were lower in 2023 than the average catch rates of the last six years (note natural log of 0 would indicate a 1:1 ratio), particularly in the trawl survey and the small-mesh traps from the trap surveys. While the catch rates of pre-recruit Snow Crab from the trawl time series were lower in 2023 in all ADs, the catch rates were higher than the 6-year average in the large-mesh traps in ADs 2HJ and 4R3Pn (Figure 37). In AD 2HJ, the increase in catches of pre-recruits consisted of primarily new-shelled crab, whereas in AD 4R3Pn these crab were mostly old-shelled (Figure 35).

Toward inferring long-term prospects, trends in small Snow Crab were examined from catch rates of Snow Crab less than 45 mm CW. Indices of small Snow Crab can provide an indication of recruitment prospects in four to seven years. As with pre-recruit Snow Crab, the proportion of the small crab measured by these surveys that reach exploitable size depends on several factors including mortality, skip-molting incidence, and the size at which crab terminally molt. Trawl data are primarily used to infer trends in small crab as the small-mesh traps catch very few crab of that size (Figure 37), however they can also show up in small-mesh traps in some areas (Figure 39). Catch rates of small Snow Crab in 2023 generally corresponded with catch rates of small Snow Crab in the mid- to late 2000s (Figure 37, Figure 40). The small Snow Crab in these years would have grown into the exploitable crab of 2015–18, which represents a time-series low in the exploitable biomass index. The distribution of small crab has not contracted in recent years to the same extent seen in exploitable crab (Figure 40), with small crab still caught in most of the same areas despite overall lower catch magnitudes relative to most other years in the time series. Comparative fishing coverage was insufficient to estimate conversion factors for the CCGS Alfred Needler to new vessels in AD 3Ps and spatiotemporal modelling to determine vessel effects was not performed for Snow Crab smaller than pre-recruit size, therefore, trends could not be determined from the trawl time series for this AD.

---

## Females

The management regime of the NL (and most other commercially harvested) Snow Crab stock restricts all females and a large proportion of breeding males from exploitation. The fishery targets only the largest males, which constitute a small fraction of the overall population. A management strategy of maintaining a sufficient residual biomass of the largest males, coupled with the ability of sub-legal-sized adolescent and adult males to successfully copulate and breed, is thought to safeguard reproductive capacity in the stock.

Low catch rates of females in the trawl surveys were seen in all ADs for which there were data in the early to mid-2010s, and a decreasing trend has emerged again in recent years (Figure 37). Decreasing catch rates in the small-mesh traps have also been seen in ADs 3LNO, 3Ps, and 4R3Pn. Careful monitoring of the decreasing trend, particularly in light of the declines in male size-at-terminal molt (see Size-at-Maturity section), especially in AD 2HJ, will be important moving forward as this could have serious implications for reproductive potential in AD 2HJ and potentially other ADs considering upstream/downstream population connectivity. The overall spatial distribution pattern observed in the trawl survey is typical of a dominant shallow water presence of mature females (Figure 41). For example, relatively high abundance has consistently been found on top of the Hamilton Bank and nearshore plateaus in AD 2HJ, in the shallow western portions of AD 3K, and along the shallow northern Grand Bank in AD 3LNO. Assessment Division 3Ps is overall the shallowest of all ADs, with females typically concentrated in the central portions of the division near the fringes of the St. Pierre and Green Banks, and into Placentia Bay (Pantin et al. 2024). These shallow areas, where the majority of reproduction occurs, are typically very cold. Mullaney et al. (2018a) described winter and spring breeding migrations of female and male Snow Crab into shallow water along offshore parts of the NL Shelf, a behavior known to occur in some inshore bays for decades.

The sporadic capture of females by the trawl survey throughout the time series could reflect their affinity to form aggregations, demographic pulses, or their small size. Their general size corresponds with a trough in size frequency distributions from the Campelen trawl (Figure 42, Figure 43), and assumed poor catchability. However, variability in annual abundance indices could also reflect demographic changes in this component of the population. Cyclic pulses of female abundance have been described in other areas, including the Northern Gulf of St. Lawrence (Sainte-Marie 1993; Sainte-Marie et al. 1996).

It is unknown to what extent mature female abundance influences future recruitment. Historically, some of the largest recruitment pulses observed in the stock have been born from periods of low mature female abundance. For example, the 15–25 mm CW crab observed in the 2001–02 surveys would have almost certainly been 2–3 years of age (Sainte-Marie et al. 1995) and therefore produced from the relatively low abundance levels of mature females that occurred in 1998–2000 (Figure 42). Further research into the importance of female abundance in regulating stock productivity is required.

## Environment

Increased bottom temperature has been shown to relate positively to size and negatively to abundance in regulating stock productivity and ultimately biomass. Cold bottom temperatures appear to promote terminal molt at small sizes in Snow Crab, resulting in relatively low recruitment and yield-per-crab from a given year class (Dawe et al. 2012). This outcome appears particularly applicable under low population densities of large males (Mullaney and Baker 2021). However, recruitment is more strongly affected by the positive effects of cold environmental conditions on year class production (Dawe et al. 2008; Marcello et al. 2012) than it is by the negative effects of cold conditions on size-at-terminal molt. This is consistent with the

---

positive benefits of cold conditions in promoting early to mid-life survival and subsequently increased densities of Snow Crab in the population. Cold bottom temperature conditions were experienced between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s, and from about 2012–17 (Cyr et al. 2024).

The last six years have shown an overall trend towards warmer and potentially less favourable environmental conditions for future Snow Crab productivity (Figure 44, Figure 45). It was particularly warm in 2021 and 2022, with the NL Climate Index (Cyr and Galbraith 2020) indicating 2021 was the warmest year of the time series and 2022 was in the top five warmest years (Cyr et al. 2024). Although a return to cooler conditions in recent years (2012–17) is positive because it appears to have promoted the emergence of a modest pulse of small crab likely fueling the recent fishery, expectations for the future should be tempered as climatic conditions are still relatively warm. The ocean climate indices have varied considerably over the past decade, introducing uncertainty beyond the short-term, but the overall trend is warming. Recent cold bottom conditions are not as spatially or temporally expansive as they were in the late 1980s and early 1990s, from which the highest exploitable biomass levels in the mid- to late 1990s originated (Mullowney et al. 2014). Long-term abundance may heavily hinge on the extent to which the recent warming conditions are sustained, although it is unclear how environmental, anthropogenic, or other factors such as predation will affect the survival and progression of recruitment pulses throughout life.

Bottom temperature is not the only climatic factor influencing Snow Crab productivity; the AO and sea ice extent are important variables in predicting abundances of different life stages (Mullowney et al. 2023a). Sea ice extent has shown positive correlations with Snow Crab exploitable biomass index at lags longer than 10 years, indicating an effect on early life stages, while the AO has been shown to be positively related to Snow Crab exploitable biomass index at lags of 7–8 years indicating an effect on mid-life stages. Although the association of these indices and future biomass is consistent with a linkage between cold conditions and high stock productivity (e.g., positive AO and NAO generally leads to cold conditions along the NL Shelf), other climatic factors such as plankton bloom strength and timing, water mixing, food availability, or predator field dynamics may affect Snow Crab survival during early ontogeny. The short-term prediction model predicts that exploitable biomass may remain at similar levels or potentially decline over the next three years (Figure 46).

There is much uncertainty regarding the reliability of qualitatively relating recent climate events to long-term recruitment potential. One factor contributing to this uncertainty is inconsistency in levels of fishing, in particular if exploitation rates are allowed to increase during unproductive periods (Mullowney et al. 2014). The history of the stock trajectory depicts oscillating periods of changes in bottom-up versus top-down control. For example, following a regime shift culminating in a collapse of most of the finfish community in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Buren et al. 2014), the Snow Crab resource was largely under bottom-up control, in association with low exploitation rates in the largest areas of abundance (i.e., offshore areas in AD 3LNO) (Mullowney et al. 2014). Conversely, recent assessments have highlighted that heavy exploitation has grown in importance over the past decade. However, in recent years (>2019) there has been a general trend of improvements in the exploitable biomass associated with substantially decreased fisheries exploitation rates coupled with a period of moderately cool oceanographic conditions.

Inconsistencies in rates of predation are another top-down factor that can affect the degree of climate control on Snow Crab productivity. A general prolonged shift toward warmer conditions throughout the 2000s appears to have affected the Snow Crab resource in the form of increased predation, as temperate finfish populations responded positively to warming (DFO 2014b; Rose and Rowe 2015; Pedersen et al. 2017). The predation mortality index remained among the

---

highest in recent years, however there have been declines from the peaks of 2016–18 (Figure 47). The predation mortality index has remained generally high within the Divs. 2J3K and 3LNO time series and remained lower in the 3Ps time series, with the highest predation mortality rates in Divs. 2J3K. The regulating effect of predation is thought to be most important on small- to intermediate-sized crab (Chabot et al. 2008); thus, a delay would be expected between decreases in the predation mortality index and recruitment into the exploitable biomass. Following that consumption occurs primarily on small- to intermediate-sized crab, the predation mortality index may also infer mid- to long-term recruitment prospects. The recent decrease in the index in all ADs since about the mid-2010s is consistent with most other data suggesting forthcoming declines in recruitment.

With respect to overall ecosystem productivity, ecosystem conditions in the NL bioregion remain indicative of a low productivity state, likely driven by bottom-up processes (e.g., food limitation). Total fish biomass levels remain much lower than prior to the finfish collapse in the early 1990s, however some ecosystem indicators (i.e., biomass trends and stomach content weights) appear to be improving in the most recent years for which data is available. However, overall biomass has yet to return to the levels of the early 2010s. Increased nutrient availability and phytoplankton biomass, along with a higher abundance of large, energy-rich *Calanus* copepods, are indicative of improved productivity at the lower trophic levels in recent years (DFO 2023). This has the potential for positive impacts on the energy transfer to higher trophic levels and overall ecosystem productivity.

## **Mortality**

An index of total mortality from trawl survey data can be calculated based on stage-specific biomass indices of exploitable Snow Crab, which indicate the exploitable Snow Crab that remain from the previous year. This index has not been updated in the last two assessments. Total mortality in exploitable Snow Crab was high in all ADs with trawl surveys during 2015–17 (DFO 2022) and in recent years total mortality has been highest in AD 2HJ. There is high variability in the total mortality index in AD 3Ps which likely reflects the shell condition-based methodology, with a spring survey potentially affecting the subjective shell condition classifications.

### **Natural Mortality**

Bitter Crab Disease is one important source of consistently measured natural mortality in the population. It is fatal to crab, occurs primarily in new-shelled crab of both sexes, and is most commonly acquired during molting (Dawe 2002). The most reliable size group of Snow Crab assessed for the impact of BCD on the population is the 40–59 mm CW size group, with these small- to mid-sized animals commonly visibly infected (Mullowney et al. 2011). Although the macroscopic analyses used to classify crab as infected are known to underestimate true prevalence, a study using advanced polymerase chain reaction techniques on specimens collected since the mid-2000s to identify infections has shown trends closely reflect the visually observed patterns seen throughout the region (DFO, unpublished data).

Bitter Crab Disease has been observed in the trawl and trap surveys in Divs. 2J3KLNOPs throughout the time series. The prevalence and distribution of BCD throughout the NL Shelf has been described in detail by Dawe (2002) and appears related to circulation features (Dawe et al. 2010b) and the density of small crab (Mullowney et al. 2011). Spatially, the disease has tended to follow a pattern of being most prominent in shallow nearshore areas of the NL Shelf with a virtual absence in deeper areas farther offshore. Bitter Crab Disease has been consistently low in fall trawl surveys in AD 2HJ, although prevalence exceeding 10% occurred for 60–75 mm CW Snow Crab in 2015 and 2016 (Figure 48). However, there have been no

---

reports of BCD in this AD in the trawl survey since then. Bitter Crab Disease is normally most prevalent in AD 3K and in 2023 it was present in all non-legal size categories in this AD. The disease is also very prevalent in the DFO inshore trap surveys in White Bay and Notre Dame Bay (inshore 3K), where often over 10% of the catches of new-shelled males have BCD. Bitter Crab Disease is normally uncommon in AD 3LNO, but a prolonged pulse of relatively high incidence was observed in this AD from approximately 2001–06, most prominent in 40–59 mm CW Snow Crab. This sustained pulse of BCD likely reflected progression of the recruitment pulse detected in the trawl surveys as 20–30 mm CW Snow Crab in 2001–03 (Figure 42), which was subsequently tracked as pre-recruits in surveys from 2008–10. The disease is uncommon in AD 3Ps, however this is likely due to the timing of the survey in spring, as chronic infections are most apparent in the fall (Mullowney et al. 2011).

### **Fishing Mortality**

Beyond direct removals of Snow Crab from the system, the fishery also imposes mortality on Snow Crab through discarding. Crab that are caught and released as undersized or legal-sized soft-shell males are subject to multiple stresses and have unknown survival rates. Time out of water, air temperature, water temperature, wind speed, sunlight, shell hardness, and size may all influence the mortality level on discarded Snow Crab (Miller 1977; Dufour et al. 1997; Grant 2003; van Taemelen 2005; Urban 2015). Soft-shell crab are likely subject to more damage and mortality than hard-shelled crab. Poor handling practices, such as prolonged exposure on deck and dropping or throwing crab, can induce limb loss and lead to increased mortality levels associated with catching and discarding (Grant 2003).

In a study in the Bering Sea, Urban (2015) predicted only about 5% mortality for discarded Snow Crab. This estimate is virtually identical to the estimate of Grant (2003) in NL for Snow Crab subjected to best handling practices, specifically in the form of minimal dropping distances and exposure time on deck. However, Grant (2003) showed that mortality rates increased substantially under poor handling practices. It must be noted that both studies featured predominately hard-shelled crab and both authors cautioned that unobserved latent mortality was unaccounted for in their studies. Despite not knowing absolute discard mortality rates, minimizing fisheries-induced mortality and wastage of crab not retained in the fishery (particularly the most vulnerable soft-shell pre-recruits which are suspected to experience higher rates of discard mortality) is an advised best practice for the NL Snow Crab fishery.

There was particular concern in recent years for AD 2HJ, where the discard level was very high at approximately 40% of the catch in 2019 (Figure 49) and was comprised of mostly legal-sized soft-shell crab throughout the time series (Figure 50). Accordingly, relative levels of resource wastage in the form of discard mortality are likely highest in the AD 2HJ fishery, assuming survival is lowest in soft-shell crab. Assessment Division 3K most recently had a peak in discarding in 2017–18 nearing 40% discarded and with higher amounts of legal-sized soft-shell crab (Figure 49, Figure 50). These periods of high soft-shell crab discarding were associated with generally low and declining recruitment and exploitable biomass. In AD 3LNO, the majority of discards were composed of undersized, hard-shelled crab. Historically, there had to be higher levels of soft-shell crab in the population in this area, as the resource was consistently productive and strong recruitment occurred each year. The historic situation likely reflects the imposition of an efficient harvest that maintained a strong residual biomass that prohibited persistent high levels of soft-shell crab from emerging as a major concern in the fishery through trap competition. In AD 3Ps, there was a high period of discarding in 2016–17, however it has been consistently around 20% since 2019, with the majority of the discards consisting of undersized hard-shelled crab (Figure 50). At-sea observer coverage is poor in AD 4R3Pn, with much greater uncertainty surrounding the estimates (Figure 49) resulting from a low number of traps sampled in 2023.

---

Measures should be taken not only to reduce soft-shell encounters overall, but to better quantify prevalence of soft-shell crab in the fishery and afford better protection to incoming recruitment. A high incidence of soft-shell crab in the catch ultimately reflects inefficiency in resource extraction. It is wastage that occurs on pre-recruits and constitutes an opportunity cost to the future fishery as well as a biological loss to future reproductive potential.

Prevalence of legal-sized soft-shell males in the fishery is affected by fishery timing and exploitable biomass level. From a biological perspective, the optimal time to harvest Snow Crab to avoid soft-shell individuals in the catch is winter. However, in the absence of an ability to conduct a winter fishery, mortality on soft-shell males can be minimized by fishing early in spring before recently-molted crabs are capable of climbing into traps. It can be further reduced by maintaining a relatively high exploitable biomass level, thereby maintaining strong competition for baited traps and low catchability of less-competitive soft-shell immediate pre-recruits, even during peak soft-shell periods (Mullowney et al. 2021). Discard levels in the fishery are generally negatively related to CPUE, suggesting that maintaining a high fishery CPUE is a good management strategy to avoid high discarding (Figure 51) (Mullowney et al. 2018b).

Overall, the many shortcomings of the soft-shell protocol (described in the FISHERY section) undermine its intent of safeguarding against handling mortality in the fishery. As it has been and continues to be invoked, the soft-shell protocol can serve as a basis to enable and prolong fishing on soft-shell crab under the auspice of conservation rather than preventing mortality to soft-shell crab. The soft-shell protocol as currently invoked is not an effective conservation tool to safeguard against handling mortality in this fishery and should be reexamined.

Trends in total mortality generally reflect those of fishing-induced mortality, as measured by ERIs. Previous assessments have demonstrated that ADs experiencing notable recovery in the exploitable biomass were associated with reduced total mortality rates and associated reductions in exploitation rates, while ADs remaining at low levels with little signs of recovery were associated with persistently high total mortality and exploitation rates (Pantin et al. 2024). In AD 2HJ, the trawl and trap ERIs decreased in 2023 and under status quo removals in 2024 the ERIs are projected to continue to decrease to the lowest levels in more than 20 years (Figure 52). In AD 3K, the ERIs remained at similar levels from 2022–23, however under status quo removals in 2024 the ERIs are projected to increase, with the trawl-derived ERI projected around 42%. This is the maximum exploitation level permitted under the PA Framework. In AD 3LNO, the ERIs remained at similar levels from 2022–23 and no change is projected under status quo removals in 2024. In AD 3Ps, ERIs remained around the same level from 2022–23 and no significant change is projected under status quo removals in 2024. In AD 4R3Pn, the trap survey-derived ERI has been variable and at a high level. In 2023, the ERI decreased and under status quo removals in 2024 the ERI is projected to decrease slightly but remain high. With the implementation of the PA Framework for decision-making for the 2023 fishery and beyond, ERIs will be prohibited from increasing to the very high levels of the past.

The consequences of high exploitation (as seen in some ADs in the past) are unknown, but the potential for biological harm to the resource through fishing elevates as exploitation reaches and becomes sustained at high levels. In the NL Snow Crab fishery, historic ERIs in some ADs and years have been overall very high relative to other major fisheries for the species in Atlantic Canada and Alaska, particularly the high ERIs seen in most ADs in the late 2010s and later in AD 2HJ. For example, exploitation rates above 42% are not permitted under the PA Framework used to manage the Snow Crab fishery in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, even when the biomass is extremely high (DFO 2014a). In NL, in historic portions of the time series in ADs 2HJ and 3K, there have been a lack of old-shell crab in the biomass, even at largest sizes associated with terminally molted animals, which is not typical of the population structure for most other fished Snow Crab populations globally. The strategy of exploiting heavily and near-

---

wholly relying on incoming recruitment each year is risky with respect to the possibility of unforeseen events that affect recruitment. Moreover, areas with low residual biomasses are generally associated with wasteful practices and recruitment overfishing, with soft-shell prevalence and discard rates generally high in the presence of high exploitation and low residual biomass. Overall, these historically high exploitation rates have become reduced in recent years, with all ADs except 4R3Pn exploiting the biomass at rates in a range of about 25–45% or lower. For the first time in decades, moderate to low mortality has been imposed on the exploitable biomass across virtually the entire stock range. This shift toward overall more moderate exploitation of the resource is associated with the development of a PA Framework in 2018 (Mullowney and Baker 2023).

Beyond promoting risk and wastage in the fishery, high exploitation rates greatly increase the potential for negative biological outcomes in the population. The strategy of removing most large males from the population could have serious consequences, such as sperm limitation in females or changes in growth patterns or maturation sizes (Baker et al. 2022). Large hard-shelled males are the prime breeders and likely serve to introduce sufficient intraspecific competition in the population to promote large size-at-terminal molt. Large competitive males serve to maintain reproductive integrity as well as physically structure population demographics. The outcomes of the scenario of rendering the population virtually void of large males in some areas will be important to continue to monitor from biological and management advice perspectives. Baker et al. (2022) concluded that conservative exploitation rates are important in safeguarding an adequate proportion of large, hard-shelled males in the population and necessary to ensure that existing low sperm reserves do not hamper the reproductive potential of the population.

### **Size-at-Maturity**

A broad-scale decline in male size-at-maturity (i.e., the size at which a crab undergoes terminal molt into morphometric maturity) was demonstrated during recent stock assessments for the NL Snow Crab stock (Mullowney and Baker 2021; Pantin et al. 2024). This shift occurred in all major ADs around 2015–17, but persisted in AD 2HJ and was well below exploitable size (i.e., 62–76 mm CW from 2015–21). This work has not been updated with data past 2021 due to interruptions in the trawl survey sampling and coverage. The declines in male size-at-maturity suggest that any improvements in recruitment potential could be significantly dampened unless male size-at-maturity recovers to previous levels.

Mullowney and Baker (2021) found that the pronounced shift in male size-at-maturity in AD 2HJ was a consequence of a concomitant combination of cold conditions and low density of large males. This study showed that low densities of large males promoted a small terminal molt size and, consequently, high exploitation could affect molting dynamics. While temperature also affects molting and growth dynamics, this study asserted that other factors interacted with temperature to regulate molting, as this shift has not been seen in female size-at-maturity under the same environmental conditions or more extreme historical cold periods. The emergence or potential reversal of this phenomenon will be important to monitor moving forward as persistent decreased size-at-maturity would negatively impact stock and, subsequently, fishery productivity. The potential for these changes to affect reproductive success is possible; the mating behaviors of Snow Crab rely on large males and small females. Trends in size-at-maturity should continue to be monitored closely.

### **Precautionary Approach**

In 2024, assuming status quo removals, CPUE is predicted to remain in the Healthy Zone in all ADs, except AD 2HJ, where the predicted CPUE remains in the Cautious Zone (Figure 53).

---

Recent and ongoing data deficiencies resulted in the exclusion of AD 4R3Pn in the PA Framework.

Discard levels, assuming status quo removals, are predicted to be in the Healthy Zone in ADs 2HJ, 3K, and 3LNO in 2024, while AD 3Ps discards are predicted to be in the Cautious Zone in 2024 (Figure 53).

Data from both the fall and spring surveys throughout Divs. 2HJ3KLNOPs show that in nearly all years the vast majority (i.e., >80%) of mature females are carrying full clutches of viable eggs (Figure 53). In 2023, all ADs were in the Healthy Zone for egg clutches. Mature females store sperm and can produce multiple clutches of eggs from a single mating season (Sainte-Marie 1993). The ability of males to mate with multiple females and of females to store sperm ensures that a large portion of mature females should have full egg clutches. Although it is believed that per capita fecundity can be impacted by excessive fishery exploitation of males, it has not been persistently observed to date in NL Snow Crab. However, some notable exceptions have occurred in the clutch fullness index such as observed in AD 2HJ in 2006 and 2007, AD 3K in 2015, and AD 3Ps in 2014–16 (Figure 53). With no broad-scale prolonged periods of low clutch fullness presently, the overall evidence suggests that the stock may maintain a high level of reproductive resiliency to historic levels of fishery exploitation. Investigations into possible top-down fishery effects in light of current high exploitation rates on males in some ADs, and the extent to which these high exploitation rates can be sustained before unwanted changes or harm is caused to the resource, would be beneficial to the management of the fishery. This includes more in-depth monitoring of female insemination levels.

In 2024, the stock status in all ADs are projected to remain in the Healthy Zone in the PA Framework, except AD 2HJ which is projected to remain in the Cautious Zone (Figure 54). These projections assume status quo landings.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Assessment Division 2HJ**

Exploitable biomass indices (trawl and trap) have remained low for many years, however there were slight increases in these indices in the last two years. Both trawl and trap surveys indicate that immediate recruitment (new-shelled exploitable crab) did not change between 2022 and 2023, with the increase in exploitable crab in 2023 attributable to residual crab. The ERI has been high throughout most of the time series relative to other ADs within NL, as well as other fished Snow Crab stocks globally. However, the ERI has decreased in recent years to a more moderate level and under status quo removals in 2024 it is projected to continue to decrease. Catch rates of pre-recruit crab have been low in the last couple years, however there was a slight increase in catch rates in the trap surveys in 2023. Following the PA Framework, with status quo removals the stock status is projected to remain in the Cautious Zone in 2024.

### **Assessment Division 3K**

Exploitable biomass indices (trawl and trap) increased to high levels in recent years, but declined significantly over the last two years. Both trawl and trap surveys indicate a decrease in immediate recruitment in 2023. The ERI has been high throughout most of the time series relative to other ADs within NL, as well as other fished Snow Crab stocks globally, but has been at a much lower level since 2020. The ERI remained at a similar level from 2022–23, however under status quo removals in 2024 the ERI is projected to increase to a high level of 42%. This is the maximum ERI permitted in the Healthy Zone of the PA Framework. Catch rates of

---

pre-recruit crab have decreased in the last three years, particularly in the trawl time series. Following the PA Framework, with status quo removals the stock status is projected to remain in the Healthy Zone in 2024.

### **Assessment Division 3LNO**

Former ADs 3L Inshore and 3LNO Offshore were combined into one AD based on revised models for trap and trawl surveys at the 2024 stock assessment. Exploitable biomass indices (trawl and trap) have increased in recent years, but remained near similar levels from 2022–23. The trap survey was incomplete in this AD in 2023, however the data collected indicated that immediate recruitment likely remained unchanged or increased. The ERI remained at similar levels from 2022–23. Catch rates of pre-recruit crab have decreased in the last year in both the trawl and trap surveys. Following the PA Framework, with status quo removals the stock status is projected to remain in the Healthy Zone in 2024.

### **Assessment Division 3Ps**

Exploitable biomass indices (trawl and trap) have increased to high levels in recent years, but remained near similar levels from 2022–23. Neither the trawl nor trap survey had complete coverage in this AD in 2023, however the data collected indicated a possible decrease in immediate recruitment. The ERI remained at similar levels from 2022–23. Catch rates of pre-recruit crab have decreased in the last three years in both the trawl and trap surveys. Following the PA Framework, with status quo removals the stock status is projected to remain in the Healthy Zone in 2024.

### **Assessment Division 4R3Pn**

The trap-based exploitable biomass index has increased in recent years but remained near a similar level from 2022–23. There was a decrease in immediate recruitment in the trap survey in the last two years. The ERI has been variable and at a high level in this AD and is projected to remain high with status quo removals in 2024. Catch rates of pre-recruits have been variable in the short time series, however there was an increase in catches of these crab in 2023. Completion of the trap survey outside the major fishing areas has been poor, therefore determining stock status for the entire AD is more uncertain. Recent and ongoing data deficiencies do not allow inclusion of this AD into the PA Framework.

## **REFERENCES CITED**

- Adams, S.M., and Breck, J.E. 1990. Bioenergetics. In: Methods for Fish Biology. Edited by C.B. Schreck and P.B. Moyle. American Fisheries Society. Bethesda, Maryland. 389–415.
- Akaike, H. 1973. Information theory as an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In: Second International Symposium on Information Theory. Akademiai Kiado, Budapest. pp. 267–281.
- Alunno-Bruscia, M., and Sainte-Marie, B. 1998. [Abdomen allometry, ovary development, and growth of female snow crab, \*Chionoecetes opilio\* \(Brachyura, Majidae\), in the northwestern Gulf of St. Lawrence](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 55: 459–477.
- Anderson, S.C. 2023. sdmTMBextra: Extra functions for working with 'sdmTMB' models. R package version 0.0.1.

- 
- Anderson, S.C., Ward, E.J., English, P.A, Barnett, L.A.K., and Thorson, J.T. 2024. [sdmTMB: an R package for fast, flexible, and user-friendly generalized linear mixed effects models with spatial and spatiotemporal random fields](#). bioRxiv: 2022–03.
- Baker, K., Mullowney, D., Pederson, E., Coffey, W., Cyr, F., and Belanger, D. 2021. [An Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in 2018](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2021/028. viii + 180 p.
- Baker, K.D., Mullowney, D.R.J., and Sainte-Marie, B. 2022. [Large males matter: Low sperm reserves in female snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) off Newfoundland, Canada](#). Fish. Res. 253: 106385.
- Baker, K.D., Anderson, S.C., Mullowney, D.R.J., Walkusz, W., and Skanes, K.R. 2024. [Moving away from a scale mismatch: Spatiotemporal modelling of striped shrimp \(\*Pandalus montagui\*\) density in Canada's subarctic](#). Fish. Res. 270: 106898.
- Benoît, H.P., and Cadigan, N. 2014. [Model-based estimation of commercial-sized snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) abundance in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, 1980-2013, using data from two bottom trawl surveys](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2014/082. v + 24 p.
- Benoît, H.P., and Cadigan, N. 2016. [Trends in the biomass, distribution, size composition and model-based estimates of commercial abundance of snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) based on the multi-species bottom trawl survey of the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, 1980-2015](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2016/089. v + 20 p.
- Brêthes, J.-C., Bouchard, R., and Desrosiers, G. 1985. [Determination of the Area Prospected by a Baited Trap from a Tagging and Recapture Experiment with Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\)](#). J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci. 6(1): 37–42.
- Buren, A.D., Koen-Alonso, M., Pepin, P., Mowbray, F., Nakashima, B., Stenson, G., Ollerhead, N., and Montevecchi, W.A. 2014. [Bottom-Up Regulation of Capelin, a Keystone Forage Species](#). PLoS ONE 9(2): e87589.
- Chabot, D., Sainte-Marie, B., Briand, K., and Hanson, J. 2008. [Atlantic cod and snow crab predator–prey size relationship in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada](#). Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 363: 227–240.
- Comeau, M., Conan, G.Y., Maynou, F., Robichaud, G., Therriault, J.-C., and Starr, M. 1998. [Growth, spatial distribution, and abundance of benthic stages of the snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in Bonne Bay, Newfoundland, Canada](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 55: 262–279.
- Cyr, F., and Galbraith, P. 2020. [Newfoundland and Labrador climate index](#). Federated Research Data Repository.
- Cyr, F., and Galbraith, P.S. 2021. [A climate index for the Newfoundland and Labrador shelf](#). Earth Syst. Sci. Data. 13(5): 1807–1828.
- Cyr, F., Coyne, J., Snook, S., Bishop, C., Galbraith, P.S., Chen, N., and Han, G. 2024. Physical Oceanographic Conditions on the Newfoundland and Labrador Shelf during 2023. Can. Tech. Rep. Hydrogr. Ocean Sci. 382: v + 54 p.
- Dawe, E.G. 2002. Trends in prevalence of Bitter Crab Disease caused by *Hematodinium* sp. in Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*) throughout the Newfoundland and Labrador continental shelf. In: Crab in Cold Water Regions: Biology, Management, and Economics. Edited by A.J. Paul, E.G. Dawe, R. Elner, G.S. Jamieson, G.H. Kruse, R.S. Otto, B. Sainte-Marie, T.C. Shirley, and D. Woodby. University of Alaska Sea Grant. Fairbanks. 385–400.
-

- 
- Dawe, E.G., Hoenig, J.M., and Xu, X. 1993. [Change-in-Ratio and Index-Removal Methods for Population Assessment and Their Application to Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\)](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 50: 1467–1476.
- Dawe, E.G., Taylor, D.M., Veitch, P.J., Drew, H.J., Beck, P.C., and O’Keefe, P.G. 1997. [Status of Newfoundland and Labrador snow crab in 1996](#). Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 1997/07. 30 p.
- Dawe, E.G., Parsons, D.G., and Colbourne, E.B. 2008. [Relationships of sea ice extent and bottom water temperature with abundance of snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) on the Newfoundland - Labrador Shelf](#). ICES CM 2008/B:02. 18 p.
- Dawe, E.G., Walsh, S.J., and Hynick, E.M. 2010a. [Capture efficiency of a multi-species survey trawl for Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in the Newfoundland region](#). Fish. Res. 101(1–2): 70–79.
- Dawe, E.G., Mullaney, D.R., Colbourne, E.B., Han, G., Morado, J.F., and Cawthorn, R. 2010b. Relationship of Oceanographic Variability with Distribution and Prevalence of Bitter Crab Syndrome in Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*) on the Newfoundland-Labrador Shelf. In: Biology and Management of Exploited Crab Populations under Climate Change. Edited by G.H. Kruse, G.L. Eckert, R.J. Foy, R.N. Lipcius, B. Sainte-Marie, D.L. Stram, and D. Woodby. Alaska Sea Grant, University of Alaska. Fairbanks. 175–198.
- Dawe, E.G., Mullaney, D.R., Moriyasu, M., and Wade, E. 2012. [Effects of temperature on size-at-terminal molt and molting frequency in snow crab \*Chionoecetes opilio\* from two Canadian Atlantic ecosystems](#). Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 469: 279–296.
- DFO. 2014a. [Assessment of candidate harvest decision rules for compliance to the Precautionary Approach framework for the snow crab fishery in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2014/007.
- DFO. 2014b. [Short-Term Stock Prospects for Cod, Crab and Shrimp in the Newfoundland and Labrador Region \(Divisions 2J3KL\)](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Resp. 2014/049.
- DFO. 2020. [Proceedings of the Newfoundland and Labrador Regional Peer Review of the 4R Iceland Scallop Assessment, and the 2HJ3KLNOP4R Snow Crab Assessment; February 19-21, 2019](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Proceed. Ser. 2020/003.
- DFO. 2022. [Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador \(Divisions 2HJ3KLNOP4R\) Snow Crab](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2022/054.
- DFO. 2023. [Oceanographic Conditions in the Atlantic Zone in 2022](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2023/019.
- DFO. 2024. [Newfoundland & Labrador Comparative Fishing Analysis – Part 1](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Sci. Advis. Rep. 2024/002.
- Dufour, R., Bernier, D., and Brêthes, J.-C. 1997. Optimization of meat yield and mortality during snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio* O. Fabricius) fishing operations in Eastern Canada. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2152 : viii + 30 p.
- Evans, G.T., Parsons, D.G., Veitch, P.J., and Orr, D.C. 2000. [A Local-influence Method of Estimating Biomass from Trawl Surveys, with Monte Carlo Confidence Intervals](#). J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci. 27: 133–138.
- Fonseca, D.B., Sainte-Marie, B., and Hazel, F. 2008. [Longevity and Change in Shell Condition of Adult Male Snow Crab \*Chionoecetes opilio\* Inferred from Dactyl Wear and Mark-Recapture Data](#). Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 137(4): 1029–1043.
-

- 
- Foyle, T.P., O'Dor, R.K., and Elner, R.W. 1989. [Energetically defining the thermal limits of the snow crab](#). J. Exp. Biol. 145: 371–393.
- GEBCO Compilation Group. 2021. [GEBCO 2021 Grid](#).
- Grant, S.M. 2003. Mortality of snow crab discarded in Newfoundland and Labrador's trap fishery: At-sea experiments on the effect of drop height and air exposure duration. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2481: vi + 28 p.
- Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C.W., Skaug, H., and Bell, B.M. 2016. [TMB: Automatic Differentiation and Laplace Approximation](#). J. Stat. Software. 70(5): 1–21.
- Macdonald, J.S., and Waiwood, K.G. 1987. [Feeding chronology and daily ration calculations for winter flounder \(\*Pseudopleuronectes americanus\*\), American plaice \(\*Hippoglossoides platessoides\*\), and ocean pout \(\*Macrozoarces americanus\*\) in Passamaquoddy Bay, New Brunswick](#). Can. J. Zool. 65(3): 499–503.
- Marcello, L.A., Mueter, F.J., Dawe, E.G., and Moriyasu, M. 2012. [Effects of temperature and gadid predation on snow crab recruitment: Comparisons between the Bering Sea and Atlantic Canada](#). Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 469: 249–261.
- Miller, R.J. 1977. [Resource Underutilization in a Spider Crab Industry](#). Fisheries. 2(3): 9–30.
- Mullowney, D.R.J., and Baker, K.D. 2021. [Size-at-maturity shift in a male-only fishery: factors affecting molt-type outcomes in Newfoundland and Labrador snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\)](#). ICES J. Mar. Sci. 78(2): 516–533.
- Mullowney, D.R.J., and Baker, K.D. 2023. [Multi-indicator precautionary approach frameworks for crustacean fisheries](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 80(7): 1207–1220.
- Mullowney, D.R., Dawe, E.G., Morado, J.F., and Cawthorn, R.J. 2011. [Sources of variability in prevalence and distribution of bitter crab disease in snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) along the northeast coast of Newfoundland](#). ICES J. Mar. Sci. 68(3): 463–471.
- Mullowney, D.R.J., Dawe, E.G., Colbourne, E.B., and Rose, G.A. 2014. [A review of factors contributing to the decline of Newfoundland and Labrador snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\)](#). Rev. Fish Biol. Fish. 24: 639–657.
- Mullowney, D., Coffey, W., Evans, G., Colbourne, E., Maddock Parsons, D., Koen-Alonso, M., and Wells, N. 2017. [An Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in 2015](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2017/032. v + 179 p.
- Mullowney, D., Morris, C., Dawe, E., Zagorsky, I., and Goryanina, S. 2018a. [Dynamics of snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) movement and migration along the Newfoundland and Labrador and Eastern Barents Sea continental shelves](#). Rev. Fish Biol. Fish. 28: 435–459.
- Mullowney, D., Baker, K., Pedersen, E., and Osborne, D. 2018b. [Basis for a Precautionary Approach and Decision Making Framework for the Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) Fishery](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2018/054. iv + 66 p.
- Mullowney, D.R.J., Baker, K.D., Zabihi-Seissan, S., and Morris, C. 2020. [Biological perspectives on complexities of fisheries co-management: A case study of Newfoundland and Labrador snow crab](#). Fish. Res. 232: 105728.
- Mullowney, D.R.J., Baker, K.D., and Pantin, J.R. 2021. [Hard to Manage? Dynamics of Soft-Shell Crab in the Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab Fishery](#). Front. Mar. Sci. 8: 591496.
-

- 
- Mullowney, D.R.J., Baker, K.D., Szuwalski, C.S., Boudreau, S.A., Cyr, F., and Kaiser, B.A. 2023a. [Sub-Arctic no more: Short- and long-term global-scale prospects for snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) under global warming](#). PLOS Clim. 2(10): e0000294.
- Mullowney, D., O'Connell, N., Kilada, R., and Rochette, R. 2023b. [Refining age at legal-size in the Newfoundland & Labrador populations of the snow crab \*Chionoecetes opilio\* \(Fabricius, 1788\) \(Decapoda: Brachyura: Oregoniidae\)](#). J. Crust. Biol. 43: 1–14.
- NAFO. 2022. Report of the Scientific Council Meeting. NAFO Scientific Council Studies, Serial No. N7322(22/18).
- Pantin, J., Baker, K., Mullowney, D., Coffey, W., Zabihi-Seissan, S., Cyr, F., and Koen-Alonso, M. 2022. [An Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in 2019](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2022/076. viii + 194 p.
- Pantin, J.R., Coffey, W., Mullowney, D., Baker, K.D., Cyr, F., and Koen-Alonso, M. 2024. [Assessment of Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) in 2021](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2024/055. viii +172 p.
- Pedersen, E.J., Thompson, P.L., Ball, R.A., Fortin, M.-J., Gouhier, T.C., Link, H., Moritz, C., Nenzen, H., Stanley, R.R.E., Taranu, Z.E., Gonzalez, A., Guichard, F., and Pepin, P. 2017. [Signatures of the collapse and incipient recovery of an overexploited marine ecosystem](#). R. Soc. Open Sci. 4(7): 170215.
- Puebla, O., Sévigny, J.-M., Sainte-Marie, B., Brêthes, J.-C., Burmeister, A., Dawe, E.G., and Moriyasu, M. 2008. [Population genetic structure of the snow crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*\) at the Northwest Atlantic scale](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 65(3): 425–436.
- Punt, A. E. 2023. [Those who fail to learn from history are condemned to repeat it: A perspective on current stock assessment good practices and the consequences of not following them](#). Fish. Res. 261: 106642.
- Rose, G.A., and Rowe, S. 2015. [Northern cod comeback](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 72(12): 1789–1798.
- Sainte-Marie, B. 1993. [Reproductive Cycle and Fecundity of Primiparous and Multiparous Female Snow Crab, \*Chionoecetes opilio\*, in the Northwest Gulf of Saint Lawrence](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 50(10): 2147–2156.
- Sainte-Marie, B., Raymond, S., and Brêthes, J.-C. 1995. [Growth and maturation of the benthic stages of male snow crab, \*Chionoecetes opilio\* \(Brachyura: Majidae\)](#). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 52(5): 903–924.
- Sainte-Marie, B., Sévigny, J.-M., Smith, B.D., and Lovrich, G.A. 1996. Recruitment Variability in Snow Crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*): Pattern, Possible Causes, and Implications for Fishery Management. In: High Latitude Crabs: Biology, Management, and Economics. Edited by S. Keller, and C. Kaynor. Alaska Sea Grant College Program. 451–478.
- Squires, H.J., and Dawe, E.G. 2003. [Stomach Contents of Snow Crab \(\*Chionoecetes opilio\*, Decapoda, Brachyura\) from the Northeast Newfoundland Shelf](#). J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci. 32: 27–38.
- Stroeve, J., and Meier, W.N. 2018. Sea Ice Trends and Climatologies from SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS, Version 3. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center.
- Szuwalski, C.S., and Punt, A.E. 2013. [Regime shifts and recruitment dynamics of snow crab, \*Chionoecetes opilio\*, in the eastern Bering Sea](#). Fish. Oceanogr. 22: 345–354.
-

- 
- Szuwalski, C., Cheng, W., Foy, R., Hermann, A.J., Holloweed, A., Holsman, K., Lee, J., Stockhausen, W., and Zheng, J. 2021. [Climate change and the future productivity and distribution of crab in the Bering Sea](#). ICES J. Mar. Sci. 78: 502–515.
- Trueman, S., Wheeland, L., Benoît, H., Munro, H., Nguyen, T., Novaczek, E., Skanes, K., and Yin, Y. 2025. [Results of Comparative Fishing Between the CCGS \*Teleost\* and CCGS \*Alfred Needler\* with the CCGS \*John Cabot\* and CCGS \*Capt. Jacques Cartier\* in the Newfoundland and Labrador Region in 2021 and 2022](#). DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2025/021. v + 237 p.
- Urban, J.D. 2015. [Discard mortality rates in the Bering Sea snow crab, \*Chionoecetes opilio\*, fishery](#). ICES J. Mar. Sci. 72(5): 1525–1529.
- van Taemelen, P.G. 2005. [Estimating Handling Mortality Due to Air Exposure: Development and Application of Thermal Models for the Bering Sea Snow Crab Fishery](#). Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 134(2): 411–429.
- Wiff, R., and Roa-Ureta, R. 2008. [Predicting the slope of the allometric scaling of consumption rates in fish using the physiology of growth](#). Mar. Freshw. Res. 59(10): 912–921.
- Wood, S. N. 2017. Generalized additive models: An introduction with R (2nd edition). Chapman and Hall / CRC.
- Yodzis, P., and Innes, S. 1992. [Body Size and Consumer-Resource Dynamics](#). Am. Nat. 139(6): 1151–1175.

FIGURES




Figure 1. Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab Management Areas (CMAs) (black lines) and Newfoundland and Labrador Snow Crab Assessment Divisions (ADs) (colored blocks).




Figure 2. Map of the Newfoundland and Labrador Continental Shelf showing place names, bathymetrical features, and NAFO Divisions.




Figure 3. Logbook return rates by Assessment Division and year (1996–2023).




Figure 4. Number of Snow Crab measurements by at-sea observers by year (1999–2023). Colored bars represent Assessment Divisions.




Figure 5. Percent of landings measured by at-sea observers by Assessment Division and year (1999–2023).




Figure 6. Locations of random depth-stratified survey sets (black) and comparative fishing sets (blue) during fall trawl surveys in NAFO Divs. 2HJ3KLNO in 2021–23.




Figure 7. Locations of random depth-stratified survey sets (black) and comparative fishing sets (blue) during spring trawl surveys in NAFO Divs. 3LNOPs in 2022–23.




Figure 8. Location of sets and CPUE (kg/trap) of exploitable Snow Crab in large-mesh traps from the DFO inshore trap surveys (2015–23).




Figure 9. Location of sets and CPUE (#/trap) of all Snow Crab in small-mesh traps from the DFO inshore trap surveys (2015–23).




Figure 10. Location of sets and CPUE (kg/trap) of exploitable Snow Crab in large-mesh traps from the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey and Torngat Joint Fisheries Board trap survey (2015–23).




Figure 11. Location of sets and CPUE (#/trap) of Snow Crab in small-mesh traps from the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey and Torngat Joint Fisheries Board trap survey (2015–23).




Figure 12. Stochastic partial differential equation mesh used in model fitting spring trawl survey exploitable Snow Crab data (left) and fall trawl survey exploitable Snow Crab data (right). Points represent data and observations with zero density are shown in grey.




Figure 13. Stochastic partial differential equation mesh used in model fitting trap survey exploitable Snow Crab data. Points represent data and observations with zero density are shown in grey.




Figure 14. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab by Assessment Division (1979–2023).




Figure 15. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) by Assessment Division (1995–2023).





Figure 16. Fishery timing by Assessment Division (1988–2023). Solid line = median timing of fishery, dashed line = start of fishery, dotted line = end of fishery, and shaded area = fishery 25–75% complete. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.



2HJ
  3K
  3LNO
  3Ps
  4R3Pn




Figure 17. Estimated effort (number of trap hauls) in total (top) and by Assessment Division (bottom) (1990–2023). Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 18. Fishing locations and catch rates (kg/trap) from fishery logbooks (2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2021–23). Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 19. Standardized fishery CPUE (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 20. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) by Assessment Division (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.



Figure 21. Catch rates (kg/trap) of legal-sized Snow Crab by shell condition from at-sea observer sampling by Assessment Division (1999–2023). Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure 22. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling by Assessment Division (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure 23. Unstandardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) throughout the season (calendar day) by Assessment Division (1998–2023), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE in five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 24. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) throughout the season (calendar day) by Assessment Division (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 25. Fishery catch rate depletion regression models on five-day increment catch rates from logbooks in Assessment Division 2HJ (2004–23). Blue points represent unstandardized catch rates and red line is fitted Delury depletion estimates. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 26. Fishery catch rate depletion regression models on five-day increment catch rates from logbooks in Assessment Division 3K (2004–23). Blue points represent unstandardized catch rates and red line is fitted Delury depletion estimates. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 27. Fishery catch rate depletion regression models on five-day increment catch rates from logbooks in Assessment Division 3LNO (2004–23). Blue points represent unstandardized catch rates and red line is fitted Delury depletion estimates. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 28. Fishery catch rate depletion regression models on five-day increment catch rates from logbooks in Assessment Division 3Ps (2004–23). Blue points represent unstandardized catch rates and red line is fitted Delury depletion estimates. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 29. Fishery catch rate depletion regression models on five-day increment catch rates from logbooks in Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2004–23). Blue points represent unstandardized catch rates and red line is fitted Delury depletion estimates. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 30. Fishery depletion model biomass estimates of exploitable Snow Crab (t) from logbooks (blue) and three-year centered moving averages (red) by Assessment Division (2000–23). Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure 31. Annual trawl survey-based exploitable biomass index (red) (1995–2023) and trap survey-based exploitable biomass index (blue) (2018–20). Solid line = two-year moving average of exploitable biomass, dashed line = annual estimate, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals of annual estimate.




Figure 32. Distribution of exploitable males (kg/tow) from 2HJ3KLNO fall and 3Ps spring trawl surveys (2015–23). + denotes tow with zero exploitable crab caught. This map does not include comparative fishing tows (2021–23) included in models for estimating exploitable biomass.




Figure 33. Annual trawl (red, 1995–2023) and trap (blue, 2018–23) survey-based exploitable biomass index by Assessment Division. Solid line = two-year moving average of exploitable biomass, dashed line = annual estimate, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals of annual estimate.




Figure 34. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable Snow Crab from all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey by Assessment Division (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed vertical line represents the change in CPS survey design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure 35. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations for the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey by Assessment Division (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure 36. Proportions of recruit (green) and residual (red) exploitable males in the trawl surveys by Assessment Division (1995–2023).




Figure 37. Indices of mature female, small, and pre-recruit (70–94 mm carapace width adolescent male) crab from the trawl (red), large-mesh (blue), and small-mesh (black) trap surveys. The index for the trawl series is the ratio of the annual #/tow to the 2018–23 mean. The index for the trap series is the ratio of the annual #/trap to the 2018–23 mean. Thin lines denote annual value, thick lines are loess regression curves. Values above zero (black horizontal line) indicate higher catch rates than the six-year mean while values below zero indicate lower catch rates than the six-year mean.






Figure 39. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations from the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey by Assessment Division (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure 40. Distribution of small (<45 mm CW) crab (#/tow) from 2HJ3KLNO fall trawl surveys (2015–23) and 3Ps spring trawl surveys on CCGS Teleost and CCGS John Cabot (2016, 2021–22). + denotes tow with zero small crab caught.




Figure 41. Distribution of mature females (#/tow) from 2HJ3KLNO fall trawl surveys (2015–23) and 3Ps spring trawl surveys on CCGS Teleost and CCGS John Cabot (2016, 2021–22). + denotes tow with zero mature female crab caught.




Figure 42. Abundance indices (#/tow) by carapace width for juveniles + adolescent males (dark blue), adult males (light blue), immature females (dark red), and mature females (red) from fall (Assessment Divisions 2HJ, 3K, and 3LNO) trawl surveys (1997–2009). Information on females, while displayed on the negative y-axis, represent positive abundance indices. The vertical gray line is the minimum legal-size.




Figure 43. Abundance indices (#/tow) by carapace width for juveniles + adolescent males (dark blue), adult males (light blue), immature females (dark red), and mature females (red) from fall (Assessment Divisions 2HJ, 3K, and 3LNO) trawl surveys (2010–23) and spring 3Ps trawl surveys on CCGS Teleost and CCGS John Cabot (2016, 2021–22). Information on females, while displayed on the negative y-axis, represent positive abundance indices. The vertical gray line is the minimum legal-size.




Figure 44. Fall bottom temperatures on the Newfoundland and Labrador Shelf averaged over the 1991–2020 climatological period (left panel) and during 2023 (center). Temperature anomalies for 2023 in relation to the climatology is shown in the right panel. Black dots in the center panel indicate the location of the profiles used to calculate the 2023 update (mostly multispecies survey observations).




Figure 45. Spring bottom temperatures on the Newfoundland and Labrador Shelf averaged over the 1991–2020 climatological period (left panel) and during 2023 (center). Temperature anomalies for 2023 in relation to the climatology is shown in the right panel. Black dots in the center panel indicate the location of the profiles used to calculate the 2023 update (mostly multispecies survey observations).




Figure 46. Short-term prediction model of exploitable biomass. Black points are trawl survey-measured exploitable biomass in NAFO Divs. 2HJ3KLNOP (1995–2023). Black points and associated error bars are full model fits (short-, mid-, long-term effects) and red shaded area is the model run with no short-term effects. Shaded areas are 95% confidence intervals of model fits.




Figure 47. Consumption of Snow Crab by finfish predators (left) and predation mortality index (middle and right) by Ecosystem Production Unit (EPU); blue is 2J3K fall series, red is 3LNO fall series, and green is 3Ps spring series. Solid vertical line represents the restart of the stomach collection program and the dashed vertical line represents the change in survey vessels.




Figure 48. Annual prevalence of Bitter Crab Disease (BCD) from macroscopic observations in new-shelled adolescent male crab in fall trawl surveys by Assessment Division and carapace width categories (1996–2023).




Figure 49. Discards (%) based on raw estimates (points) and standardized values (solid lines) by Assessment Division (1999–2023). The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure 50. Catch rates of discards (kg/trap) by size and shell condition groups (legal-sized soft-shelled, undersized new-shelled, undersized old-shelled, and undersized soft-shelled) by Assessment Division (1999–2023) from at-sea observer sampling. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure 51. Standardized CPUE (blue) and discard rates (red) by Assessment Division (1996–2023). Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure 52. Annual trawl survey-based Exploitation Rate Index (ERI) (red) (1996–2023) and trap survey-based ERI (orange) (2018–23) by Assessment Division. Solid line = two-year moving average of ERI, dashed line = annual estimate, and 2024 points (\*) depict projected annual ERIs under status quo removals in the 2024 fishery.




Figure 53. Predicted CPUE (left), predicted % discards (middle), and observed proportion of females with full egg clutches (right) (solid lines), as well as standardized CPUE and % discards (points) in the Precautionary Approach Framework, by Assessment Division (2004–23). Shaded areas = prediction intervals (CPUE and discards) or 1 standard deviation (egg clutches), orange points = predicted values under status quo landings in the 2024 fishery, vertical blue shades in 2024 = predicted values under varying levels of Exploitation Rate Index (ERI) (light to dark blue: ERI = 5–42%), Red horizontal line = Limit Reference Point, green horizontal line = Upper Stock Reference.




Figure 54. Projected stock status (black points) in the NL Snow Crab Precautionary Approach Framework, by Assessment Division (2004–24). The green, white, and red shaded areas represent the Healthy, Cautious, and Critical Zones, respectively. The dashed vertical line represents the present year (2023), after which the stock status is predicted with status quo landings for 2024.

## APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 2HJ DETAILS




Figure A1.1. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 2HJ (1998–2023). Red dashes are the voluntary TAC (15% reduction of TAC) set by harvesters in 2JN from 2014–18.




Figure A1.2. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 2HJ (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A1.3. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) of Snow Crab throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 2HJ (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A1.4. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 2HJ (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A1.5. Weekly catch rates (kg/trap) and the percentage of soft-shell crab in the catch from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within the Assessment Division 2HJ (2000–23). Bubble size depicts percentage of soft-shell crab and solid line depicts unstandardized observed catch rates. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A1.6. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the Torngat Joint Fisheries Board trap survey in Crab Management Area 1 (N5440/2JN) (2013–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Note: No shell conditions for 2022.




Figure A1.7. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Area 2 (S5440/2JS) (2007–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed vertical line denotes the CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A1.8. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps in the Torngat Joint Fisheries Board trap survey in Crab Management Area 1 (N5440/2JN) in Assessment Division 2HJ (2014–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Note: No shell conditions for 2022.




Figure A1.9. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Area 2 (S5440/2JS) in Assessment Division 2HJ (2012–16, 2020–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A1.10. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the Torngat Joint Fisheries Board trap survey in Crab Management Area 1 (N5440/2JN) in Assessment Division 2HJ (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size.




Figure A1.11. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Area 2 (S5440/2JS) in Assessment Division 2HJ (2020–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size.

## APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3K DETAILS




Figure A2.1. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (1998–2023).




Figure A2.2. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A2.3. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) of Snow Crab throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A2.4. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A2.5. Weekly catch rates (kg/trap) and the percentage of soft-shell crab in the catch from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2000–23). Bubble size depicts percentage of soft-shell crab and solid line depicts unstandardized observed catch rates. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A2.6. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed vertical line denotes CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A2.7. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in White Bay (Crab Management Areas 3A and 3B) (1996–2023). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A2.8. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in Green Bay and Notre Dame Bay (Crab Management Areas 3C and 3D) (1996–2023). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A2.9. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A2.10. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3K (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size.




Figure A2.11. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from White Bay (Crab Management Areas 3A and 3B) (2009–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.



Figure A2.12. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from Green Bay and Notre Dame Bay (Crab Management Areas 3B, 3C, and 3D) (2010–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A2.13. Visually observed percentage of Bitter Crab Disease (BCD) in new-shelled males from DFO inshore trap surveys in White Bay (Crab Management Areas 3A and 3B), and Green Bay and Notre Dame Bay (Crab Management Areas 3C and 3D) (1996–2023).

### APPENDIX 3: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3LNO DETAILS




Figure A3.1. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (1998–2023).



Figure A3.2. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 3O200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (1998–2023).




Figure A3.3. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A3.4. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A3.5. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) of Snow Crab throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A3.6. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A3.7. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (2013–23; missing 2020–22). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A3.8. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A3.9. Weekly catch rates (kg/trap) and the percentage of soft-shell crab in the catch from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3LNO (2000–23). Bubble size depicts percentage of soft-shell crab and solid line depicts unstandardized observed catch rates. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A3.10. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed vertical line denotes CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A3.11. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in Bonavista Bay (Crab Management Area 5A) (1995–2023). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.12. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in Trinity Bay (Crab Management Area 6A) (2013–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.13. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in Conception Bay (Crab Management Area 6B) (1995–2023). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.14. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in St. Mary's Bay (Crab Management Area 9A) (2013–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.15. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 3O200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed line denotes CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.16. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.17. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 3O200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.18. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas 5A, 6A, 6B, 6C, 8A, and 9A within Assessment Division 3LNO (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.19. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from Bonavista Bay (Crab Management Area 5A) (2009–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.20. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from Trinity Bay (Crab Management Area 6A) (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.21. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from Conception Bay (Crab Management Area 6B) (2009–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.22. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from St. Mary's Bay (Crab Management Area 9A) (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A3.23. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas 3L200, 3Lex, 3N200, 8B, MS, MSex, and NS within Assessment Division 3LNO (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size.




Figure A3.24. Visually observed percentage of Bitter Crab Disease (BCD) in new-shelled males from DFO inshore trap surveys in Bonavista Bay (Crab Management Area 5A), Trinity Bay (Crab Management Area 6A), and Conception Bay (Crab Management Area 6B) (1995–2023).

## APPENDIX 4: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 3PS DETAILS




Figure A4.1. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (1998–2023).




Figure A4.2. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (1990–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A4.3. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) of Snow Crab throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A4.4. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A4.5. Weekly catch rates (kg/trap) and the percentage of soft-shell crab in the catch from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within the Assessment Division 3Ps (2000–23). Bubble size depicts percentage of soft-shell crab and solid line depicts unstandardized observed catch rates. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A4.6. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed vertical line denotes CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A4.7. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) of exploitable crab from large-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap surveys in Fortune Bay (Crab Management Area 11E) (2007–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A4.8. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A4.9. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 3Ps (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size.




Figure A4.10. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps in the DFO inshore trap survey from Fortune Bay (Crab Management Area 11E) (2009–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.

## APPENDIX 5: ASSESSMENT DIVISION 4R3PN DETAILS




Figure A5.1. Annual landings (tonnes) of Snow Crab (grey bars) and total allowable catch (TAC) (yellow dashes) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (1998–2023).




Figure A5.2. Standardized fishery CPUE (kg/trap) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (1993–2023). Solid line = standardized CPUE, dotted lines = raw mean CPUE, dashed lines = raw median CPUE, and shaded band = 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A5.3. Standardized CPUE (kg/trap) of Snow Crab throughout the season (calendar day) in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2018–23), derived from logbooks. Points denote mean CPUE of five-day increments, trend lines are loess regression curves, and grey bands are 95% confidence intervals. Data in the most recent year are considered preliminary due to delays in logbook returns and data entry.




Figure A5.4. Catch rates (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2013–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A5.5. Weekly catch rates (kg/trap) and the percentage of soft-shell crab in the catch from at-sea observer sampling in Crab Management Areas within the Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2000–23). Bubble size depicts percentage of soft-shell crab and solid line depicts unstandardized observed catch rates. Years without results represent low or absent at-sea observer coverage.




Figure A5.6. CPUE (kg/trap) by shell condition (blue = total, red = residual crab, green = recruits) for exploitable crab from large-mesh traps at core stations (left) and all stations (right) in the Collaborative Post-Season (CPS) trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2004–23). Shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval. The dashed line denotes CPS survey re-design. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A5.7. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and shell condition from large-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey in Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2012–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.




Figure A5.8. CPUE (#/trap) by male carapace width distributions and maturity from small-mesh traps at all stations in the Collaborative Post-Season trap survey from Crab Management Areas within Assessment Division 4R3Pn (2018–23). The red vertical line indicates the minimum legal size. Years without results represent incomplete or absent survey coverage.