# Chapter 6. Arrowtooth Flounder 
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## Executive Summary

The following changes have been made to this assessment relative to the November 2005 SAFE.
Changes to the input data

1) 2006 shelf survey size composition.
2) 2006 shelf survey biomass point-estimates and standard errors.
3) Estimate of catch and discards through 6, September 2006.
4) Estimate of retained and discarded portion of the 2005 catch.

Assessment results

1) The projected age $1+$ total biomass for 2007 is $1,275,900 \mathrm{t}$.
2) The projected female spawning biomass for 2007 is $824,400 \mathrm{t}$.
3) The recommended 2007 ABC is $158,000 \mathrm{t}$ based on an $\mathrm{F}_{0.40}(0.24)$ harvest level.
4) The 2007 overfishing level is $193,000 \mathrm{t}$ based on a $\mathrm{F}_{0.35}(0.30)$ harvest level.

|  | 2006 Assessment <br> recommendation <br> for 2007 harvest | 2005 Assessment <br> recommendation <br> for 2006 harvest |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total biomass | $1,275,900 \mathrm{t}$ | $964,200 \mathrm{t}$ |
| ABC | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 0 0 0} \mathrm{t}$ | $135,500 \mathrm{t}$ |
| Overfishing | $193,000 \mathrm{t}$ | $166,100 \mathrm{t}$ |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ABC}}$ | $\mathrm{F}_{0.40}=0.24$ | $\mathrm{~F}_{0.40}=0.26$ |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\text {overfishing }}$ | $\mathrm{F}_{0.35}=0.30$ | $\mathrm{~F}_{0.30}=0.32$ |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{40}$ | $339,600 \mathrm{t}$ | $295,100 \mathrm{t}$ |
| $\mathrm{B}_{35}$ | $297,000 \mathrm{t}$ | $258,200 \mathrm{t}$ |

SSC comments to the assessment authors:

- Given the large and growing importance of arrowtooth flounder and likely impacts of this stock on other Council-managed species and the ecosystem in general, an expanded ecosystem section is warranted in future assessments.

Work has begun on an expanded ecosystem section, primarily focusing on the arrowtooth flounderpollock mortality relationship. A key part of this analysis is an updated bioenergetics model which is now in preparation. We anticipate providing the requested expanded analysis in next year's assessment.

## Introduction

The arrowtooth flounder (Atheresthes stomias) is a relatively large flatfish which occupies continental shelf waters almost exclusively until age 4 , but at older ages occupies both shelf and slope waters. Two species of Atheresthes occur in the Bering Sea. Arrowtooth flounder and Kamchatka flounder ( A. evermanni) are very similar in appearance and are not usually distinguished in the commercial catches. Until about 1992, these species were not consistently separated in trawl survey catches (see Appendix figure) and are thus combined in this assessment to maintain the comparability of the trawl survey time series. Arrowtooth flounder ranges into the Aleutian Islands region where their abundance is lower than in the eastern Bering Sea. The resource in the EBS and the Aleutians are managed as a single stock although the stock structure has not been studied.

Arrowtooth flounder was managed with Greenland turbot as a species complex until 1985 because of similarities in their life history characteristics, distribution and exploitation. Greenland turbot were the target species of the fisheries whereas arrowtooth flounder were caught as bycatch. Starting in 1986, management has been by individual species due to considerable differences in stock condition.

Arrowtooth flounder begin to recruit to the continental slope at about age 4. Based on age data from the 1982 U.S.-Japan cooperative survey, recruitment to the slope gradually increases at older ages and reaches a maximum at age 9 . However, greater than $50 \%$ of age groups 9 and older continue to occupy continental shelf waters. The low proportion of the overall biomass on the slope during the 1988 and 1991 surveys, relative to that of earlier surveys, indicates that the proportion of the population occupying slope waters may vary considerably from year to year depending on the age structure of the population.

## Catch History

Catch records of arrowtooth flounder and Greenland turbot were combined during the 1960s. The fisheries for Greenland turbot intensified during the 1970s and the bycatch of arrowtooth flounder is assumed to have also increased. In 1974-76, total catches of arrowtooth flounder reached peak levels ranging from 19,000 to $25,000 \mathrm{t}$ (Table 6.1). Catches decreased after implementation of the MFCMA and the resource has remained lightly exploited with catches averaging 12,751 trom 1977-2006. This decline resulted from catch restrictions placed on the fishery for Greenland turbot and phasing out of the foreign fishery in the U.S. EEZ. Total catch reported through 6 September, 2006 is $11,214 \mathrm{t}$ (well below the 2006 ABC of $136,000 \mathrm{t}$ ). NMFS Regional Office reports indicate that bottom trawling accounted for $79 \%$ of the 2006 catch.

Although research has been conducted on their commercial utilization (Greene and Babbit 1990, Wasson et al. 1992, Porter et al. 1993, Reppond et al. 1993, Cullenberg 1995) and some targeting occurs in the Gulf of Alaska, arrowtooth flounder continue to be captured primarily in pursuit of other high value species and most often discarded in the Bering Sea and the Aleutian Islands. The catch information in Table 6.1 reports the annual total catch tonnage for the foreign, JV, and DAP fisheries. The proportion of retained and discarded arrowtooth flounder in Bering Sea fisheries are estimated from observer at-sea sampling for 1985-2005 are shown in Table 6.2. Half of the arrowtooth flounder caught in 2005 were retained.

Substantial amounts of arrowtooth flounder are discarded overboard in the various trawl and longline target fisheries. Largest discard amounts occurred in the Pacific cod fishery and the various flatfish fisheries. Retention is expected to increase in the future due to enactment of improved retention/utilization regulations by the Council.

## Data

The data used in this assessment include estimates of total catch, trawl survey biomass estimates and standard error from shelf and slope surveys, sex-specific trawl survey size composition and available fishery length-frequencies from observer sampling.

## Fishery Catch and Catch-at-Age

Fishery catch data from 1970 - September 6, 2006 (Table 6.1) and fishery length-frequency data from 1978-91 and 2000-2005 are used in the assessment.

## Survey CPUE

The relative abundance of arrowtooth flounder increased substantially on the continental shelf from 1982 to 1990 as the CPUE from AFSC shelf surveys increased steadily from 1.6 to $9.9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ (Fig. 6.1). The overall shelf catch rate decreased slightly to $7.1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ in 1991. The CPUE continued to increase through 1997 to $15.0 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$. These increases in CPUE were also observed on the slope from 1981 to 1986 as CPUE from the Japanese land-based fishery increased from 1.5 to $21.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Bakkala and Wilderbuer 1990). The 2005 CPUE of $16.35 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ was the highest ever estimated from the shelf survey. The 2006 estimate is lower at $13.12 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$.

## Absolute Abundance from Trawl Surveys

Biomass estimates ( t ) for arrowtooth flounder from the standard survey area in the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region are shown in Table 6.3. Although the standard sampling trawl changed in 1982 to a more efficient trawl which may have caused an overestimate of the biomass increase in the pre-1982 part of the time-series, biomass estimates from AFSC surveys on the continental shelf have shown a consistent increasing trend since 1975. Since 1982, biomass point -estimates indicate that arrowtooth abundance has increased eight-fold to a high of $570,600 \mathrm{t}$ in 1994. The population biomass remained at a high level from 1992-97. Results from the 1997-2000 bottom trawl surveys indicate the Bering Sea shelf population biomass had declined to $340,000 \mathrm{t}, 60 \%$ of the peak 1994 biomass point estimate. Beginning in 2002 the shelf survey estimate increased further and peaked in 2005. In 2006 the estimate declined slightly. The 2005 and 2006 biomass estimates have had a large effect on the model estimates in this assessment.

Arrowtooth flounder absolute abundance estimates are based on "area-swept" bottom trawl survey methods. These methods require several assumptions which can add to the uncertainty of the estimates. For example, it is assumed that the sampling plan covers the distribution of the species and that all fish in the path of the trawl are captured (no losses due to escape or gains due to herding). Due to sampling variability alone, the $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the 2006 point estimate are $516,000-700,340 \mathrm{t}$.

Trawl surveys were intermittently conducted over the continental slope. The eastern Bering Sea continental slope was surveyed in 2002 and 2004 at depths ranging from 200-1,200 meters. The Poly Nor' Eastern bottom trawl net with mud sweep ground gear was the standard sampling net. Surveys conducted in 1988 and 1991 used a Nor' Eastern trawl with bobbin roller gear. Trawl surveys on the continental slope estimate that arrowtooth flounder biomass increased significantly from 1979 to 1985. The biomass estimate in 1988 and 1991 were lower. However, sampling in 1988 and 1991 (200-800 m)
was not as deep as in 1985 and earlier years (200-1,000 m). Based on slope surveys conducted between 1979 and 1985, 67 to $100 \%$ of the arrowtooth flounder biomass on the slope were found at depths less than 800 m . These data suggest that less than $20 \%$ of the total EBS population occupied slope waters in 1988 and 1991, a period of high arrowtooth flounder abundance. Surveys conducted during periods of low and increasing arrowtooth abundance (1979-85) indicate that $27 \%$ to $51 \%$ of the population weight occupied slope waters. Although the 2002-2004 surveys were deeper than earlier slope surveys, over $90 \%$ of the estimated arrowtooth biomass was located in waters less than 800 meters. The 2002 slope point estimate was $61,200 \mathrm{t}$ which increased to $68,600 \mathrm{t}$ in 2004.

Approximately 1.35 billion fish were estimated for the eastern Bering Sea in 2004 with most of the fish ( 1.3 billion) occupying shelf waters and 53.2 million located on the continental slope. The Aleutian Islands region accounted for an additional 132 million arrowtooth flounder. The assessment model described below does not use the Aleutian Islands portion of the biomass to model stock abundance and is thus a conservative estimate of the arrowtooth/Kamchatka flounder stock size.

The combined arrowtooth/Kamchatka flounder abundance estimated from the 2006 Aleutian Islands trawl survey is $229,205 \mathrm{t}$, the highest estimate observed in the Aleutian Islands since surveys began in 1980.

## Weight-at-age, Length-at-age and Maturity-at-age

Parameters of the von Bertalanffy growth curve for arrowtooth flounder from age data collected during the 1982 U.S.-Japan cooperative survey and the 1991 slope survey (Zimmermann and Goddard 1995) are as follows:

|  | Sample | Age |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Sex | size | range | $L_{\text {inf }}$ | k | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{o}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 age sample |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 528 | $2-14$ | 45.9 | 0.23 | -0.70 |
| Female | 706 | $2-14$ | 73.8 | 0.14 | -0.20 |
| Sexes Combined | 1,234 | $2-14$ | 59.0 | 0.17 | -0.50 |
| 1991 age sample |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 53 | $3-9$ | 57.9 | 0.17 | -2.17 |
| Female | 134 | $4-12$ | 85.0 | 0.16 | -0.81 |

Based on 282 observations during a AFSC survey in 1976, the length (mm)-weight (gm) relationship for arrowtooth flounder (sexes combined) is described by the equation:

$$
\mathrm{W}=5.682 \times 10^{-6} * \mathrm{~L}^{3.1028}
$$

Maturity information from a histological examination of arrowtooth flounder in the Gulf of Alaska (Zimmerman 1997) indicate that $50 \%$ of male and female fish become mature at 46.9 and 42.2 cm , respectively.

## Analytic Approach

## Model Structure

This stock assessment utilizes the AD Modeler Builder software to model the population dynamics of Bering Sea arrowtooth flounder. The model is a length-based approach where survey and fishery length
composition observations are used to calculate estimates of population numbers-at-age by the use of a length-age (growth) matrix. The model simulates the dynamics of the population and compares the expected values of the population characteristics to those observed from surveys and fishery sampling programs. This is accomplished by the simultaneous estimation of the parameters in the model using the maximum likelihood estimation procedure. The fit of the simulation values to the observed characteristics is optimized by maximizing the $\log$ (likelihood) function given some distributional assumptions about the observed data (see Table 6.4).

The suite of parameters estimated by the base model are classified by three likelihood components:

| Data Component | Distribution assumption |
| :--- | :---: |
| Trawl fishery size composition | Multinomial |
| Shelf survey population size composition | Multinomial |
| Slope survey population size composition | Multinomial |
| Trawl survey biomass estimates and S.E. | Log normal |

The total log likelihood is the sum of the likelihoods for each data component. The model allows for the individual likelihood components to be weighted by an emphasis factor. The number of parameters estimated in the initial stages by the model are presented below:

| Fishing mortality | Selectivity | Year class strength | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 14 | 49 | 94 |

The recruitment parameters are comprised of 21 initial ages in 1976 and 27 subsequent age 1 recruitment estimates from 1976-2004. Recruitment in 2006 was set at the average from 1976-2002. The difference in the number of parameters estimated in this assessment compared to last year can be accounted for by an additional year (2006) of shelf survey data and fishery catch and the estimate of one more year of recruitment. In addition, one more parameter is estimated in a later stage to estimate the relationship between bottom water temperature and shelf survey catchability (discussed later).

We assume that the shelf and slope surveys measure non-overlapping segments of the arrowtooth flounder stock. The model was configured with the assumption that the Bering Sea shelf area comprises $87 \%$ of the population, calculated from the average proportion of shelf/shelf+slope biomass from the trawl survey time-series. In this assessment we did not attempt to incorporate the Aleutian Islands biomass estimate. Equal emphasis was placed on fitting all data components for this assessment and the relationship between annual bottom water temperature and shelf survey catchability was modeled to improve the fit to the shelf survey biomass estimates. Results are closely linked to fitting the general trend of increasing shelf survey biomass estimates during the 1980s to the present high level, and to fitting the male and female size compositions and sex ratios from the shelf and slope surveys (Fig. 6.2).

## Parameters Estimated Independently

## Catchability

A past assessment (Wilderbuer and Sample 1995) analyzed the value of $q$ or catchability of the research trawl by examining fits of the models' various likelihood components over a range of fixed $q$ values. The results indicated $q=2.0$ which suggests that more fish are caught in the survey trawl than are present in the "effective" fishing width of the trawl (ie. some herding occurs or the "effective" fishing width of the trawl may be the distance between the doors instead of between the wingtips of the survey trawl).

Attempts to estimate $q$ in previous assessments were unsuccessful as estimated values always reached the upper bounds placed on the parameter. It may not be possible to obtain reliable estimates of $q$ for this stock given the present level of information available. Catchability is therefore assumed to be 1.0 for the whole stock with $87 \%$ on the shelf and $13 \%$ in slope waters (as discussed above).

Examination of Bering Sea shelf survey biomass estimates indicate that some of the annual variability seemed to positively covary with bottom water temperature. Variations in CPUE (Fig. 6.1) were particularly evident during the coldest year (1999) and the warmest year (2003) (Fig. 6.3). The relationship between average annual bottom water temperature collected during the survey and annual survey biomass estimates were modeled to provide an improved fit to the shelf survey biomass, as:

$$
\operatorname{Sur}_{t}=q e^{-\alpha T_{t}} \sum N_{t, a} W_{t, a} v_{a}
$$

where $\operatorname{Sur} B_{t}$ is the model estimate of shelf survey biomass in year $t, \alpha$ is a parameter estimated by the model, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the average annual bottom water temperature, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{a}}$ is the number at age for each year and age estimated by the model, $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{a}}$ is the weight at age for fish in each year, and $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the selectivity at age estimated by the model. The value of $q$ was fixed at 0.87 (as discussed above).

## Parameters Estimated Conditionally

## Year class strengths

The population simulation specifies the number-at-age in the beginning year of the simulation, the number of recruits in subsequent years, and the survival rate for each cohort as it moves through the population calculated from the population dynamics equations (see Table 6.4 and Table 6.5).

## Fishing Mortality

The fishing mortality rates (F) for each age and year are calculated to approximate the catch weight by solving for F while still allowing for observation error in catch measurement. A large emphasis was placed on the catch likelihood component.

## Selectivity and sex ratio

Survey results indicate that fish less than about 4 years old ( $<30 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) are found only on the Bering Sea shelf. Males from $30-50 \mathrm{~cm}$ and females $30-70 \mathrm{~cm}$ are found in shelf and slope waters, and males $>50$ cm and females $>70 \mathrm{~cm}$ are found exclusively on the slope. Sex specific "domed-shaped" selectivity was freely estimated for males and females in the shelf survey. We assumed an asymptotic selectivity pattern for both sexes in the slope survey.

At the present time there is no directed fishery for arrowtooth flounder in the eastern Bering Sea. Length measurements collected from the fishery represent opportunistic samples of arrowtooth flounder taken as bycatch. This results in sample size problems which make estimates of fishery selectivity unreliable. Also, we felt that a directed fishery would likely target a different segment of the stock. Accordingly, the shape of the selectivity curve was fixed asymptotic for older fish in the fishery since a directed fishery would presumably target on larger fish. This also allowed for a realistic calculation of exploitable biomass from the model estimate of total biomass and reasonable fishing mortality values.

Past estimates of the natural mortality of arrowtooth flounder were assumed to be 0.20 . This estimate was used because it is similar to that of other species of flatfish with approximately the same age range as arrowtooth flounder and is the same estimate used by Okada et al. (1980). However, examination of shelf and slope survey population estimates indicate that females are consistently estimated to be in higher abundance than males (Fig. 6.4). This difference was also evident in the Gulf of Alaska from
triennial surveys conducted from 1984-96 (Turnock et al. 1998). Possible reasons for the higher estimates of females in the survey observations may be: 1) there is a spatial separation of males and females where males are less available to the survey trawl, 2) there is a higher natural mortality for males than females, 3 ) there are some sampling problems, or 4) there is a genetic predisposition to produce more females than males.

Since we do not believe that male arrowtooth flounder are less available to the Bering Sea shelf survey sampling trawl than females, differential sex-specific natural mortality has been investigated as an alternative model in past assessments as an explanation of the observed differences in survey catch sex ratio (Wilderbuer and Sample 2002).

For this assessment, model runs were again made with female natural mortality fixed at 0.2 for a range of values for males. Model runs were evaluated with respect to the estimate of male and female selectivity for the shelf survey, the estimated sex ratio and the overall model fit. Also, a constraint was placed on fitting the sex ratio estimated from the trawl surveys, as follows:

$$
\text { SRlike }=0.5\left[\frac{S R_{\text {obs }}-S R_{\text {pred }}}{\sigma_{\text {obs }}}\right]^{2}
$$

where SRlike is the sex ratio likelihood component, $\mathrm{SR}_{\text {obs }}$ is the observed sex ratio in shelf survey trawl surveys from 1982-2006, $\mathrm{SR}_{\text {pred }}$ is the model predicted sex ratio in the estimated population, and $\mathrm{o}_{\text {obs }}$ is the standard error of the observed population sex ratio.

Model runs with this configuration result in the best fit to all the data components (Fig. 6.5) at male $\mathrm{M}=$ 0.27 . However, at this value, maximum male selectivity on the shelf is estimated at 0.65 for age 7 which is inconsistent with the hypothesis that the observed sex ratio is the result of increased male natural mortality, not availability to the survey bottom trawl. At increasing values of male $M$ the estimated sex ratio more closely match the observed sex ratio and maximum male selectivity for the shelf survey increases. By increasing the value of male $M$ there is a trade-off between fitting the time series of survey length compositions and the observed sex ratio. Model runs with increasing emphasis placed on fitting the observed sex ratio provide the best fit to all the observed data components at higher values of male M (best fit $\mathrm{M}=0.3$ at emphasis $=15, \mathrm{M}=0.31$ at emphasis $=20$, and $\mathrm{M}=0.32$ at emphasis $=30$ ). Likelihood values for all the data components are shown below from runs made with male natural mortality rates ranging from $0.27-0.34$ with equal emphasis placed on all data components.

| male natural mortality values |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.3 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.34 |
| Likelihood component |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| shelf biomass | 66.31 | 67.46 | 68.48 | 69.44 | 70.34 | 71.20 | 72.02 | 72.80 |
| slope biomass | 92.70 | 91.03 | 89.59 | 88.35 | 87.31 | 86.44 | 85.72 | 85.12 |
| shelf length comp | 1497.21 | 1500.78 | 1504.57 | 1508.53 | 1512.64 | 1516.90 | 1521.32 | 1525.88 |
| slope length comp | 660.64 | 665.19 | 670.91 | 677.65 | 685.31 | 693.79 | 703.02 | 712.93 |
| recruitment | 30.43 | 29.94 | 29.52 | 29.17 | 28.89 | 28.67 | 28.48 | 28.34 |
| sex ratio | 81.44 | 72.68 | 64.72 | 57.50 | 50.97 | 45.06 | 39.73 | 34.93 |
| shelf age comps | 130.05 | 130.70 | 131.21 | 131.67 | 132.10 | 132.53 | 132.96 | 133.39 |
| total likelihood | 2558.78 | 2557.78 | 2559.00 | 2562.32 | 2567.56 | 2574.58 | 2583.24 | 2593.40 |
| male max shelf selectivity (age) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.61(7)$ | $.65(7)$ | $0.69(7)$ | $0.73(8)$ | $0.78(8)$ | $0.83(8)$ | $.89(8)$ | $0.96(8)$ |  |

The natural mortality value for males is unknown but most likely ranges between 0.28 and 0.35 . Lower values in this range do not provide estimates of maximum selectivity and sex ratio which would be
expected with the differential sex-specific natural mortality hypothesis. The run with male $\mathrm{M}=0.33$ is the preferred run since it provides a good fit to all the data components and is consistent with the hypothesis that differences in sex ratios observed from trawl surveys are the result of differential sexspecific natural mortality and not availability. For this run the maximum shelf selectivity occurs at 0.89 for age 8 fish. This value is close to 1.0 but still allows for some overlap with slope survey size composition observations where fish of this age are present in both shelf and slope surveys. It may be that the rate of male natural mortality is even higher as it has been estimated at 0.35 in the Gulf of Alaska stock assessment, an assessment with age data from eight surveys which may provide more precise estimates. These analyses are consistent with our hypothesis that the differences in sex ratios observed in catches of arrowtooth flounder throughout the Bering Sea, Aleutian Islands and the Gulf of Alaska result from differential sex-specific survival rates and are not due to distributional or behavior differences. Although the hypothesis of lower availability for males cannot be ruled out without further research, age data from Gulf of Alaska trawl surveys indicate that males do not live past 17 years whereas many female arrowtooth flounder have been aged as high as 25 years. This result is what would be expected in age compositions from a population with a higher M for males than females.

## Model Results

## Fishing mortality and selectivity

The stock assessment model estimates of the annual fishing mortality on fully selected ages and the estimated annual exploitation rates (catch/total biomass) are given in Table 6.6. The average exploitation rate has been at a low level, less than $3 \%$, from 1977-2006 due to the relative undesirability of arrowtooth flounder as a commercial product and the additional constraints of the 2 million ton TAC and halibut bycatch limits. Age-specific selectivity estimated by the model (Table 6.7, Fig. 6.5) indicate that arrowtooth flounder are $50 \%$ selected by the fishery at about $7-8$ years of age and are fully selected by ages 14 and 11 , for males and females, respectively.

## Abundance Trend

Model estimates indicate that arrowtooth flounder total biomass more than quadrupled from 1976 to the 2006 value of 1.17 million $t$ (Fig. 6.6, Table 6.8). After a rapid increase from 1985-94, the population leveled-off from 1995-2003 before increasing again the past few years to its highest level yet observed, largely from the influence of the largest shelf survey biomass estimates ever recorded in 2005 and 2006. Female spawning biomass is also estimated to be at a high level, $753,000 \mathrm{t}$ in 2006, also the highest level estimated from 1976 to the present (Table 6.8). Model estimates of population numbers by age, year, and sex are given in Table 6.9.

The model fit to the shelf survey tracks the trend of increasing abundance from 1982 to the high levels since the mid 1990s, but does not fit the high biomass estimates of 1993-1997, and 2005-2006. The very high 2005 survey estimate is particularly not fit very well by the model but does have a large influence on estimates of total biomass, female spawning biomass, overall abundance trend and the recent recruitment estimates by increasing all the estimated values. Consideration of the relationship between annual bottom water temperature and catchability improved the fit to the shelf survey biomass and indicated that catchability increases with water temperature, although the relationship does not hold in all years (Fig 6.3). The model indicates an increasing biomass trend on the slope and estimates a higher biomass than the 2002 and 2004 slope survey estimates (Fig. 6.6). The slope biomass represents a smaller fraction of the total stock and was considered to be poorly estimated by the 1991 survey which is an underestimate due to the reduction in sampling depth relative to earlier surveys.

The model provides reasonable fits to the survey shelf size composition time-series since 1981 for males and females, which are shown in the Appendix. Reasonable fits also resulted for slope survey size composition observations and the 1996 and 1998 shelf survey age compositions.

## Recruitment Trends

Increases in abundance from 1983-95 were the result of 5 strong year-classes spawned in 1980, 1983, 1986, 1987 and 1988 (Fig. 6.7, Table 6.10). From 1989-1994 recruitment was below average and stock abundance leveled-off. Recent increases in arrowtooth flounder biomass can be attributed to the strong 1995 and very strong 1998 year classes. Small fish present in the three shelf surveys from 2003-2005 (fig 6.2) indicate strong 2001-2003 year classes which should increase the stock size even higher than the present level in the near future.

Otoliths for aging arrowtooth flounder have been routinely collected during AFSC surveys in the EBS, but they have been infrequently aged because of higher priority for aging other species. However, an examination of length-frequency data shows that modes formed by age groups 1 to 3 are reasonably well separated so that fish less than 25 cm can be used as a measure of recruitment for age 2 fish; some age 1 fish are also included, but they are poorly recruited to the survey trawls. Population estimates (in millions) for fish less than 25 cm are shown in Table 6.10

Over this 24 year period, population estimates for this size group have averaged 126 million. Above average recruitment been observed in surveys conducted in 1983, 1986, 1988, 1989, 2001 and 2003. Since the estimates primarily represent age 2 fish, the year-classes producing the strong recruitment are 1981, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1992, 1999 and 2001-2003. The stock assessment model estimates of age 2 recruitment are based on these data and show the same trends in recruitment (Fig. 6.7).

## Acceptable Biological Catch

Arrowtooth flounder have a wide-spread bathymetric distribution in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands region and are believed to be at a high level, primarily as a result of five above average year-classes spawned during the 1980s, good recent recruitment, and minimal commercial harvest. They are currently estimated to be at a stable and high level. The estimate of projected 2007 total biomass from the stock assessment projection model is $\mathbf{1 , 2 7 5 , 9 0 0} \mathbf{t}$ and the female spawning biomass is estimated at $\mathbf{8 2 4 , 4 0 0}$ $t$ (not including the Aleutian Islands).

The reference fishing mortality rate for arrowtooth flounder is determined by the amount of reliable population information available (Amendment 56 of the Fishery Management Plan for the groundfish fishery of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands). Equilibrium female spawning biomass is calculated by applying the female spawning biomass per recruit resulting from a constant $\mathrm{F}_{0.40}$ harvest to an estimate of average equilibrium recruitment. Year classes spawned in 1977-2003 are used to calculate the average equilibrium recruitment. Using the time-series of age 1 recruitment from 1978-2004 from the stock assessment model results in an estimate of $\mathrm{B}_{0.40}=339,600 \mathrm{t}$. The stock assessment model estimates the 2007 level of female spawning biomass at $824,400 t(B)$. Since reliable estimates of $B, B_{0.40}, \mathrm{~F}_{0.40}$, and $\mathrm{F}_{0.30}$ exist and $\mathrm{B}>\mathrm{B}_{0.40}(824,400>339,600)$, arrowtooth flounder reference fishing mortality is defined in tier 3a. For the 2007 harvest: $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ABC}} \triangleleft \mathrm{F}_{0.40}=0.24$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\text {overfishing }}=\mathrm{F}_{0.35}=0.30$ (full selection F values).

Acceptable biological catch is estimated for 2007 by applying the $\mathrm{F}_{0.40}$ fishing mortality rate and agespecific fishery selectivities to the projected 2007 estimate of age-specific total biomass as follows:

$$
A B C=\sum_{a=a_{r}}^{a_{\text {nages }}} \bar{w}_{a} n_{a}\left(1-e^{-M-F s_{a}}\right) \frac{F s_{a}}{M+F s_{a}}
$$

where $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the selectivity at age, M is natural mortality, $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the mean weight at age, and $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the beginning of the year numbers at age. This results in a 2007 ABC of $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{t}$.

The potential yield of arrowtooth flounder in 2006, at various levels of fishing mortality (full selection), are as follows:

| F level |  | Exploitation rate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Potential yield |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {overfishing }}$ | 0.30 |  | $193,200 \mathrm{t}$ |
| $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{0 . 4 0}}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{t}$ |  |

This estimate of 2007 ABC is for the combined harvest of arrowtooth flounder and Kamchatka flounder. If future catches were separated by species, then this complex could be managed with Kamchatka flounder in the Tier 5 management category. Using 0.2 as a value for M (although it is unknown if sexual specific natural mortality exists for Kamchatka flounder) and the 2006 survey biomass point estimate of $61,644 \mathrm{t}$ (Appendix table) would give an overfishing limit of $12,329 \mathrm{t}$. It is unlikely that the current level of catch is sufficient to warrant a conservation concern for this complex.

## Projected Biomass

A standard set of projections is required for each stock managed under Tiers 1, 2, or 3 of Amendment 56. This set of projections encompasses seven harvest scenarios designed to satisfy the requirements of Amendment 56, the National Environmental Protection Act, and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA).

For each scenario, the projections begin with the vector of 2006 numbers at age estimated in the assessment. This vector is then projected forward to the beginning of 2007 using the schedules of natural mortality and selectivity described in the assessment and the best available estimate of total (year-end) catch for 2006. In each subsequent year, the fishing mortality rate is prescribed on the basis of the spawning biomass in that year and the respective harvest scenario. In each year, recruitment is drawn from an inverse Gaussian distribution whose parameters consist of maximum likelihood estimates determined from recruitments estimated in the assessment. Spawning biomass is computed in each year based on the time of peak spawning and the maturity and weight schedules described in the assessment. Total catch is assumed to equal the catch associated with the respective harvest scenario in all years. This projection scheme is run 1000 times to obtain distributions of possible future stock sizes, fishing mortality rates, and catches.

Five of the seven standard scenarios will be used in an Environmental Assessment prepared in conjunction with the final SAFE. These five scenarios, which are designed to provide a range of harvest alternatives that are likely to bracket the final TAC for 2007, are as follow (" $m a x F_{A B C}$ " refers to the maximum permissible value of $F_{A B C}$ under Amendment 56):

Scenario 1: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to $\max F_{A B C}$. (Rationale: Historically, TAC has been constrained by ABC, so this scenario provides a likely upper limit on future TACs.)

Scenario 2: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to a constant fraction of $\max F_{A B C}$, where this fraction is equal to the ratio of the $F_{A B C}$ value for 2007 recommended in the assessment to the $\max F_{A B C}$ for 2007. (Rationale: When $F_{A B C}$ is set at a value below $\max F_{A B C}$, it is often set at the value recommended in the stock assessment.)
Scenario 3: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to $50 \%$ of $\max F_{A B C}$. (Rationale: This scenario provides a likely lower bound on $F_{A B C}$ that still allows future harvest rates to be adjusted downward when stocks fall below reference levels.)

Scenario 4: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to the 2002-2006 average $F$. (Rationale: For some stocks, TAC can be well below ABC, and recent average $F$ may provide a better indicator of $F_{T A C}$ than $F_{A B C}$.)

Scenario 5: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to zero. (Rationale: In extreme cases, TAC may be set at a level close to zero.)

Two other scenarios are needed to satisfy the MSFCMA's requirement to determine whether a stock is currently in an overfished condition or is approaching an overfished condition. These two scenarios are as follow (for Tier 3 stocks, the MSY level is defined as $B_{35 \%}$ ):

Scenario 6: In all future years, $F$ is set equal to $F_{O F L}$. (Rationale: This scenario determines whether a stock is overfished. If the stock is expected to be above $1 / 2$ of its MSY level in 2007 and above its MSY level in 2017 under this scenario, then the stock is not overfished.)

Scenario 7: In 2007 and 2008, $F$ is set equal to $\max F_{A B C}$, and in all subsequent years, $F$ is set equal to $F_{\text {OFL }}$. (Rationale: This scenario determines whether a stock is approaching an overfished condition. If the stock is expected to be above its MSY level in 2019 under this scenario, then the stock is not approaching an overfished condition.)

Simulation results (Table 6.11) indicate that arrowtooth flounder are not currently overfished and the stock is not considered to be approaching an overfished condition. The stock projection at the average exploitation rate for the past 5 years is shown in Figure 6.8.

## Scenario Projections and Two-Year Ahead Overfishing Level

In addition to the seven standard harvest scenarios, Amendments $48 / 48$ to the BSAI and GOA Groundfish Fishery Management Plans require projections of the likely OFL two years into the future. While Scenario 6 gives the best estimate of OFL for 2007, it does not provide the best estimate of OFL for 2008, because the mean 2008 catch under Scenario 6 is predicated on the 2007 catch being equal to the 2007 OFL, whereas the actual 2007 catch will likely be less than the 2007 ABC. Therefore, the projection model was re-run with the 2007 catch fixed equal to the 2006 catch and the 2008 fishing mortality rate fixed at $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ABC}}$.

| Year | Catch | ABC | OFL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 11,214 | 158,000 | 193,000 |
| 2008 | 11,214 | 170,500 | 208,400 |

## Ecosystem Considerations

## Ecosystem Effects on the stock

## 1) Prey availability/abundance trends

Arrowtooth flounder diet varies by life stage as follows: Larvae consume plankton and algae, early juveniles consume zooplankton, late juvenile stage and adults prey includes polychaetes, crustaceans, brittle stars, shrimp, herring myctophids and other small fish. Adult arrowtooth larger than 30 cm are mainly piscivorus and consume pollock as a major portion of their diet. Information is not available to assess the abundance trends of the benthic infauna of the Bering Sea shelf. The original description of infaunal distribution and abundance by Haflinger (1981) resulted from sampling conducted in 1975 and 1976 and has not be re-sampled since. Information on pollock abundance is available in Chapter 1 of this SAFE report. It has been hypothesized that predators on pollock, such as adult arrowtooth flounder, may
be important species which control (with other factors) the variation in year-class strength of juvenile pollock (Hunt et al. 2002). The populations of arrowtooth flounder which have occupied the outer shelf and slope areas of the Bering Sea over the past twenty years for summertime feeding do not appear foodlimited. These populations have fluctuated due to the variability in recruitment success which suggests that the primary infaunal food source has been at an adequate level to sustain the arrowtooth flounder resource.

## 2) Predator population trends

As juveniles, it is well-documented from studies in other parts of the world that flatfish are prey for shrimp species in near shore areas. This has not been reported for Bering Sea arrowtooth flounder due to a lack of juvenile sampling and collections in near shore areas, but is thought to occur. As late juveniles they are found in stomachs of pollock and Pacific cod,; mostly on small arrowtooth flounder ranging from 5 to 15 cm standard length..

Past, present and projected future population trends of these predator species can be found in their respective SAFE chapters in this volume. Encounters between arrowtooth flounder and their predators may be limited as their distributions do not completely overlap in space and time.

## 3) Changes in habitat quality

Changes in the physical environment which may affect arrowtooth flounder distribution patterns, recruitment success, migration timing and patterns are catalogued in the Ecosystem Considerations Appendix of this SAFE report. Habitat quality may be enhanced during years of favorable cross-shelf advection (juvenile survival) and warmer bottom water temperatures with reduced ice cover (higher metabolism with more active feeding).

## Fishery Effects on the ecosystem

1) Arrowtoooth flounder are not pursued as a target fishery at this time and thus have no "fishery effect" on the ecosystem. In instances when arrowtooth flounder were caught in sufficient quantities in the catch that they could be classified as a target, their contribution to the total bycatch of prohibited species is summarized for 2003 and 2004 in Table 13 of the Economic SAFE (Appendix C) and is summarized for 2004 as follows:

2) Relative to the predator needs in space and time, any harvesting of arrowtooth flounder is not very selective for fish between $5-15 \mathrm{~cm}$ and therefore has minimal overlap with removals from predation.
3) The catch is not perceived to have an effect on the amount of large size target fish in the population due to it's history of very light exploitation ( $2 \%$ ) over the past 28 years.
4) Arrowtooth flounder discards are presented in the Catch History section.
5) It is unknown what effect the catch has had on arrowtooth flounder maturity-at-age and fecundity.
6) Analysis of the benthic disturbance from harvesting arrowtooth flounder is available in the Preliminary draft of the Essential Fish Habitat Environmental Impact Statement.

| Ecosystem effects on arrowtooth flounder |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | Observation | Interpretation | Evaluation |
| Prey availability or abundance tren Benthic infauna | ds $\quad$ Stomach contents | Stable, data limited | Unknown |
| Predator population trends Fish (Pollock, Pacific cod) | Stable | Possible increases to rock sole mortality |  |
| Changes in habitat quality Temperature regime | Cold years arrowtooth catchability and herding may decrease | Likely to affect surveyed stock | No concern (dealt with in model) |
| Winter-spring environmental conditions | Affects pre-recruit survival | Probably a number of factors | Causes natural variability |
| Arrowtooth flounder effects on ecosystem |  |  |  |
| Indicator | Observation | Interpretation | Evaluation |
| Fishery contribution to bycatch |  |  |  |
| Prohibited species | Stable, heavily monitored | Minor contribution to mortality | No concern |
| Forage (including herring, Atka mackerel, cod, and pollock) | Stable, heavily monitored | Bycatch levels small relative to forage biomass Bycatch levels small | No concern |
| HAPC biota | Low bycatch levels of (spp) | relative to HAPC biota | No concern |
| Marine mammals and birds | Very minor direct-take | Safe | No concern |
| Sensitive non-target species | Likely minor impact | Data limited, likely to be safe | No concern |
| Fishery concentration in space and time | Very low exploitation rate | Little detrimental effect | No concern |
| Fishery effects on amount of large size target fish | Very low exploitation rate | Natural fluctuation | No concern |
| Fishery contribution to discards and offal production | Stable trend | Improving, but data limited | Possible concern |
| Fishery effects on age-at-maturity and fecundity | Unknown | NA | Possible concern |
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Table 6.1. All nation total catch $(\mathrm{t})$ of arrowtooth flounder in the eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region ${ }^{\text {a }}$, 1970-2006. Catches since 1990 are not reported by area.

|  | Eastern Bering Sea |  |  |  | Aleutian Island Region |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-U.S. } \\ & \text { fisheries } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} . \\ & \mathrm{J} . \mathrm{V} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U.S. } \\ & \text { DAH } \end{aligned}$ | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-U.S. } \\ & \text { fisheries } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} . \\ \mathrm{J} . \mathrm{V} . \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U.S. } \\ & \text { DAH } \end{aligned}$ | Total | Total |
| 1970 | 12,598 |  |  | 12,598 | 274 |  |  | 274 | 12,872 |
| 1971 | 18,792 |  |  | 18,792 | 581 |  |  | 581 | 19,373 |
| 1972 | 13,123 |  |  | 13,123 | 1,323 |  |  | 1,323 | 14,446 |
| 1973 | 9,217 |  |  | 9,217 | 3,705 |  |  | 3,705 | 12,922 |
| 1974 | 21,473 |  |  | 21,473 | 3,195 |  |  | 3,195 | 24,668 |
| 1975 | 20,832 |  |  | 20,832 | 784 |  |  | 784 | 21,616 |
| 1976 | 17,806 |  |  | 17,806 | 1,370 |  |  | 1,370 | 19,176 |
| 1977 | 9,454 |  |  | 9,454 | 2,035 |  |  | 2,035 | 11,489 |
| 1978 | 8,358 |  |  | 8,358 | 1,782 |  |  | 1,782 | 10,140 |
| 1979 | 7,921 |  |  | 7,921 | 6,436 |  |  | 6,436 | 14,357 |
| 1980 | 13,674 | 87 |  | 13,761 | 4,603 |  |  | 4,603 | 18,364 |
| 1981 | 13,468 | 5 |  | 13,473 | 3,624 | 16 |  | 3,640 | 17,113 |
| 1982 | 9,065 | 38 |  | 9,103 | 2,356 | 59 |  | 2,415 | 11,518 |
| 1983 | 10,180 | 36 |  | 10,216 | 3,700 | 53 |  | 3,753 | 13,969 |
| 1984 | 7,780 | 200 |  | 7,980 | 1,404 | 68 |  | 1,472 | 9,452 |
| 1985 | 6,840 | 448 |  | 7,288 | 11 | 59 | 89 | 159 | 7,447 |
| 1986 | 3,462 | 3,298 | 5 | 6,766 |  | 78 | 337 | 415 | 7,181 |
| 1987 | 2,789 | 1,561 | 158 | 4,508 |  | 114 | 237 | 351 | 4,859 |
| 1988 |  | 2,552 | 15,395 | 17,947 |  | 22 | 2,021 | 2,043 | 19,990 |
| 1989 |  | 2,264 | 4,000 | 6,264 |  |  | 1,042 | 1,042 | 7,306 |
| 1990 |  | 660 | 7,315 | 7,975 |  |  | 5,083 | 5,083 | 13,058 |
| 1991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22,052 |
| 1992 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,382 |
| 1993 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,338 |
| 1994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14,366 |
| 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,280 |
| 1996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14,652 |
| 1997 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,054 |
| 1998 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15,241 |
| 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,573 |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,929 |
| 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13,908 |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,540 |
| 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,834 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17,809 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13,685 |
| 2006** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,214 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Catches from data on file Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 7600 Sand Point Way N.E., Seattle, WA 98115.
${ }^{b}$ Japan, U.S.S.R., Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Poland, and Federal Republic of Germany.
'Joint ventures between U.S. fishing vessels and foreign processing vessels. **Catch information through 6 September, 2006 (NMFS regional office).

Table 6.2 Estimates of retained and discarded arrowtooth flounder catch, 1985-2005.

|  |  |  | $\%$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Retained | Discarded | Total | retained |
| 1985 | 17 | 72 | 89 | 19 |
| 1986 | 65 | 277 | 342 | 19 |
| 1987 | 75 | 320 | 395 | 19 |
| 1988 | 3,309 | 14,107 | 17,416 | 19 |
| 1989 | 958 | 4,084 | 5,042 | 19 |
| $1990^{*}$ | 2,356 | 10,042 | 12,398 | 19 |
| 1991 | 3,211 | 18,841 | 22,052 | 15 |
| 1992 | 675 | 9,707 | 10,382 | 7 |
| 1993 | 403 | 6,775 | 7,178 | 6 |
| 1994 | 626 | 13,641 | 14,267 | 4 |
| 1995 | 509 | 8,772 | 9,281 | 5 |
| 1996 | 1,372 | 13,280 | 14,652 | 9 |
| 1997 | 1,029 | 9,024 | 10,054 | 10 |
| 1998 | 2,896 | 12,345 | 15,241 | 19 |
| 1999 | 2,538 | 8,035 | 10,573 | 24 |
| 2000 | 5,124 | 7,805 | 12,929 | 60 |
| 2001 | 4,271 | 6,959 | 11,230 | 62 |
| 2002 | 4,039 | 7,501 | 11,540 | 35 |
| 2003 | 4,024 | 8,810 | 12,834 | 31 |
| 2004 | 3,747 | 14,062 | 17,809 | 21 |
| 2005 | 7,010 | 6,675 | 13,685 | 51 |

1990 retained rate was applied to the 1985-89 reported catch.

Table 6.3 Estimated combined arrowtooth flounder and Kamchatka flounder biomass from trawl surveys conducted on the Eastern Bering Sea shelf, slope and the Aleutian Islands.

| Year | shelf survey | slope survey | shelf + slope | Aleutian Islands |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1975 | 28,000 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1979 | 35,000 | 36,700 | 71,700 | -- |
| 1980 | 47,800 | -- | -- | 17,016 |
| 1981 | 49,500 | 34,900 | 84,400 | -- |
| 1982 | 67,400 | 24,700 | 92,100 | -- |
| 1983 | 149,300 | -- | -- | 25,499 |
| 1984 | 182,900 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1985 | 159,900 | 74,400 | 234,300 | -- |
| 1986 | 232,100 | -- | -- | 111,040 |
| 1987 | 290,600 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1988 | 306,500 | 30,600* | 337,100 | -- |
| 1989 | 410,700 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1990 | 459,200 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1991 | 329,200 | 28,000* | 357,200 | 38,152 |
| 1992 | 414,000 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1993 | 543,600 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1994 | 570,600 | -- | -- | 107,347 |
| 1995 | 480,800 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1996 | 556,400 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1997 | 478,600 | -- | -- | 111,557 |
| 1998 | 344,900 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1999 | 243,800 | -- |  |  |
| 2000 | 340,400 | -- | -- | 95,563 |
| 2001 | 408,800 | -- | -- | -- |
| 2002 | 355,100 | 61,200 | 416,300 | 137,785 |
| 2003 | 553,900 | -- | -- | -- |
| 2004 | 547,400 | 68,600 | 616,000 | 134,217 |
| 2005 | 757,685 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 670,131 |  |  | 229,205 |

Table 6.4--Key equations used in the population dynamics model.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
N_{t, 1}=R_{t}=R_{0} e^{\tau_{t}}, \quad \tau_{t} \sim N\left(0, \delta_{R}^{2}\right) & \text { Recruitment 1956-75 } \\
N_{t, 1}=R_{t}=R_{\gamma} e^{\tau_{t}}, \tau_{t} \sim N\left(0, \delta_{R}^{2}\right) & \text { Recruitment 1976-2005 }
\end{array}
$$

$$
C_{t, a}=\frac{F_{t, a}}{Z_{t, a}}\left(1-e^{-z_{t, a}}\right) N_{t, a}
$$

Catch in year $t$ for age $a$ fish
$N_{t+1, a+1}=N_{t, a} e^{-z_{t, a}} \quad$ Numbers of fish in year $t+1$ at age $a$
$N_{t+1, A}=N_{t, A-1} e^{-z_{t, A-1}}+N_{t, A} e^{-z_{t, A}} \quad$ Numbers of fish in the "plus group"
$S_{t}=\sum N_{t, a} W_{t, a} \phi_{a}$
Spawning biomass
$Z_{t, a}=F_{t, a}+M$
Total mortality in year $t$ at age $a$
$F_{t, a}=s_{a} \mu^{F} \exp ^{\varepsilon^{F}}, \varepsilon^{F}{ }_{t} \sim N\left(o, \sigma^{2_{F}}\right) \quad$ Fishing mortality
$S_{a}=\frac{1}{1+\left(e^{-\alpha+\beta a}\right)}$
$C_{t}=\sum C_{t, a}$
Age-specific fishing selectivity

$$
P_{t, a}=C_{t, a} / C_{t}
$$

Proportion at age in catch
$\operatorname{SurB}_{t}=q \sum N_{t, a} W_{t, a} v_{a}$
Survey biomass
$L=\sum_{t, a} m_{t} p_{t, a} \ln \frac{\hat{p_{t, a}}}{p_{t, a}}+(-0.5) \sum_{t}\left[\left(\ln \frac{\operatorname{surB_{t}}}{\hat{\operatorname{sur} B_{t}}} 1 / \sigma_{t}\right)^{2}-\ln \sigma_{t}\right]$
Total log likelihood

Table 6.5--Variables used in the population dynamics model.

Variables

| $R_{t}$ | Age 1 recruitment in year $t$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $R_{0}$ | Geometric mean value of age 1 recruitment, 1956-75 |
| $R_{\gamma}$ | Geometric mean value of age 1 recruitment, 1976-96 |
| $\tau_{t}$ | Recruitment deviation in year $t$ |
| $N_{t, a}$ | Number of fish in year $t$ at age $a$ |
| $C_{t, a}$ | Catch numbers of fish in year $t$ at age $a$ |
| $P_{t, a}$ | Proportion of the numbers of fish age $a$ in year $t$ |
| $C_{\text {t }}$ | Total catch numbers in year $t$ |
| $W_{t, a}$ | Mean body weight ( kg ) of fish age $a$ in year $t$ |
| $\phi_{a}$ | Proportion of mature females at age $a$ |
| $F_{t, a}$ | Instantaneous annual fishing mortality of age $a$ fish in year $t$ |
| M | Instantaneous natural mortality, assumed constant over all ages and years |
| $Z_{t, a}$ | Instantaneous total mortality for age $a$ fish in year $t$ |
| $s_{a}$ | Age-specific fishing gear selectivity |
| $\mu^{F}$ | Median year-effect of fishing mortality |
| $\varepsilon_{t}^{F}$ | The residual year-effect of fishing mortality |
| $\nu_{a}$ | Age-specific survey selectivity |
| $\alpha$ | Slope parameter in the logistic selectivity equation |
| $\beta$ | Age at $50 \%$ selectivity parameter in the logistic selectivity equation |
| $\sigma_{t}$ | Standard error of the survey biomass in year $t$ |

Table 6.6 Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder fishing mortality and exploitation rate (catch/total biomass).

| year | Full selection $\mathbf{F}$ | Exploitation rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 0.119 | 0.075 |
| 1977 | 0.079 | 0.047 |
| 1978 | 0.073 | 0.042 |
| 1979 | 0.109 | 0.058 |
| 1980 | 0.150 | 0.072 |
| 1981 | 0.148 | 0.064 |
| 1982 | 0.095 | 0.040 |
| 1983 | 0.104 | 0.044 |
| 1984 | 0.062 | 0.027 |
| 1985 | 0.043 | 0.019 |
| 1986 | 0.036 | 0.017 |
| 1987 | 0.021 | 0.010 |
| 1988 | 0.076 | 0.037 |
| 1989 | 0.025 | 0.012 |
| 1990 | 0.041 | 0.020 |
| 1991 | 0.064 | 0.032 |
| 1992 | 0.027 | 0.014 |
| 1993 | 0.022 | 0.012 |
| 1994 | 0.030 | 0.019 |
| 1995 | 0.018 | 0.012 |
| 1996 | 0.028 | 0.018 |
| 1997 | 0.019 | 0.013 |
| 1998 | 0.029 | 0.019 |
| 1999 | 0.020 | 0.013 |
| 2000 | 0.025 | 0.015 |
| 2001 | 0.027 | 0.016 |
| 2002 | 0.022 | 0.012 |
| 2003 | 0.024 | 0.013 |
| 2004 | 0.032 | 0.017 |
| 2005 | 0.023 | 0.012 |
| 2006 | 0.017 | 0.010 |

Table 6.7 Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder age-specific fishery and survey selectivities, by sex.

|  | Fishery |  |  | shelf survey |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | females | males | females | males | females | males |
| 1 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| 2 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.03 |
| 3 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.83 | 0.40 | 0.01 | 0.08 |
| 5 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 1.00 | 0.56 | 0.07 | 0.13 |
| 6 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.97 | 0.73 | 0.43 | 0.20 |
| 7 | 0.52 | 0.41 | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.29 |
| 8 | 0.78 | 0.60 | 0.76 | 0.89 | 0.99 | 0.40 |
| 9 | 0.92 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 0.82 | 1.00 | 0.53 |
| 10 | 0.97 | 0.88 | 0.57 | 0.68 | 1.00 | 0.65 |
| 11 | 0.99 | 0.94 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 1.00 | 0.75 |
| 12 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.42 | 0.35 | 1.00 | 0.83 |
| 13 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.36 | 0.23 | 1.00 | 0.89 |
| 14 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 0.93 |
| 15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.25 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 0.96 |
| 16 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 1.00 | 0.97 |
| 17 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| 18 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 20 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.11 | 0.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 21 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 6.8 Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder 1+ total biomass (t) and female spawning biomass (t) from the 2005 and 2006 assessments.

|  | 2005 Assessment |  | 2006 Assessment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | age 2+ <br> Total biomass | Female Spawning biomass | age 2+ <br> Total biomass | Female Spawning biomass |
| 1976 | 248,608 | 179,275 | 256,799 | 188,233 |
| 1977 | 235,767 | 166,195 | 242,346 | 173,329 |
| 1978 | 236,275 | 159,111 | 241,173 | 164,447 |
| 1979 | 244,946 | 152,849 | 248,466 | 156,804 |
| 1980 | 253,757 | 147,398 | 256,175 | 150,274 |
| 1981 | 266,858 | 150,041 | 268,480 | 151,976 |
| 1982 | 285,145 | 161,150 | 286,215 | 162,318 |
| 1983 | 316,173 | 175,316 | 316,934 | 175,868 |
| 1984 | 349,043 | 188,294 | 349,684 | 188,506 |
| 1985 | 386,948 | 218,733 | 387,615 | 218,853 |
| 1986 | 430,165 | 258,720 | 431,114 | 258,822 |
| 1987 | 481,305 | 286,525 | 482,306 | 286,657 |
| 1988 | 537,011 | 318,029 | 538,038 | 318,441 |
| 1989 | 584,155 | 344,425 | 585,224 | 345,180 |
| 1990 | 643,636 | 379,624 | 644,789 | 380,757 |
| 1991 | 691,603 | 422,354 | 693,228 | 423,327 |
| 1992 | 720,380 | 471,184 | 722,711 | 471,102 |
| 1993 | 750,290 | 518,645 | 753,551 | 518,712 |
| 1994 | 770,760 | 550,949 | 775,196 | 552,569 |
| 1995 | 776,741 | 564,174 | 782,795 | 566,724 |
| 1996 | 784,094 | 574,985 | 792,358 | 577,885 |
| 1997 | 783,604 | 573,642 | 794,845 | 577,545 |
| 1998 | 790,796 | 569,515 | 806,168 | 575,216 |
| 1999 | 798,875 | 560,489 | 821,070 | 568,298 |
| 2000 | 815,566 | 563,698 | 847,056 | 574,240 |
| 2001 | 837,169 | 571,182 | 882,597 | 585,655 |
| 2002 | 861,848 | 578,624 | 925,437 | 598,762 |
| 2003 | 893,464 | 599,767 | 980,859 | 630,168 |
| 2004 | 922,807 | 627,794 | 1,042,920 | 673,219 |
| 2005 | 946,736 | 646,631 | 1,106,230 | 707,778 |
| 2006 |  |  | 1,168,600 | 753,323 |

Table 6.9 Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder population number-at-age, by sex, 1976-2006.

| females | numbers at age (1,000s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1976 | 114,894 | 48,908 | 31,277 | 31,084 | 42,495 | 25,057 | 15,006 | 11,130 | 9,066 | 7,721 |
| 1977 | 195,275 | 94,055 | 40,026 | 25,575 | 25,349 | 34,387 | 19,896 | 11,544 | 8,308 | 6,656 |
| 1978 | 110,420 | 159,864 | 76,985 | 32,743 | 20,884 | 20,594 | 27,588 | 15,630 | 8,889 | 6,327 |
| 1979 | 116,760 | 90,397 | 130,853 | 62,981 | 26,743 | 16,977 | 16,548 | 21,743 | 12,094 | 6,809 |
| 1980 | 148,640 | 95,584 | 73,984 | 107,009 | 51,379 | 21,663 | 13,516 | 12,798 | 16,360 | 8,963 |
| 1981 | 334,401 | 121,676 | 78,218 | 60,476 | 87,177 | 41,451 | 17,065 | 10,231 | 9,328 | 11,677 |
| 1982 | 127,867 | 273,741 | 99,570 | 63,938 | 49,271 | 70,345 | 32,670 | 12,931 | 7,468 | 6,670 |
| 1983 | 113,955 | 104,678 | 224,048 | 81,438 | 52,182 | 39,962 | 56,194 | 25,442 | 9,829 | 5,601 |
| 1984 | 304,247 | 93,288 | 85,673 | 183,230 | 66,445 | 42,286 | 31,850 | 43,556 | 19,205 | 7,312 |
| 1985 | 206,910 | 249,079 | 76,361 | 70,096 | 149,705 | 54,067 | 34,068 | 25,236 | 33,970 | 14,848 |
| 1986 | 204,346 | 169,396 | 203,899 | 62,491 | 57,308 | 122,049 | 43,777 | 27,269 | 19,980 | 26,733 |
| 1987 | 486,095 | 167,298 | 138,673 | 166,874 | 51,102 | 46,754 | 99,004 | 35,173 | 21,711 | 15,828 |
| 1988 | 267,773 | 397,972 | 136,963 | 113,510 | 136,531 | 41,753 | 38,075 | 80,181 | 28,336 | 17,440 |
| 1989 | 263,243 | 219,216 | 325,748 | 112,044 | 92,700 | 110,950 | 33,523 | 29,957 | 61,883 | 21,640 |
| 1990 | 162,800 | 215,519 | 179,464 | 266,627 | 91,657 | 75,708 | 90,247 | 27,084 | 24,048 | 49,502 |
| 1991 | 174,341 | 133,283 | 176,428 | 146,868 | 217,998 | 74,739 | 61,331 | 72,312 | 21,477 | 18,960 |
| 1992 | 188,266 | 142,728 | 109,100 | 144,348 | 119,991 | 177,367 | 60,197 | 48,566 | 56,346 | 16,587 |
| 1993 | 149,055 | 154,134 | 116,845 | 89,297 | 118,076 | 97,977 | 144,200 | 48,585 | 38,928 | 44,993 |
| 1994 | 169,253 | 122,033 | 126,185 | 95,643 | 73,057 | 96,464 | 79,767 | 116,715 | 39,108 | 31,239 |
| 1995 | 216,054 | 138,568 | 99,902 | 103,278 | 78,226 | 59,635 | 78,361 | 64,272 | 93,321 | 31,136 |
| 1996 | 308,054 | 176,887 | 113,443 | 81,776 | 84,505 | 63,930 | 48,594 | 63,541 | 51,875 | 75,127 |
| 1997 | 253,592 | 252,206 | 144,809 | 92,851 | 66,890 | 68,996 | 51,964 | 39,204 | 50,898 | 41,391 |
| 1998 | 294,116 | 207,619 | 206,475 | 118,535 | 75,972 | 54,662 | 56,212 | 42,121 | 31,624 | 40,948 |
| 1999 | 503,268 | 240,794 | 169,967 | 168,995 | 96,954 | 62,022 | 44,419 | 45,324 | 33,712 | 25,208 |
| 2000 | 311,651 | 412,032 | 197,132 | 139,127 | 138,267 | 79,220 | 50,512 | 35,978 | 36,521 | 27,087 |
| 2001 | 375,455 | 255,152 | 337,314 | 161,354 | 113,811 | 112,921 | 64,437 | 40,809 | 28,881 | 29,213 |
| 2002 | 469,756 | 307,387 | 208,881 | 276,088 | 131,985 | 92,930 | 91,802 | 52,004 | 32,708 | 23,059 |
| 2003 | 541,549 | 384,594 | 251,648 | 170,976 | 225,874 | 107,823 | 75,648 | 74,286 | 41,845 | 26,236 |
| 2004 | 429,611 | 443,372 | 314,854 | 205,979 | 139,872 | 184,494 | 87,734 | 61,161 | 59,696 | 33,514 |
| 2005 | 394,240 | 351,724 | 362,963 | 257,693 | 168,464 | 114,160 | 149,821 | 70,646 | 48,854 | 47,474 |
| 2006 | 142,900 | 322,769 | 287,945 | 297,096 | 210,821 | 137,616 | 92,917 | 121,199 | 56,818 | 39,167 |

Table 6.9 (cont'd) Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder population number-at-age, by sex, 1976-2006.
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Table 6.9 (cont'd) Model estimates of arrowtooth flounder population number-at-age, by sex, 1976-2006.

| males |  |  |  | bers | (1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 1976 | 1,834 | 1,422 | 1,107 | 862 | 669 | 519 | 398 | 306 | 231 | 174 | 264 |
| 1977 | 1,551 | 1,178 | 910 | 708 | 551 | 427 | 331 | 254 | 195 | 148 | 280 |
| 1978 | 1,410 | 1,035 | 785 | 605 | 470 | 366 | 284 | 220 | 169 | 130 | 284 |
| 1979 | 1,368 | 946 | 693 | 525 | 405 | 315 | 245 | 190 | 147 | 113 | 277 |
| 1980 | 1,434 | 887 | 612 | 448 | 339 | 261 | 203 | 158 | 122 | 95 | 251 |
| 1981 | 1,825 | 896 | 552 | 380 | 277 | 210 | 162 | 126 | 98 | 76 | 214 |
| 1982 | 2,401 | 1,142 | 558 | 343 | 236 | 172 | 130 | 100 | 78 | 61 | 180 |
| 1983 | 1,449 | 1,577 | 748 | 365 | 224 | 154 | 113 | 85 | 66 | 51 | 157 |
| 1984 | 1,203 | 944 | 1,024 | 485 | 236 | 145 | 100 | 73 | 55 | 42 | 135 |
| 1985 | 1,617 | 816 | 638 | 692 | 328 | 160 | 98 | 67 | 49 | 37 | 120 |
| 1986 | 3,298 | 1,116 | 562 | 440 | 477 | 226 | 110 | 68 | 46 | 34 | 108 |
| 1987 | 5,906 | 2,292 | 775 | 390 | 305 | 331 | 156 | 76 | 47 | 32 | 98 |
| 1988 | 3,513 | 4,164 | 1,615 | 546 | 275 | 215 | 233 | 110 | 54 | 33 | 92 |
| 1989 | 3,664 | 2,351 | 2,780 | 1,077 | 364 | 183 | 143 | 155 | 73 | 36 | 83 |
| 1990 | 4,780 | 2,572 | 1,649 | 1,949 | 755 | 255 | 128 | 100 | 109 | 51 | 83 |
| 1991 | 10,807 | 3,306 | 1,777 | 1,138 | 1,345 | 521 | 176 | 89 | 69 | 75 | 93 |
| 1992 | 4,062 | 7,317 | 2,234 | 1,199 | 768 | 908 | 352 | 119 | 60 | 47 | 113 |
| 1993 | 3,679 | 2,846 | 5,122 | 1,563 | 839 | 537 | 635 | 246 | 83 | 42 | 112 |
| 1994 | 10,017 | 2,591 | 2,003 | 3,604 | 1,100 | 590 | 378 | 447 | 173 | 58 | 108 |
| 1995 | 6,875 | 6,997 | 1,808 | 1,398 | 2,514 | 767 | 412 | 264 | 312 | 121 | 116 |
| 1996 | 6,903 | 4,857 | 4,941 | 1,277 | 986 | 1,774 | 541 | 291 | 186 | 220 | 167 |
| 1997 | 16,476 | 4,833 | 3,398 | 3,455 | 892 | 690 | 1,240 | 378 | 203 | 130 | 271 |
| 1998 | 9,154 | 11,634 | 3,410 | 2,397 | 2,437 | 630 | 486 | 875 | 267 | 143 | 283 |
| 1999 | 8,975 | 6,402 | 8,130 | 2,382 | 1,674 | 1,702 | 440 | 340 | 611 | 186 | 297 |
| 2000 | 5,573 | 6,329 | 4,512 | 5,727 | 1,678 | 1,179 | 1,199 | 310 | 239 | 430 | 341 |
| 2001 | 5,963 | 3,912 | 4,439 | 3,163 | 4,015 | 1,176 | 827 | 840 | 217 | 168 | 540 |
| 2002 | 6,422 | 4,178 | 2,738 | 3,106 | 2,213 | 2,809 | 823 | 578 | 588 | 152 | 495 |
| 2003 | 5,094 | 4,521 | 2,939 | 1,926 | 2,184 | 1,556 | 1,975 | 579 | 407 | 413 | 455 |
| 2004 | 5,787 | 3,580 | 3,175 | 2,063 | 1,352 | 1,533 | 1,092 | 1,386 | 406 | 285 | 609 |
| 2005 | 7,340 | 4,038 | 2,496 | 2,212 | 1,437 | 942 | 1,068 | 761 | 965 | 283 | 623 |
| 2006 | 10,487 | 5,164 | 2,839 | 1,754 | 1,555 | 1,010 | 662 | 750 | 535 | 678 | 637 |

Table 6.10 Estimated age 2 recruitment of arrowtooth flounder (thousands of fish) from the 2005 and 2006 stock assessments and also from estimates of fish less than 25 cm in the annual Bering Sea shelf trawl survey.

| Year class | 2005 Assessment | 2006 Assessment | shelf survey fish<25 cm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | 90,202 | 91,854 |  |
| 1975 | 179,026 | 176,600 |  |
| 1976 | 299,862 | 300,190 |  |
| 1977 | 171,830 | 169,748 |  |
| 1978 | 178,454 | 179,474 |  |
| 1979 | 226,701 | 228,447 |  |
| 1980 | 511,851 | 513,951 | 86,100 |
| 1981 | 196,785 | 196,556 | 290,200 |
| 1982 | 172,697 | 175,165 | 57,900 |
| 1983 | 463,036 | 467,733 | 62,400 |
| 1984 | 317,925 | 318,113 | 150,300 |
| 1985 | 307,381 | 314,178 | 94,300 |
| 1986 | 763,287 | 747,396 | 200,600 |
| 1987 | 416,129 | 411,643 | 273,800 |
| 1988 | 379,073 | 404,744 | 105,200 |
| 1989 | 242,933 | 250,297 | 71,700 |
| 1990 | 272,594 | 268,021 | 79,400 |
| 1991 | 284,381 | 289,462 | 96,800 |
| 1992 | 212,340 | 229,179 | 126,600 |
| 1993 | 246,661 | 260,227 | 75,100 |
| 1994 | 316,190 | 332,198 | 55,600 |
| 1995 | 447,325 | 473,639 | 108,800 |
| 1996 | 353,281 | 389,913 | 93,600 |
| 1997 | 400,751 | 452,206 | 92,100 |
| 1998 | 639,346 | 773,802 | 126,300 |
| 1999 | 384,309 | 479,174 | 164,300 |
| 2000 | 425,284 | 577,269 | 108,800 |
| 2001 | 543,515 | 722,270 | 253,400 |
| 2002 |  | 832,652 | 406,700 |
| 2003 |  | 660,527 | 407,800 |
| 2004 |  |  | 335,800 |
| 2005 |  |  | 495,500 |
| 2006 |  |  | 217,200 |

Table 6.11 Projections of arrowtooth flounder female spawning biomass ( $1,000 \mathrm{st}$ ), future catch $(1,000 \mathrm{st})$ and full selection fishing mortality rates for seven future harvest scenarios. 2007 ABC is highlighted.

| Scenarios 1 and 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum ABC harvest permissible |  |  |  |
|  | Female |  |  |
|  | spawning |  |  |
| Year | biomass | catch | F |
| 2006 | 760.788 | 11.214 | 0.02 |
| 2007 | 812.001 | 158.000 | 0.24 |
| 2008 | 751.244 | 143.333 | 0.24 |
| 2009 | 698.999 | 133.060 | 0.24 |
| 2010 | 637.350 | 124.111 | 0.24 |
| 2011 | 564.581 | 113.837 | 0.24 |
| 2012 | 501.926 | 101.835 | 0.24 |
| 2013 | 453.133 | 90.328 | 0.24 |
| 2014 | 416.818 | 81.411 | 0.24 |
| 2015 | 390.026 | 74.963 | 0.24 |
| 2016 | 370.441 | 70.026 | 0.24 |
| 2017 | 356.805 | 66.438 | 0.24 |
| 2018 | 347.780 | 64.020 | 0.24 |
| 2019 | 342.388 | 62.476 | 0.23 |

Scenario 4
Harvest at average $F$ over the past 5 years

|  | Female <br> spawning <br> biomass | catch | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 760.788 | 11.214 | 0.02 |
| 2007 | 824.400 | 12.750 | 0.02 |
| 2008 | 890.672 | 9.932 | 0.01 |
| 2009 | 947.846 | 10.713 | 0.01 |
| 2010 | 978.191 | 11.388 | 0.01 |
| 2011 | 980.551 | 11.801 | 0.01 |
| 2012 | 975.004 | 11.887 | 0.01 |
| 2013 | 964.606 | 11.729 | 0.01 |
| 2014 | 949.934 | 11.475 | 0.01 |
| 2015 | 931.907 | 11.196 | 0.01 |
| 2016 | 911.856 | 10.911 | 0.01 |
| 2017 | 891.241 | 10.629 | 0.01 |
| 2018 | 871.423 | 10.362 | 0.01 |
| 2019 | 853.643 | 10.122 | 0.01 |

Scenario 3
1/2 Maximum ABC harvest permissible

| Female <br> spawning |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | catch | F |  |
| 2006 | 760.788 | 11.214 | 0.02 |
| 2007 | 818.946 | 79.000 | 0.12 |
| 2008 | 826.919 | 73.384 | 0.11 |
| 2009 | 831.264 | 74.305 | 0.11 |
| 2010 | 812.584 | 74.635 | 0.11 |
| 2011 | 770.841 | 73.272 | 0.11 |
| 2012 | 727.830 | 69.955 | 0.11 |
| 2013 | 688.109 | 65.641 | 0.11 |
| 2014 | 652.524 | 61.538 | 0.11 |
| 2015 | 621.073 | 58.050 | 0.11 |
| 2016 | 593.755 | 55.144 | 0.11 |
| 2017 | 570.721 | 52.734 | 0.11 |
| 2018 | 551.920 | 50.777 | 0.11 |
| 2019 | 537.331 | 49.240 | 0.11 |

Scenario 5
No fishing

Female
spawning

| Year | biomass | catch | F |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 760.788 | 11.214 | 0.02 |
| 2007 | 825.286 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008 | 902.760 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 968.155 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 1006.740 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 1017.120 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 1019.010 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 1015.100 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 1005.760 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | 991.868 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 | 974.843 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 956.257 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 | 937.656 | 0 | 0 |
| 2019 | 920.480 | 0 | 0 |

Table 6.9 (continued).

| Scenario 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Determination of whether arrowtooth |  |  |  |
| flounder are curreB35=297,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Female |  |  |
|  | spawning |  |  |
| Year | biomass | catch | F |
| 2006 | 760.788 | 11.214 | 0.02 |
| 2007 | 808.682 | 193.181 | 0.30 |
| 2008 | 718.135 | 167.373 | 0.30 |
| 2009 | 647.308 | 149.848 | 0.30 |
| 2010 | 574.413 | 135.723 | 0.30 |
| 2011 | 494.236 | 121.215 | 0.30 |
| 2012 | 427.691 | 105.597 | 0.30 |
| 2013 | 379.238 | 91.533 | 0.30 |
| 2014 | 347.265 | 81.289 | 0.30 |
| 2015 | 324.024 | 74.041 | 0.30 |
| 2016 | 310.207 | 67.623 | 0.29 |
| 2017 | 304.259 | 64.330 | 0.28 |
| 2018 | 299.209 | 62.533 | 0.28 |
| 2019 | 297.042 | 61.997 | 0.28 |



Atheresthes spp.
AFSC survey data: standard shelf area


Figure 6.1 Atheresthes species combined CPUE ( $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) from the standard shelf survey area.


Figure 6.2. Size composition of arrowtooth flounder from the shelf trawl surveys.


Figure 6.2. continued.


Figure 6.2. continued.


Figure 6.3--Shelf survey annual avg. bottom temperature anomalies (bars), model estimate of annual shelf survey $q$ due to effect of water temperature (diamonds with lines), given the assumption that $87 \%$ of the biomass resides on the Bering Sea shelf.


Figure 6.4--Proportion of the estimated male population from Bering Sea trawl surveys on the continental shelf and slope.




Figure 6.5--Age-specific fishery selectivity (top panel), shelf survey selectivity (middle panel) and slope survey selectivity (bottom panel), by sex, estimated from the stock assessment model.


Figure 6.6--Stock assessment model results of the fit to the shelf survey biomass time-series (upper left panel), slope survey biomass (upper right panel), estimate of female spawning biomass with B35 and B40 indicated (bottom left panel) and the estimate of total biomass (bottom right panel).


Figure 6.7--Estimates of arrowtooth flounder age 1 recruitment from the stock assessment model.


Figure 6.8--Projected female spawning biomass $(1,000 \mathrm{~s} t)$ of arrowtooth flounder if future harvest is at the same fishing mortality rate as the past five years.

## APPENDIX

Figures showing the fit of the stock assessment model to the time-series of shelf and slope survey size composition data by sex (estimated values are the dotted lines) and the fishery size composition data from 1978-90.

Table of arrowtooth flounder catch during research activities by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, 1977-2005.

BSAI arrowtooth flounder TAC (1986-2006) and ABC (1982-2006)

Shelf survey biomass estimates for arrowtooth and Kamchatka flounder 1982-2006

## Shelf survey males










1993

## Shelf survey males








## Shelf survey males








## Shelf survey males







## Shelf survey females




1982


1983



1985





## Shelf survey females






## Shelf survey females









## Shelf survey females











## Slope survey females









## age comp for shelf males age comp for shelf female






Total catch ( $t$ ) of arrowtooth flounder
due to Alaska Fisheries Science Center
research activity in the Bering Sea and
Aleutian Islands, 1977-2000 and 2002-
2005.

| year | Research <br> catch $(\mathbf{t})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1977 | 1.0 |
| 1978 | 3.7 |
| 1979 | 22.5 |
| 1980 | 63.6 |
| 1981 | 48.4 |
| 1982 | 46.6 |
| 1983 | 21.8 |
| 1984 | 6.1 |
| 1985 | 194.1 |
| 1986 | 57.7 |
| 1987 | 9.4 |
| 1988 | 33.7 |
| 1989 | 22.8 |
| 1990 | 18.4 |
| 1991 | 27.5 |
| 1992 | 10.9 |
| 1993 | 16.3 |
| 1994 | 40.7 |
| 1995 | 18.2 |
| 1996 | 17.9 |
| 1997 | 32.3 |
| 1998 | 12.6 |
| 1999 | 9.8 |
| 2000 | 10.8 |
| 2002 | 11.2 |
| 2003 | 18.0 |
| 2004 | 19.4 |
| 2005 | 23.1 |


| arowtooth |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| flounder |  |  |
| year | TAC | ABC |
| 1980 |  | 20,000 |
| 1981 |  | 16,500 |
| 1982 |  | 16,500 |
| 1983 |  | 20,000 |
| 1984 |  | 20,000 |
| 1985 |  | 20,000 |
| 1986 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 1987 | 9,795 | 30,900 |
| 1988 | 5,531 | 99,500 |
| 1989 | 6,000 | 163,700 |
| 1990 | 10,000 | 106,500 |
| 1991 | 20,000 | 116,400 |
| 1992 | 10,000 | 82,300 |
| 1993 | 10,000 | 72,000 |
| 1994 | 10,000 | 93,400 |
| 1995 | 10,227 | 113,000 |
| 1996 | 9,000 | 129,000 |
| 1997 | 20,760 | 108,000 |
| 1998 | 16,000 | 147,000 |
| 1999 | 134,354 | 140,000 |
| 2000 | 131,000 | 131,000 |
| 2001 | 22,015 | 117,000 |
| 2002 | 16,000 | 113,000 |
| 2003 | 12,000 | 112,000 |
| 2004 | 12,000 | 115,000 |
| 2005 | 12,000 | 108,000 |
| 2006 | 13,000 | 136,000 |
|  |  |  |


| year | Shelf survey <br> Arrowtooth <br> flounder | biomass estimates $(\mathbf{t})$ <br> Kamchatka <br> flounder |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 2}$ | 69,690 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 3}$ | 110,643 | 17,299 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 4}$ | 160,396 | 20,695 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}$ | 163,637 | 31 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 6}$ | 229,865 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 7}$ | 296,964 | 40 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ | 294,771 | 13,723 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | 350,347 | 17,108 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 402,192 | 32,799 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | 292,066 | 37,152 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | 370,287 | 50,081 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | 500,385 | 38,376 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | 514,336 | 56,268 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 452,449 | 28,393 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | 532,159 | 24,196 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | 460,348 | 18,282 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | 344,890 | 23,474 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | 244,141 | 18,974 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 318,814 | 21,551 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 378,071 | 31,120 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 331,191 | 25,213 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 515,363 | 27,531 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 518,788 | 29,663 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 709,047 | 46,084 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 608,487 | 61,644 |

Comparison of species identified during the EBS survey
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