Status of forage species

in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region

Olav A. Ormseth and Ellen Yasumiishi
Alaska Fisheries Science Center

A report on the status of forage species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) region is prepared on a biennial basis and presented to the Plan Team and the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) in odd years. This report is not intended to be a formal stock assessment, although forage populations are analyzed if data are available. The two main objectives of the report are to 1) investigate trends in the abundance and distribution of forage populations and 2) describe interactions between federal fisheries and species that make up the forage base (i.e., to monitor potential impacts of bycatch). The report's structure is as follows:

1) Summary of findings and response to Plan Team & SSC comments
2) Overview of forage species and their management
3) Trends in abundance and spatial distribution
4) Bycatch and other impacts of federal fisheries on forage species
5) Data gaps and research priorities
6) Appendix

Because forage species are a fundamental component of the ecosystems in the BSAI, there is potential for overlap between the data presented here and forage-related information reported in the Ecosystem Considerations report published annually by the NPFMC (https://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/index.php). To minimize duplication of efforts, this report relies mainly on data from the bottom trawl surveys in the BSAI as well as acoustic-survey results where applicable. The Ecosystem Considerations report contains results from the surface-trawl surveys conducted by the Ecosystem Monitoring and Assessment (EMA) program (Yasumiishi et al. 2017), as well as estimates of euphausiid abundance from acoustic surveys (Ressler 2016). Indirect indicators of forage species abundance and prey availability, such as seabird breeding success and groundfish predator diets, are also described in the Ecosystem Considerations report. A brief summary of relevant findings from that report are included in this document's "Summary of findings" section below, and in other relevant sections of the report.

Summary of findings

This report

1) Capelin, eulachon, and other FMP forage species have decreased greatly in abundance since 2015. This general pattern occurs in the EBS and NBS.
2) Herring abundance is relatively high in the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey.
3) Surface-trawl indices in the NBS indicate an overall reduction in the availability of forage fishes.
4) Incidental catches of FMP forage species continue to be very low by historical standards. The preliminary 2019 catch is 24 t, and as is typical is dominated by osmerids, especially eulachon.

5) The reclassification of squids as Ecosystem Components, for which catch limits are not required, has resulted in substantially increased squid catches in the EBS during 2019-2021. These catches are now similar in scale to catch levels during the 1970s and 1980s.
6) Prohibited Species catch (PSC) of Pacific herring exceeded the limit, and event discussed in the 2020 ESR; the herring bycatch in 2021 is high relative to previous years but is below the limit.

Ecosystem Status Report (ESR)
Beginning in 2021 there is an effort to enhance the connection between this forage report and the ESR. The following forage synthesis statement is similar to the one included in the 2021 EBS ESR.

The abundance of forage species (fishes as well as squids, euphausiids, and other invertebrates) in the EBS is difficult to measure. There are no dedicated surveys for these species, and the existing surveys are limited in their ability to assess forage species due to gear selectivity (e.g. large mesh size) or catchability (e.g. vertical distribution).

Nevertheless, these surveys can be used to discern general trends in abundance. The trawl survey-based aggregate forage index in the report card (which does not include Pacific herring or juvenile pollock) suggests that forage abundance has declined substantially since 2015. This is supported by the reduced abundance and frequency of occurrence observed for individual species as described in this report. The surface-trawl survey in the NBS indicates a similar decline in capelin and age-0 pollock. Trends in herring abundance are more complicated, with results varying between the EBS bottom trawl survey, the NBS surface trawl survey, and the Togiak District spawner biomass and recruitment indices (Buck et al. contribution in the 2021 EBS ESR). The herring data do seem to suggest an increase in herring abundance throughout the Bering Sea in recent years. Temporal patterns of juvenile salmon abundance in the NBS are similarly complex, although the abundance of small salmon, herring, and forage species as a whole were substantially lower in 2021 relative to 2019.

Taken together, the available information suggests that the EBS and NBS are experiencing a decline in the availability of forage species to predators. Because many forage species are sensitive to their environment, particularly changes in temperature, it is likely that recent warm years in this region have contributed to this decline. A decline in forage availability may have contributed to other substantial changes in the Bering Sea.

Overview of forage species and their management

Defining “forage species” can be a difficult task, as most fish species experience predation at some point in their life cycle. A forage fish designation is sometimes applied only to small, energy-rich, schooling fishes like sardine and herring, but in most ecosystems this is too limiting a description. Generally, forage species are those whose primary ecosystem role is as prey and serve a critical link between lower and upper trophic levels. For this report, the following species or groups of species are considered to be critical components of the forage base in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) area:

- members of the "forage fish group" listed in the BSAI Fishery Management Plan (FMP; see below)
- Pacific herring *Clupea pallasii*
- juvenile groundfishes and salmon
- shrimps
- squids
- Arctic cod *Boreogadus saida*

<u>Forage fish group in the FMP</u>
Prior to 1998, forage fishes in the BSAI were either managed as part of the Other Species group (nontarget species caught incidentally in commercial fisheries) or were classified as "nonspecified" in the FMP, with no conservation measures. In 1998, Amendment 36 to the BSAI FMP created a separate forage fish category, with conservation measures that included a ban on directed fishing. Beginning in 2011, members of this forage fish group (the "FMP forage group" in this report) are considered "ecosystem components". The FMP forage fish group is large and diverse, containing over fifty species from the following taxonomic groups (see the appendix at the end of this report for a full list of species):

- Osmeridae (smelts; eulachon *Thaleichthys pacificus* and capelin *Mallotus catervarius* are the principal species, with rainbow smelt *Osmerus mordax* locally abundant in some areas)
- Ammodytidae (sand lances; Pacific sand lance *Ammodytes personatus* is the main representative)
- Trichodontidae (sandfishes; Pacific sandfish *Trichodon trichodon* is the main species)
- Stichaeidae (pricklebacks)
- Pholidae (gunnels)
- Myctophidae (lanternfishes)
- Bathylagidae (blacksmelts)
- Gonostomatidae (bristlemouths)
- Euphausiacea (krill; these are crustaceans, not fish, but are considered essential forage)

The primary motivation for the creation of the FMP forage group was to prevent fishing-related impacts to the forage base in the BSAI; it was an early example of ecosystem-based fisheries management. The management measures for the group are specified in section 50 CFR 679b20.doc of the federal code:

50 CFR 679b20.doc § 679.20 General limitations
(i) Forage fish
(1) <u>Definition.</u> See Table 2c to this part.
(2) <u>Applicability.</u>
The provisions of § 679.20 (i) apply to all vessels fishing for groundfish in the BSAI or GOA, and to all vessels processing groundfish harvested in the BSAI or GOA.
(3) <u>Closure to directed fishing.</u>
Directed fishing for forage fish is prohibited at all times in the BSAI and GOA.
(4) <u>Limits on sale, barter, trade, and processing.</u>
The sale, barter, trade, or processing of forage fish is prohibited, except as provided in paragraph (i)(5) of this section.
(5) <u>Allowable fishmeal production.</u>

Retained catch of forage fish not exceeding the maximum retainable bycatch amount may be processed into fishmeal for sale, barter, or trade.

In sum, directed fishing for species in the FMP forage fish group is prohibited, catches are limited by a maximum retention allowance (MRA) of 2% by weight of the retained target species (Tables 10 to 50 CFR part 679), and processing of forage fishes is limited to fishmeal production. While the basis for a 2% MRA is not entirely clear, it appears this percentage was chosen to accommodate existing levels of catch that were believed not to significantly impact prey availability (Federal Register, 1998, vol. 63(51), pages 13009-13012). The intent of amendment 36 was thus to prevent an increase in forage fish removals, not to reduce existing levels of catch. In 1999, the state of Alaska adopted a statute with the same taxonomic groups and limitations (5 AAC 39.212 of the Alaska administrative code), except that no regulations were passed regarding the processing of forage fishes. This exception has caused some confusion regarding the onshore processing of forage fishes for human consumption (J. Bonney, Alaska Groundfish Data Bank, pers. comm.).

Pacific herring

Herring are highly abundant and ubiquitous in Alaska marine waters. Commercial fisheries in the BSAI, mainly for herring roe, exist along the western coast of Alaska from Port Moller north to Norton Sound (Figure 1). These fisheries target herring returning to nearshore waters for spawning, and herring in different areas are managed as separate stocks. The largest stock in the BSAI spawns in Togiak Bay in northern Bristol Bay: the spawning biomass was estimated at 163,480 short tons in 2015. The next largest stock, in Norton Sound, had a 2015 biomass estimate of 53,786 short tons (data can be retrieved at www.adfg.alaska.gov). Herring are hypothesized to migrate seasonally between their spawning grounds and two overwintering areas in the outer domain of the eastern Bering Sea (EBS) continental shelf (Figure 2; Tojo et al. 2007). The herring fisheries are managed by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADFG) which uses a combination of various types of surveys and population modeling to set catch limits. In federal fisheries, herring are managed as Prohibited Species: directed fishing is banned and any bycatch must be returned to the sea immediately. The amount of herring bycatch allowed is also capped and if the cap is exceeded the responsible target fishery is closed in special Herring Savings Areas (Figure 1) to limit further impacts. In the BSAI, the Prohibited Species Catch Quota for herring is calculated as 1% of the estimated annual biomass of herring in the eastern Bering Sea.

Juvenile groundfishes and salmon

Members of this group, particularly age-0 and age-1 walleye pollock, *Gadus chalcogrammus*, are key forage species in the BSAI. As they are early life stages of important commercially fished species, however, their status is dependent on the assessment and management of the recruited portion of the population. Detailed information regarding these species is available in NPFMC stock assessments (http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/refm/stocks/assessments.htm) and ADFG reports (www.adfg.alaska.gov). Further information is not included in this report.

Shrimps

A variety of shrimps occur in the BSAI. Members of the family Pandalidae are generally found in offshore waters while shrimps of the family Crangonidae are distributed mainly in nearshore waters. Commercial fisheries for shrimps are managed by ADFG and are currently closed in the BSAI. Further information on shrimps in Alaska waters is available from ADFG (www.adfg.alaska.gov). This report includes data regarding catches of pandalid shrimps in federal groundfish fisheries.

Squids

Squids are abundant along the EBS slope and in the AI. Up to 15 species exist in the BSAI. Although no directed fisheries currently exist for squids, they have historically been managed as a target stock complex with annual harvest specifications due to high levels of incidental catch, mainly in the fisheries for walleye pollock. In June 2017, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) took final action to amend the fishery management plans (FMPs) for the BSAI (Amendment 117) and Gulf of Alaska (GOA; Amendment 106) regions and move the squid stock complex into the Ecosystem Component category. The rationales for this decision included (1) the lack of a directed fishery for squids in the BSAI or GOA, (2) there is little risk of overfishing in the absence of a directed fishery because squids are highly productive, and (3) current incidental fishing mortality is considered insignificant at a population level.

The FMP amendments were implemented in the Federal Register on July 6, 2018 with an effective date of August 8, 2018 (Federal Register, Volume 83, Number 130, July 6 2018, pages 31460-31470. 50 CFR 679, docket # 170714670-8561-02. https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2018-14457). Briefly, the amendments accomplish the following:

- Place squids in the Ecosystem Component category of the FMP
- Prohibit directed fishing for squid
- Establish a 20% maximum retention allowance (MRA)
- Retain recordkeeping and recording requirements
- The original amendment limited processing of squids to fishmeal production; in May 2021 NMFS issued a revision to the Part 679 rule that allows "the processing and sale of squids … as products other than fishmeal … to help prevent waste of the incidental catch of these species"

The new management regime was implemented in January 2019. Squid status and catch reporting now occurs in this document.

Arctic cod

Arctic cod is not currently included in the FMP for the BSAI. It is primarily a cold-water species with a northern distribution in the EBS, generally captured in bottom trawl surveys north of 59°N latitude. In the Alaskan Arctic it is likely the dominant prey species, and the Arctic FMP prohibits directed fishing for Arctic cod due to ecosystem concerns. As fish distributions and fishing locations shift, conservation measures for Arctic cod in the BSAI may become necessary. Further information is available at http://www.npfmc.org/arctic-fishery-management/.

Trends in abundance and spatial distribution

Data sources

There are a number of research surveys conducted on a regular basis in the BSAI, but none are optimized for sampling forage fishes. The main drawbacks are that the sampled areas do not correspond to forage fish distributions (e.g., bottom trawls do not effectively sample pelagic species) and that attributes of the sampling gears (e.g., net mesh size) are not suitable for small fishes. As a result, estimating abundance and analyzing trends and patterns in abundance and spatial distributions is difficult. Therefore results from individual surveys (i.e., years) are less important than longer-term trends.

For most of the species in this section, data are from bottom trawl surveys conducted by the AFSC on the EBS shelf (annual), the EBS slope (biennial) and in the AI (biennial; methods and data at: http://www.afsc.noaa.gov/RACE/groundfish/default.php). The standardized EBS shelf survey began in 1982 but some work using similar gear was conducted prior to 1982; the EBS slope and AI surveys have occurred biennially since the early 2000s. These surveys are conducted from May to August. The survey was expanded to the north in 1987 and this report includes only data from 1987 on. In 2010, the AFSC began to conduct an additional survey to the north of the 1987 survey area, comprising all waters south of Bering Strait including Norton Sound. Due to the loss of seasonal sea ice and corresponding changes in fish distribution this northern survey is conducted regularly as of 2017 and those data are included at the end of this section.

This section also references information from surface trawl surveys conducted by the AFSC Ecosystem Monitoring and Assessment (EMA) program (Yasumiishi et al. 2017). This survey has been conducted every year since 2003, although the extent and density of stations sampled has varied among years. This survey regularly visits the northeastern Bering Sea (NBS), and this report is now the repository for NBS data regarding forage fish abundance rather than the Ecosystem Status Report (ESR) where it previously resided. The abundance index is a standardized geostatistical index (VAST) developed by Thorson et al. (2015) to estimate indices of abundance for stock assessments. The survey occurs primarily in September, with sampling during August and October in some years.

There is also a biennial acoustic survey for walleye pollock that covers the middle and outer domains of the EBS shelf. An index of euphausiid abundance and distribution has been created using the results of this survey (Ressler et al. 2012) and is included in the ESR (Ressler 2018). Acoustic surveys are effective at sampling capelin, but the EBS survey does not extend to the inner domain of the EBS shelf where the capelin population is centered. Pacific herring are assessed by ADFG, primarily using aerial surveys and test fishing; these data are included here where appropriate.

Spatial analysis of bottom trawl survey data was conducted within ArcGIS. Point data for each survey haul were either symbolized directly or aggregated into 20 km X 20 km cells with a mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) calculated for each cell using data from all years. To better understand variability in distributions, for some species standard deviational ellipses were created using geographic data weighted by CPUE (Lefever 1926; Gong 2002). Ellipses include all points within one standard deviation of the distribution's mean geographic center.

Spatial partitioning on the EBS shelf

The cross-shelf distribution of forage fishes in the BSAI (i.e., nearshore vs. offshore) was investigated for the 2013 report (Ormseth 2013), and the results for the EBS shelf are repeated here. There appears to be strong cross-shelf partitioning among the six species/species groups studied (Figure 3). The mean CPUE of sandfish and sand lance was highest at bottom depths more shallow than 50 m, indicating a nearshore distribution in the inner domain of the EBS shelf. Capelin CPUE was also highest at bottom depths of approximately 50 m, but their distribution extended out to beyond 100 m. The distribution of herring was more variable, existing at a range of depths from 0 to more than 100 m. Eulachon were concentrated in hauls with 100-200 m bottom depth, with some catch over the EBS slope, while myctophids were found only on the slope. This type of segregation is similar to segregation observed among capelin and juvenile pollock (Hollowed et al. 2012). Habitat preferences and competitive interactions are both likely to influence these distributions. For example, sandfish and sand lance both depend on sandy substrates for burrowing. Myctophids have a mesopelagic distribution, so are unlikely to be found on the shelf. Spatial partitioning among capelin and juvenile pollock in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) is thought to be due to competition between the species (Logerwell et al. 2007).

Capelin

Capelin are distributed primarily in the inner domain of the EBS shelf (Figure 4). The pattern of CPUE varies substantially between the surface and bottom trawl surveys, with catches in the EMA survey occurring further north than in the EBS trawl survey (Yasumiishi et al. 2017). The reason for these differences is not clear. Capelin occupy different parts of the water column depending on environmental factors such as light levels and prey availability. Surveys in the GOA using identical surface trawl gear have occasionally caught capelin, but simultaneous acoustic surveying on the same vessel indicates that capelin are often below the trawl’s footrope (Dave McGowan, UW, pers. comm.). The contrast between the surveys may also arise from differences in survey timing: the EMA survey occurs in late summer after the trawl surveys have been completed. In the bottom trawl survey, biomass estimates are variable for the reasons described above but there also appear to be decadal signals in abundance (Table 1; Figures 5, 6, and 7). The greater abundance of capelin observed during 2010-2015 has now reversed itself; the 2018-2021 biomass estimates and frequency of occurrence (FO) are by far the lowest in the time series and it seem that capelin have largely disappeared from the system.

Eulachon

In contrast to capelin, eulachon dynamics in the BSAI appear to be fairly simple. Eulachon tend to occur deeper in the water column and are more likely to be associated with the bottom. As a result the bottom trawl surveys sample eulachon more effectively than other forage species, and eulachon are essentially absent from the EMA surface trawls. Eulachon are consistently distributed in the extreme southern portion of the outer EBS shelf (Figure 8).

Decadal signals also appear in survey biomass estimates for eulachon (Figures 9 and 10). Biomass estimates were mainly above the mean until the mid-2000s, fluctuated around the mean for a decade, and since 2014 have been consistently below the mean. Decadal variation in eulachon abundance also occurs in the GOA (Ormseth 2014).

Rainbow smelt

Rainbow smelt are rare in the bottom trawl survey (Table 1), so the EMA survey is the primary source of information for this osmerid. These data are included here because no rainbow smelt information is presented in the Ecosystem Considerations report. Data from EMA surveys indicate that the highest abundance of rainbow smelt is in the northeastern Bering Sea and particularly Norton Sound (Figure 11). Rainbow smelt are often found in shallow nearshore waters, so this apparent distribution may not be fully representative. For example, nearshore studies in northern Bristol Bay (Nushagak and Togiak bays) captured large number of rainbow smelt in multiple size classes (Ormseth, unpublished data).

Ammodytidae: Pacific sand lance

Sand lances are extremely difficult to sample due to their patchiness and behavior, which entails spending much of their time burrowed into sand. As a result, information for Pacific sand lance in the BSAI is extremely limited. The bottom trawl survey suggests that they have a primarily inshore distribution in the EBS, particularly in areas such as Bristol Bay with extensive sandy bottom substrates (Figure 12). They also occur in the AI, particularly in the islands west of Amchitka Pass (Figure 13). Despite the difficulty of sampling them, after myctophids, they are the most commonly observed member of the FMP forage group in the AI bottom trawl survey.

Trichodontidae: Pacific sandfish

Similar to sand lance, sandfishes burrow into sandy substrates. This is reflected in their distribution which is centered in the shallow inshore waters of the EBS, in Bristol Bay and along the northern shore of the Alaska Peninsula (Figure 14). The EMA surveys suggest a similar distribution (Yasumiishi et al. 2017). Unlike most of the other forage species, neither survey has found them north of Cape Romanzof (61°47’ N), so this is likely the northern extent of their range. This is confirmed by historical reports (Mecklenburg et al. 2002).

Myctophidae (lanternfishes)

Myctophids are generally deep-water fishes (> 200 m depth), although diel migrations can bring them into surface waters. This is consistent with their distribution observed in BSAI survey data, where they occur on the EBS slope (Figure 15) and along the shelf break and slope in the AI (Figure 16).

Euphausiacea

The AFSC’s Midwater Assessment and Conservation Engineering (MACE) program has recently developed the ability to discriminate between acoustic backscatter associated with fish versus backscatter from euphausiids. They have applied this methodology to acoustic data from acoustic trawl surveys conducted on the outer EBS shelf and have produced information regarding distribution and abundance of euphausiids since 2004 (Ressler et al. 2012). These results suggest that the distribution of euphausiids is variable but that the largest biomass is consistently found in the southeastern Bering Sea. The index suggests that euphausiid abundance has declined during the last decade (Ressler 2018).

Stichaeidae (pricklebacks), Pholidae (gunnels), Bathylagidae (blacksmelts), Gonostomatidae (bristlemouths)

These species occur rarely in the AFSC surveys, either due to their small size or their preference for unsurveyed habitats (e.g. nearshore areas or deep pelagic waters). No information exists regarding their abundance, and information regarding distribution is not presented in this report.

Pacific herring

The spatial distribution of herring in the BSAI described by the bottom trawl survey and the EMA survey vary substantially and may result from seasonal herring movement. Herring spawn in nearshore areas in the spring, then migrate to overwintering areas on the outer EBS shelf (Figure 3; Tojo et al. 2007). Older studies suggest that this is primarily a clockwise migration along the southern edge of the EBS ending at a single overwintering area north of the Pribilof Islands (Barton and Wespestad 1980). A more recent analysis suggests a more complex series of movements, with an additional overwintering ground in the southern EBS and multiple migration routes (Figure 2; Tojo et al. 2007). The routes used in any one year may depend on environmental factors, particularly temperature. The bottom trawl survey occurs primarily in June and July and is likely capturing herring that are out-migrating from nearshore spawning areas; the areas of high CPUEs on the southern edge of the EBS and around Nunivak Island (Figure 17) are consistent with the movement patterns in Figure 2. The EMA survey is conducted primarily during September, and by this time herring may have moved out of the sampling area in the southeastern Bering Sea and are no longer available to the survey. The high CPUEs observed in the EMA survey in the northeastern Bering Sea, particularly in Norton Sound (Yasumiishi et al. 2017), are harder to explain. It is possible that those herring belong to the Norton Sound stock, which is the second-largest in the BSAI, but it is unclear whether they are migrating or have a different overwintering strategy.

Herring biomass estimates and FO display high interannual variability with less of a decadal signal than other forage species (Figures 18 and 19). Biomass estimates were above the mean since 2017 (Figure 19).

Forage species in the northern Bering Sea

Four major forage species are encountered in the northern Bering Sea bottom trawl survey: capelin, rainbow smelt, Pacific herring, and Arctic cod (Figures 7 & 20). These species display very different abundance trends over the short time series (biomass estimates exist only for 2010, 2017, 2019, and 2021). Estimates for capelin and Arctic cod (Figure 21) have dropped precipitously from 2010 while Pacific herring and rainbow smelt (Figures 7 & 21) estimates have increased. These conclusions should be treated with caution as they are highly influenced by the 2010 data and the data do not exist to indicate what an average level of abundance might be for these species.

Bycatch and other conservation issues

FMP forage group

Data regarding incidental catches of this group are available since 2003 and are maintained by the Alaska Regional Office (AKRO; Table 2). Osmerids is the only species group that is caught incidentally in appreciable numbers, with the exception of substantial myctophid catches in 2006 & 2007. The years 2006 & 2007 were also years of exceptionally high osmerid catches. Eulachon and myctophids are both abundant in the Bering Canyon area, so the high catches in those areas may have resulted from a change in fishing activity by the pollock fishery.

Prior to 2005, osmerid species identification by observers was unreliable and many catches were recorded as “other osmerid”. While identification has improved since then, osmerids in catches are often too damaged for accurate identification and much of the catch is still reported as “other osmerid”. Eulachon are the most abundant osmerid in catches and it is likely that they make up the majority of the “other osmerid” catch. For this analysis, all osmerid categories in the AKRO database (eulachon, capelin, surf smelt, “other osmerid”) were combined into a single “osmerids” group.

The osmerid bycatch primarily occurs in two trawl fisheries: walleye pollock and yellowfin sole (Table 3). Catches are generally greater in the pollock fishery, but in some years (e.g., 2008, 2012, 2016) the yellowfin sole fishery catches are higher. During 2008-2021, total osmerid catch varied between 2.3 t and 34.6 t. In 2006 and 2007, however, catches were an order of magnitude higher (103.4 and 181.3 t, respectively) with most of the additional catch occurring in the pollock fishery. A similar pattern is observed in the Gulf of Alaska, where a background level of eulachon bycatch is periodically interrupted by very high bycatch levels in midwater fisheries (Ormseth 2014). The 2019 BSAI catch of osmerids as of October 31 was 22.0 t (Table 2). In 2006 & 2007 most of the osmerid catches occurred in February (Figure 23), with some additional catches in October, so it is unclear how much the total catch will increase during the rest of 2019.

The spatial concentration of eulachon bycatch corresponds to their distribution in the bottom trawl survey and the location of the fisheries in which they are caught. Most catches occur in areas 517 and 519 in the southeastern EBS (Table 4; Figures 24 & 25). Additional catch occurs in some years in area 514 in the northern part of the inner shelf, an area of intensive fishing for yellowfin sole.

Squids

The reclassification of squids as Ecosystem Components, for which catch limits are not required, has resulted in substantially increased squid catches in the EBS (Tables 5 & 6; Figures 26 & 27). Squid catches occur mainly in the pollock fishery and typically increase with the onset of the summer fishing season (Figure 26). Before squid were reclassified, squid bycatch incentivized the pollock fishery to voluntarily create spatial closures to reduce squid bycatch and maintain squid catches below the OFL. Because that constraint is now removed, squid catches continue to accumulate during July-September and result in annual squid catches similar to those observed during the foreign-era fisheries in the 1970s and 1980s.

Pacific herring

Data regarding the Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) of herring are available since 1991 and are maintained by the AKRO (Table 7 & Figures 28-30). During the 1990s herring bycatch was consistently high, but from 2000-2011 catches were relatively low. In 2012 the herring PSC was 2,376 t, an order of magnitude higher than catches in preceding years, and the PSC quota was exceeded. In 2020, herring bycatch in the pollock fishery exceeded the limit; this event was covered in detail in the 2020 ESR. As of October 17, 2021 the 2021 herring bycatch was high but below the limit.

Data regarding the size of herring captured in federal fisheries are sparse and could only be located for the years 2000-2007. There is substantial annual variability, but most captured herring were between 24 cm and 32 cm. In 2010, the average size for Togiak herring aged 5, 7, and 9 was 25, 29, and 31 cm, respectively (Buck 2012). In 2010, herring between the ages of 5 and made up most of the Togiak harvest (72.3%), while age 6 herring was the most abundant age class harvested (Buck 2012). The harvest in other years is comprised of similar age ranges (Elison et al 2015), so herring bycatch in the federal fishery appears to consist mainly of potential spawners.

Pandalid shrimps

Bycatch of pandalid shrimps ranged between 0.98 t and 4.12 t before 2020 (Table 7); in 2020 and 2021 catches have exceeded 4.1 t. Shrimps in observed hauls are not identified to species, and shrimp populations are poorly understood. The federal bycatch is much smaller than the commercial shrimp harvest in state and federal waters, which was approximately 230 t in 2016 (ADF&G Commercial Operator's Annual Reports; http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fishlicense.coar_shrimpproduction)

Data gaps and research priorities

Information regarding BSAI forage fishes is very limited, so any increase in research activity would be beneficial. Areas of particular interest are:

1) Absolute abundance of capelin, eulachon, and rainbow smelt: In the GOA, the summer acoustic survey provides a reasonable estimate of capelin abundance. Unfortunately the corresponding survey in the EBS occurs outside of the main capelin distribution. Acoustic data collected during the EMA survey may provide useful information. Estimates exist from the ecosystem models but these are highly uncertain.

2) Spawning areas of BSAI eulachon: Eulachon spawning runs have been researched in the GOA but are not well known in the BSAI. Information on where eulachon spawn would be very useful for understanding whether there are connections among eulachon populations in the EBS and other areas.

3) Stock structure of federally captured herring: Genetic studies to determine population structure, similar to those conducted for BSAI chinook and chum salmon, could be conducted and should include a comparison of the genetic composition of herring on overwintering grounds versus those on the spawning grounds to evaluate if there is mixing during non-spawning months and homing for spawning, leading to stock structure.

4) Enhanced knowledge regarding seasonal migrations of herring: What is the reason for the high EMA survey CPUE in Norton Sound during September? A possible approach would be to use recent observer estimates of herring catches in the groundfish trawl fishery to continue the analysis of Tojo et al. (2007) and explore the seasonal migration of herring in relation to variability in climate and oceanographic conditions.

5) Enhanced knowledge of survey selectivity and catchability for capelin, eulachon, etc.; knowledge of the effectiveness of the surveys at sampling forage species would allow us to make the most accurate calculations using the existing survey data.

6) Continued studies of how climate variability influences the abundance, distribution, and energy content and catch of forage species in the BSAI.

Acknowledgments

A very big thank you to all the survey personnel for gathering the various data.

Literature Cited

Barton LH and VG Wespestad (1980) Distribution, biology, and stock assessment of western Alaska's herring stocks. *In* Proceedings of the Alaska Herring Symposium. Alaska Sea Grant College Program Report 80-4. Alaska Sea Grant, Fairbanks, AK. pp 27-53

Buck GB (2012) Abundance, age, sex, and size statistics for Pacific herring in Togiak District of Bristol Bay, 2010. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Data Series No. 12-19, Anchorage.

Elison T, P Salomone, T Sands, M Jones, C Brazil, GB Buck, F West, T Krieg, T Lemons (2015) 2014 Bristol Bay area annual management report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Management Report No. 15-24, Anchorage.

Gong J (2002) Clarifying the standard deviational ellipse. *Geographical Analysis* 34: 155-167

Hollowed AB, SJ Barbeaux, ED Cokelet, E Farley, S Kotwicki, PH Ressler, C Spital, CD Wilson (2012) Effects of climate variations on pelagic ocean habitats and their role in structuring forage fish distributions in the Bering Sea. *Deep-Sea Research II* 65-70: 230-250

Lefever DW (1926) Measuring geographic concentration by means of the standard deviational ellipse. *American Journal of Sociology* 32: 88-94

Logerwell EA, PJ Stabeno, CD Wilson, AB Hollowed (2007) The effect of oceanographic variability and interspecific competition on juvenile pollock (*Theragra chalcogramma*) and capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) distributions on the Gulf of Alaska shelf. *Deep Sea Research Part II* 54: 2849-2868

Mecklenburg CW, TA Mecklenburg, LK Thorsteinson (2002) Fishes of Alaska. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD

Ormseth OA (2013) Appendix2. Preliminary assessment of forage species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. *In* Plan Team for Groundfish Fisheries of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (compiler), Stock assessment and fishery evaluation report for the groundfish resources of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. p. 1029-1063. North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 W. 4th Avenue Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501.

Ormseth OA (2014) Appendix 2. Forage species report for the Gulf of Alaska. *In* Plan Team for Groundfish Fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska (compiler), Stock assessment and fishery evaluation report for the groundfish resources of the Gulf of Alaska, p. 1001-1039. North Pacific Fishery Management Council, 605 W. 4th Avenue Suite 306, Anchorage, AK 99501.

Ressler PH, A De Robertis, JD Warren, JN Smith, S Kotwicki (2012) Developing an acoustic survey of euphausiids to understand trophic interactions in the Bering Sea ecosystem. *Deep-Sea Research II* 65-70: 184-195

Ressler PH (2018) Eastern Bering Sea euphausiids ('Krill'). Ecosystem Considerations 2018: Status of the eastern Bering Sea marine ecosystem, pp. 98-102. (https://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/index)

Thorson, J.T., A.O. Shelton, E.J. Ward, and H.J. Skaug. 2015. Geostatistical delta-generalized linear mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices for West Coast groundfishes. ICES Journal of Marine Science 72(5):1297-1310. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsu243

Tojo N, GH Kruse, FC Funk (2007) Migration dynamics of Pacific herring (Clupea pallasii) and response to spring environmental variability in the southeastern Bering Sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II* 54: 2832-2848

Yasumiishi E, K Cieciel, A Andrews, E Siddon (2017) Spatial and temporal trends in the abundance and distribution of forage fish in pelagic waters of the eastern Bering Sea during late summer, 2002-2016. Ecosystem Considerations 2017: Status of the eastern Bering Sea marine ecosystem, pp. 111-116. (https://access.afsc.noaa.gov/reem/ecoweb/index)

Table 1. Biomass estimates (t) and frequency of occurrence (FO) for selected forage species in the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. CV= coefficient of variation. No trawl survey was conducted in 2020 due to the coronavirus pandemic.

	Pacific herring			eulachon			capelin			rainbow smelt		
	biomass	CV	FO	biomass	CV	FO	biomass	CV	FO	biomass	CV	FO
1987	9,565	0.35	12%	1,816	0.28	8%	961	0.24	18%	8	1.00	0%
1988	150,345	0.87	27%	1,717	0.44	5%	3,094	0.14	31%	1,196	0.52	3%
1989	7,832	0.44	17%	1,208	0.44	6%	595	0.17	17%	0	0.00	0%
1990	4,290	0.22	18%	2,137	0.34	7%	4,476	0.32	30%	7	1.00	0%
1991	33,263	0.49	17%	6,289	0.30	6%	1,851	0.17	33%	1,757	0.61	6%
1992	9,190	0.43	12%	2,975	0.40	8%	5,450	0.20	31%	282	0.63	1%
1993	143,913	0.57	23%	2,302	0.53	5%	23,631	0.64	31%	138	0.70	1%
1994	35,049	0.45	32%	5,025	0.46	11%	1,753	0.13	31%	94	0.73	1%
1995	54,421	0.52	35%	4,641	0.30	10%	2,891	0.61	26%	108	0.67	1%
1996	24,246	0.28	14%	3,652	0.47	10%	366	0.14	14%	564	0.48	2%
1997	36,014	0.41	18%	6,987	0.32	10%	1,527	0.45	13%	471	0.87	1%
1998	15,670	0.33	21%	4,415	0.29	15%	413	0.14	15%	447	0.83	2%
1999	22,979	0.33	43%	1,795	0.22	10%	1,747	0.14	37%	4	0.89	1%
2000	31,792	0.56	23%	4,159	0.19	12%	2,220	0.31	26%	6	0.71	1%
2001	49,189	0.72	24%	3,978	0.21	17%	1,427	0.13	25%	6	1.00	0%
2002	12,308	0.30	15%	4,502	0.31	12%	1,245	0.14	30%	0	0.00	0%
2003	49,624	0.40	26%	2,368	0.28	10%	2,790	0.49	36%	3	1.00	0%
2004	90,313	0.20	45%	2,933	0.56	10%	5,814	0.21	39%	686	0.77	1%
2005	120,633	0.20	44%	1,626	0.27	10%	590	0.31	18%	0	0.00	0%
2006	28,276	0.20	43%	1,967	0.32	10%	2,604	0.12	38%	0	0.99	0%
2007	27,846	0.30	31%	3,867	0.24	13%	456	0.26	19%	188	0.64	1%
2008	81,816	0.63	36%	392	0.21	10%	1,717	0.10	41%	11	1.00	0%
2009	2,440	0.24	20%	1,043	0.28	7%	1,927	0.21	44%	1	1.00	0%
2010	34,197	0.76	13%	4,624	0.28	9%	5,316	0.26	42%	1	1.00	0%
2011	16,458	0.43	19%	4,856	0.44	10%	6,608	0.25	37%	3	1.00	0%
2012	168,947	0.34	35%	900	0.36	8%	8,376	0.20	44%	2	1.00	0%
2013	107,083	0.23	24%	1,116	0.23	9%	9,522	0.56	36%	0	0.00	0%
2014	8,743	0.49	10%	4,831	0.37	10%	5,062	0.61	24%	1,089	0.52	3%
2015	21,526	0.23	31%	1,548	0.23	10%	7,922	0.29	43%	228	0.69	1%
2016	12,573	0.25	23%	1,618	0.30	10%	2,147	0.34	28%	198	0.73	2%
2017	58,710	0.28	39%	531	0.26	6%	837	0.68	14%	596	0.46	4%
2018	101,314	0.24	25%	592	0.26	9%	74	0.17	12%	62	0.62	1%
2019	76,743	0.33	19%	1,757	0.24	15%	122	0.24	11%	77	0.73	1%
2021	67,457	0.22	44%	510	0.44	4%	47	0.26	6%	215	0.62	3%

Table 2. Bycatch (t) of FMP forage fish groups in BSAI federal fisheries, 2003-2021. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
eulachon	2.5	20.2	9.4	94.0	106.0	2.5	5.4	0.4	1.8	1.3
capelin	0.01	5.4	0.4	2.6	1.2	0.2	0.6	0.8	4.1	2.4
surf smelt	-	-	-	-	0.563	0.001	-	-	-	-
other osmerids	16.2	7.0	4.7	6.8	73.5	12.4	1.1	2.9	2.6	4.9
total osmerids	18.8	32.6	14.5	103.4	181.3	15.1	7.0	4.2	8.6	8.5
Pacific sand lance	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.2
myctophids	0.3	0.1	0.6	9.6	5.8	1.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.05
Pacific sandfish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03	0.05	0.01
pricklebacks	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3
gunnels	-	0.003	0.012	-	0.002	0.000	-	-	0.031	0.000
deep sea smelts	0.000	0.000	-	0.001	0.004	-	-	-	-	-
bristlemouths	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
total FMP forage fish	**19.4**	**33.1**	**15.6**	**113.3**	**188.0**	**17.0**	**7.7**	**4.7**	**9.8**	**9.2**

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	*2021**
eulachon	0.7	2.1	22.3	7.8	3.2	0.8	0.1	1.2	*0.1*
capelin	0.2	1.3	6.8	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.1	*0.1*
surf smelt	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	-	-
other osmerids	1.2	9.6	7.6	6.1	4.2	1.4	22.1	8.4	*1.3*
total osmerids	2.1	13.0	36.7	14.4	7.6	2.3	22.6	9.7	*1.4*
Pacific sand lance	0.1	0.2	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.6	1.7	0.4	*0.2*
myctophids	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	*0.6*
Pacific sandfish	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	1.3	*0.2*
pricklebacks	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	*0.2*
gunnels	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	-	0.0	0.01	*0.02*
deep sea smelts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
bristlemouths	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	-	-
total FMP forage fish	**2.9**	**14.6**	**39.2**	**16.6**	**8.5**	**3.8**	**24.6**	**11.63**	***2.67***

Table 3. Total bycatch (t) of osmerids (eulachon, capelin, surf smelt, and “other osmerids”) in the BSAI by target fishery, 2003-2021. Fisheries with less than 0.1 t of catch in most years are combined into the “miscellaneous fisheries” group. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	pollock	yellowfin sole	rock sole	Pacific cod	flathead sole	arrow-tooth flounder	misc fisheries	total
2003	10.01	4.26	3.73	0.17	0.25	0.34	0.02	18.78
2004	21.57	9.03	0.52	0.65	0.26	0.57	0.01	32.62
2005	12.93	0.58	0.75	0.04	0.18	0.05	0.03	14.55
2006	102.01	0.86	0.27	0.22	0.07	0.01	0.00	103.43
2007	139.90	41.17	0.19	0.00	0.01		0.00	181.27
2008	4.41	10.02	0.65	0.00	0.02		0.00	15.11
2009	5.64	1.19	0.13	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	6.98
2010	0.61	3.67	0.16	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	4.46
2011	1.76	6.46	0.54	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.01	8.85
2012	1.64	7.14	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	8.89
2013	0.67	1.22	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.01	0.01	2.12
2014	1.68	11.12	0.15	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.00	13.03
2015	24.09	6.85	5.69	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.02	36.71
2016	5.37	8.31	0.62		0.05	0.04	0.00	14.39
2017	3.27	2.90	1.41	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	7.60
2018	0.87	0.51	0.86		0.01		0.03	2.27
2019	0.90	13.18	8.25	0.04	0.14	0.02	0.04	22.58
2020	1.31	4.73	3.29		0.01	0.23	0.10	9.68
*2021**	*0.10*	*1.25*	*0.00*		*0.05*		*0.01*	*1.42*

Table 4. Total bycatch (t) of osmerids (eulachon, capelin, surf smelt, and "other osmerids) in the BSAI by NMFS statistical area, 2003-2021. Areas with less than 0.1 t of catch in most years are combined into the "all others" group. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	517	514	519	513	509	521	516	all others	total
2003	7.39	7.35	0.20	3.67	0.07	0.09	0.00	0.01	18.78
2004	22.09	8.94	0.20	0.92	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.12	32.62
2005	12.30	1.25	0.09	0.26	0.31	0.13	0.00	0.21	14.55
2006	65.88	0.98	35.52	0.48	0.30	0.10	0.00	0.17	103.43
2007	96.16	41.21	41.36	1.43	0.78	0.12	0.00	0.21	181.27
2008	2.05	10.49	1.32	0.06	0.48	0.68	0.00	0.03	15.11
2009	1.37	1.07	4.25	0.04	0.22	0.04	0.00	0.00	6.98
2010	0.48	3.42	0.09	0.24	0.21	0.01		0.01	4.46
2011	0.96	5.56	0.01	1.31	0.99	0.01	0.00	0.00	8.85
2012	1.56	6.61	0.04	0.09	0.55	0.01	0.01	0.00	8.89
2013	0.67	1.13	0.00	0.04	0.21	0.05	0.00	0.02	2.12
2014	1.45	10.89	0.02	0.20	0.32	0.04	0.11	0.00	13.03
2015	12.70	12.54	10.80	0.59	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00	36.71
2016	1.71	8.75	3.57	0.31	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00	14.39
2017	1.61	4.14	1.66	0.03	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.60
2018	0.14	1.36	0.70	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00	2.27
2019	0.56	18.03	0.01	0.39	3.06	0.02	0.46	0.04	22.58
2020	1.47	4.46	0.03	0.59	2.99	0.02	0.01	0.10	9.68
*2021**	*0.12*	*1.24*	*0.00*	*0.03*	*0.01*	*0.00*	*0.00*	*0.01*	*1.42*

Table 5. Incidental catches (t) of squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region by NMFS statistical area, 2003-2021. The “all others” category includes those areas with < 1 t of annual catch. Data are from the Alaska Regional Office Catch Accounting System. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	517	519	521	541	523	509	518	543	542	524	all others	total
2003	746	484	12	9	0	2	0	17	10	0	2	1,282
2004	587	398	5	4	0	7		3	7	0	2	1,014
2005	539	527	95	3	3	5		12	2	0	0	1,186
2006	965	261	15	2	0	162	0	7	6	0	1	1,418
2007	690	419	26	2		13		8	3	15	12	1,188
2008	1,066	344	25	25	1	25	23	18	6	0	9	1,542
2009	143	74	9	66	0	1	40	20	5	0	2	360
2010	133	145	5	90	1	5	17	11	4	0	0	410
2011	119	52	17	75	3	3	30	16	8	12	1	336
2012	308	187	20	114	0	16	17	8	6	9	2	688
2013	63	41	33	107	1	5	2	30	5	11	1	299
2014	938	548	13	76	3	19	43	21	13	5	0	1,678
2015	1,495	580	59	32	94	9	42	40	12	2	1	2,364
2016	891	180	49	25	83	3	25	16	9	3	1	1,286
2017	1,331	265	170	24	149	8	18	14	5	11	1	1,996
2018	893	577	185	21	26	12	1	8	6	5	1	1,736
2019	3,775	970	709	34	214	26	3	3	6	189	3,775	5,930
2020	2,766	1,086	519	81	270	49	17	7	8	1,611	2,766	6,415
*2021**	*3,026*	*624*	*122*	*173*	*16*	*59*	*15*	*14*	*12*	*12*	*3,026*	*4,075*

Table 6. Incidental catches (t) of squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region by target fishery, 2003-2021. Data are from the Alaska Regional Office Catch Accounting System. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	pollock	arrowtooth	rockfish	Kamchatka	Atka	misc fisheries	total
2003	1,226	6.5	12.5		20.6	16.5	1,282
2004	977	6.3	6.4		7.2	17.6	1,014
2005	1,150	10.1	7.1		9.0	10.3	1,186
2006	1,399	4.1	5.9		8.6	1.2	1,418
2007	1,169	2.5	8.4		5.2	3.5	1,188
2008	1,452	46.3	24.7		12.2	7.0	1,542
2009	209	96.0	17.5		13.6	23.4	360
2010	277	103.7	12.0		15.9	1.5	410
2011	178	67.0	36.9	48.5	5.1	0.6	336
2012	495	59.8	32.5	76.3	22.8	0.7	688
2013	118	68.5	59.8	35.9	14.7	2.8	299
2014	1,478	69.0	55.6	41.9	30.8	2.2	1,678
2015	2,206	23.7	66.2	51.7	13.0	3.3	2,364
2016	1,164	29.7	25.7	21.9	16.3	28.0	1,286
2017	1,887	10.1	30.6	24.0	12.4	32.0	1,996
2018	1,645	3.1	49.6	6.0	6.0	26.6	1,736
2019	5,757	16.3	23.4	36.7	8.8	87.8	5,930
2020	6,179	43.4	56.4	82.7	8.5	45.1	6,415
*2021**	*3,790*	*31.4*	*60.2*	*146.6*	*14.8*	*32.4*	*4,075*

Table 7. Bycatch (t) of Pacific herring and pandalid shrimps in BSAI groundfish fisheries, 1991-2021. Data are from the Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) and nontarget catch databases, respectively, maintained by the NMFS Alaska Regional Office. *2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

	Pacific herring		**pandalid shrimp**
	groundfish fishery catch	**PSC limit**	
1991	3,761	834	-
1992	1,059	956	-
1993	784	2,122	-
1994	1,728	1,962	-
1995	970	1,861	-
1996	1,513	1,697	-
1997	1,298	1,579	-
1998	963	1,585	-
1999	895	1,685	-
2000	512	1,853	-
2001	270	1,526	-
2002	134	1,526	-
2003	962	1,525	0.98
2004	1,200	1,876	2.22
2005	676	2,013	1.74
2006	484	1,770	3.24
2007	417	1,787	2.08
2008	215	1,726	2.48
2009	88	1,697	2.63
2010	356	1,973	2.14
2011	397	2,273	4.12
2012	2,376	2,094	2.45
2013	988	2,648	4.01
2014	187	2,179	3.05
2015	1,529	2,742	2.22
2016	1,494	2,630	1.89
2017	1,021	2,013	1.68
2018	541	1,830	1.83
2019	1,182	2,547	2.74
2020	3,934	2,532	4.25
2021*	*1,877*	2,723	*4.45*



Figure 1. Locations of Pacific herring fisheries in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands region (yellow dots) and Herring Savings Areas (red-outlined polygons). The two largest herring fisheries are labeled by name; the larger dot at Togiak indicates that this is by far the biggest fishery.



Figure 2. Hypothesized migration routes and seasonal distributions of Pacific herring in the eastern Bering Sea. Figure is from Tojo et al. 2007.



Figure 3. Mean bottom trawl survey catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; number/hec) versus bottom depth (m) of haul for six forage groups in the eastern Bering Sea. Red reference lines represent the 100 m and 200 m depth contours.



Figure 4. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/hec) of **capelin** in AFSC bottom trawl surveys in 2010 (top panel) and 2019 (bottom panel).



Figure 5. Biomass estimates (t) and frequency of occurrence (FO) for **capelin** in the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. The confidence intervals are omitted for clarity; please see Table 1 for information regarding uncertainty.



Figure 6. Natural log (ln) of **capelin** biomass estimates from the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. Plot includes the mean ln (biomass) over the entire time series; dashed lines indicate 1 and 2 standard deviations (S.D.) from the mean. Horizontal axis does not cross at 0.



Figure 7. Relative biomass estimates from surface-trawl surveys in the northern Bering Sea region. Data are outputs of a VAST model applied to the survey catch data. “Forage fish” is an aggregate of all the other species displayed.



Figure 8. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; number/km^2) of **eulachon** in NMFS Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands (BSAI) bottom trawl surveys, 2006-2017. Oval indicates weighted standard deviational ellipse, which includes all points within one standard deviation of the distribution's mean geographic center.



Figure 9. Biomass estimates (t) and frequency of occurrence for **eulachon** in the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. The confidence intervals are omitted for clarity; please see Table 1 for information regarding uncertainty.



Figure 10. Natural log (ln) of **eulachon** biomass estimates from the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. Plot includes the mean ln (biomass) over the entire time series; dashed lines indicate 1 and 2 standard deviations (S.D.) from the mean. Horizontal axis does not cross at 0.



Figure 11. Mean catch (in numbers) of rainbow smelt in surface-trawl surveys conducted by the Ecosystem Monitoring and Assessment program in the eastern Bering Sea, 2002-2011. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km. Blue box indicates approximate extent of survey hauls over the entire time period.



Figure 12. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/km[2]) of Pacific sand lance in the NMFS eastern Bering Sea shelf survey, 2000-2017. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km.



Figure 13. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/km[2]) of Pacific sand lance in the NMFS Aleutian Islands bottom trawl survey, 2000-2016. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km.



Figure 14. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/km^2) of Pacific sandfish in the NMFS eastern Bering Sea bottom trawl survey, 2000-2017. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km.



Figure 15. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/km^2) of myctophids in the NMFS eastern Bering Sea shelf and slope bottom trawl surveys, 2000-2017. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km.



Figure 16. Mean bottom trawl survey catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/km^2) of myctophids in the NMFS Aleutian Islands bottom trawl survey, 2000-2016. Grid cells are 20 km X 20 km.



Figure 17. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/hec) of **Pacific herring** in AFSC bottom trawl surveys in 2010 (top panel) and 2019 (bottom panel).



Figure 18. Biomass estimates (t) and frequency of occurrence for **Pacific herring** in the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. The confidence intervals are omitted for clarity; please see Table 1 for information regarding uncertainty.



Figure 19. Natural log (ln) of **Pacific herring** biomass estimates from the eastern Bering Sea shelf bottom trawl survey, 1987-2021. Plot includes the mean ln (biomass) over the entire time series; dashed lines indicate 1 and 2 standard deviations (S.D.) from the mean. Horizontal axis does not cross at 0.



Figure 20. Biomass estimates (t; solid lines) and frequency of occurrence (dashed lines) for the four most abundant forage fishes in the northern Bering Sea bottom trawl survey, 2010-2021. Error bars indicate 95% confidence interval.



Figure 21. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/hec) of **Arctic cod** in AFSC bottom trawl surveys in 2010 (top panel) and 2019 (bottom panel).





Figure 22. Mean catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE; kg/hec) of **rainbow smelt** in AFSC bottom trawl surveys in 2010 (top panel) and 2019 (bottom panel).



Figure 23. Seasonal pattern of observed eulachon catches (numbers) in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands region during 2006 & 2007.



Figure 24. Incidental catches (t) of all osmerids (eulachon, capelin, surf smelt, "other osmerids") in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands by NMFS statistical area, 2003-2021. The 2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021. Inset map shows the boundaries of the statistical areas.



Figure 25. Mean catches of eulachon in observed fishery hauls (number/haul) in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands (BSAI) during 2006 & 2007, when catches were particularly high.



Figure 26. Cumulative weekly catches of squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region, 2003-2021. Each line indicates a separate year; the three most recent years are labeled. The 2021 catch data are incomplete; retrieved October 17, 2021. Data are from the Alaska Regional Office Catch Accounting System.



Figure 27. Catches of squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region, 1977-2021. Fisheries responsible for catches are indicated by shading color; JV = foreign-US joint venture. The 2021 catch data are incomplete (retrieved October 17, 2021). Data from before 2003 are from the Alaska Regional Office (AKRO) foreign blend and blend databases; data from 2003-present are from the AKRO Catch Accounting System.



Figure 28. Catch (t) of Pacific herring in federally-managed groundfish fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, 1991-2021 (green columns). The annual limit on Prohibited Species Catch (PSC) of herring is indicated by a red line. Data are from the NMFS Alaska Regional Office. 2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.



Figure 29. Annual spatial patterns of observed Pacific herring catches (t) in federally-managed groundfish fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, 2003-2021. Numbers on the horizontal axis refer to the NMFS statistical areas outlined in the inset map. Data are from the NMFS Alaska Regional Office. 2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.



Figure 30. Seasonal and annual patterns of observed Pacific herring catches (t) in federally-managed groundfish fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, 2003-2021. Data are from the NMFS Alaska Regional Office. 2021 data are incomplete; retrieved on October 17, 2021.

Appendix: List of scientific and common names of species contained within the "FMP forage fish" category. Data sources: BSAI FMP, "Fishes of Alaska" (Mecklenburg et al. 2002).

Scientific Name	**Common Name**
Family Osmeridae	smelts
Mallotus villosus	capelin
Hypomesus pretiosus	surf smelt
Osmerus mordax	rainbow smelt
Thaleichthys pacificus	eulachon
Spirinchus thaleichthys	longfin smelt
Spirinchus starksi	night smelt
Family Myctophidae	lanternfish
Protomyctophum thompsoni	bigeye lanternfish
Benthosema glaciale	glacier lanternfish
Tarletonbeania taylori	taillight lanternfish
Tarletonbeania crenularis	blue lanternfish
Diaphus theta	California headlightfish
Stenobrachius leucopsarus	northern lampfish
Stenobrachius nannochir	garnet lampfish
Lampanyctus jordani	brokenline lanternfish
Nannobrachium regale	pinpoint lampfish
Nannobrachium ritteri	broadfin lanternfish
Family Bathylagidae	blacksmelts
Leuroglossus schmidti	northern smoothtongue
Lipolagus ochotensis	popeye blacksmelt
Pseudobathylagus milleri	stout blacksmelt
Bathylagus pacificus	slender blacksmelt
Family Ammodytidae	sand lances
Ammodytes hexapterus	Arctic sand lance
Ammodytes personatus	Pacific sand lance
Family Trichodontidae	sandfish
Trichodon trichodon	Pacific sandfish
Arctoscopus japonicus	sailfin sandfish

Scientific Name	Common Name
Family Pholidae	gunnels
Apodichthys flavidus	penpoint gunnel
Rhodymenichthys dolichogaster	stippled gunnel
Pholis fasciata	banded gunnel
Pholis clemensi	longfin gunnel
Pholis laeta	crescent gunnel
Pholis schultzi	red gunnel
Family Stichaeidae	pricklebacks
Eumesogrammus praecisus	fourline snakeblenny
Stichaeus punctatus	arctic shanny
Gymnoclinus cristulatus	trident prickleback
Chirolophis tarsodes	matcheek warbonnet
Chirolophis nugatory	mosshead warbonnet
Chirolophis decoratus	decorated warbonnet
Chirolophis snyderi	bearded warbonnet
Bryozoichthys lysimus	nutcracker prickleback
Bryozoichthys majorius	pearly prickleback
Lumpenella longirostris	longsnout prickleback
Leptoclinus maculates	daubed shanny
Poroclinus rothrocki	whitebarred prickleback
Anisarchus medius	stout eelblenny
Lumpenus fabricii	slender eelblenny
Lumpenus sagitta	snake prickleback
Acantholumpenus mackayi	blackline prickleback
Opisthocentrus ocellatus	ocellated blenny
Alectridium aurantiacum	lesser prickleback
Alectrias alectrolophus	stone cockscomb
Anoplarchus purpurescens	high cockscomb
Anoplarchus insignis	slender cockscomb
Phytichthys chirus	ribbon prickleback
Xiphister mucosus	rock prickleback
Xiphister atropurpureus	black prickleback
Family Gonostomatidae	bristlemouths
Sigmops gracilis	slender fangjaw
Cyclothone alba	white bristlemouth
Cyclothone signata	showy bristlemouth
Cyclothone atraria	black bristlemouth
Cyclothone pseudopallida	phantom bristlemouth
Cyclothone pallida	tan bristlemouth
Order Euphausiacea	krill