
Re: Survey Indices

1 message

Ian Taylor - NOAA Federal <ian.taylor@noaa.gov>
To: Chantel Wetzel - NOAA Federal <Chantel.Wetzel@noaa.gov>
Cc: Edward Dick - NOAA Federal <edward.dick@noaa.gov>

Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 3:01 PM

Hi EJ,

I'm going to run some triennial indices for the Widow and Yelloweye updates, so it would be easy to add this one as a single time series. I'm not sure when I'll get those done but hopefully this week.

As Chantel notes, our west coast groundfish assessments have included a mix of blocks on Q, blocks on selectivity, or both, without a huge amount of clarity on the reasons for choosing one option vs the other. I think that if selectivity is changing you really should also estimate a block on Q because the effective Q-at-age or length is changing from the selectivity. Also some models put the indices as separate fleets and others use blocks. I think blocks are the better way to go for simplicity.

-Ian

On Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 1:53 PM Chantel Wetzel - NOAA Federal <Chantel.Wetzel@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi E.J.,

The last benchmark for chilipepper was before the decision to split the triennial survey due to changes in survey timing, so that does not surprise me. Additionally, the earlier years did not sample as far south but the coverage changed around 1989. Ian just made this [great figure](#) which shows some of the changes in timing and coverage by survey.

I have used the offset in Q approach for other assessments in SS3. It is relatively simple and you can also decide whether it is appropriate to have a block in selectivity as well. This is one approach for putting in as a single fleet, but effectively splits it in the model. If you thought the Triennial sampled in a way that the data would be informative for chilipepper and that the changes in coverage and timing would not impact the signals in the data, we could run a single time series index if you needed

Chantel Wetzel, PhD ([she/her](#))

Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
NOAA Fisheries | U.S. Department of Commerce
(206) 302-1753



On Tue, Feb 4, 2025 at 1:36 PM Edward Dick - NOAA Federal <edward.dick@noaa.gov> wrote:

Hi Chantel and Ian,

I noticed that the previous chilipepper assessment did not split the triennial survey into an 'early' and 'late' period, and regrettably did not define a 'blue' period, either. I received the two indices you sent, and am wondering if the 'mirror' option for catchability could be used to 'glue' the two parts together. Has anyone tried that, or would it be necessary to refit the data as a single index. I'm thinking about using the mirror function, or perhaps having an offset with a prior, to explore the effect of splitting the index on the assessment results.

Any thoughts would be greatly appreciated,

E.J.



On Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 4:49 PM Chantel Wetzel - NOAA Federal <Chantel.Wetzel@noaa.gov> wrote:
Hi E.J.,

For chilipepper, there are two folders for the WCGBT survey indices (wcbgts and wcbgts_ca_or). We were unable to get a model will passing diagnostics using coastwide data for the delta_lognormal error distribution. This is likely due to very few observations of chilipepper in Washington across the time series. We then reran both error distributions with the data subset to only cover California and Oregon. Both of these models ran successfully. If you have any questions or concerns about either approach please let us know.

Chantel Wetzel, PhD ([she/her](#))

Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
NOAA Fisheries | U.S. Department of Commerce
(206) 302-1753



NOAA
FISHERIES

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Chantel Wetzel - NOAA Federal** <Chantel.Wetzel@noaa.gov>

Date: Tue, Jan 28, 2025 at 4:44 PM

Subject: Survey Indices

To: Jason Cope - NOAA Federal <jason.cope@noaa.gov>, Kristin Marshall <kristin.marshall@noaa.gov>, E. J. Dick <edward.dick@noaa.gov>, Ian Taylor <ian.taylor@noaa.gov>, Claire Rosemond - NOAA Federal <claire.rosemond@noaa.gov>, Aaron Berger - NOAA Federal <aaron.berger@noaa.gov>, Vladlena Gertseva <vladlena.gertseva@noaa.gov>, owenowen.hamel@noaa.gov <Owen.Hamel@noaa.gov>, Kiva Oken - NOAA Federal <kiva.oken@noaa.gov>

Hellow assessors,

Ian, Claire, and I have completed the initial runs estimating indices for 2025 assessments. For benchmark assessments, all surveys with sufficient observations by species were run. For update assessments, only the WCGBT survey index was run, but if there is a reason to re-evaluate other surveys, we could do that as well.

All runs can be found on the network:

\\nwcfile\FRAM\Assessments\CurrentAssessments\your species name\data\indices

Additionally, there is a CSV file called "configuration_file_share" that provides information on the configuration of the sdmTMB model.

Please reach out to us if you have any questions,

Chantel Wetzel, PhD ([she/her](#))

Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
NOAA Fisheries | U.S. Department of Commerce
(206) 302-1753



NOAA
FISHERIES