

# Predicting blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) fisheries independent survey abundances and commercial landings in Charleston Harbor, South Carolina

## Abstract

Marked high fluctuations in blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) seasonal and annual abundance, and commercial landings are typical, but data from both fisheries independent and dependent surveys have shown declines in populations in recent years in South Carolina. Despite several long-term fisheries independent surveys encountering blue crab, predictive models have not recently been developed in South Carolina to quantify variation in abundance and commercial landings. The goal of this study is to assess the current status of blue crab in SC and explore the potential for developing a more predictive understanding of commercial landings. This goal is met through the following objectives: 1) assess long-term trends in blue crab landings and fisheries-independent abundance, 2) test the applicability of a juvenile index, where juvenile abundance in one year predicts adult abundance in a following year, 3) explore predictive relationships between fisheries-independent abundance and commercial landings. Data from several long-term South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) fisheries independent blue crab surveys were standardized for each of 6 surveys and commercial landings data were compiled. Long-term trends showed... Analyses testing the applicability of a juvenile index showed that the Creek Trawl survey was the only survey with significant, but weak, correlative relationships between multiple lagged population structure variables and its own annual abundance. Significant relationships were found with effort-corrected commercial landings predicted by the previous year's abundance of males crabs. This relationship was significant for immature crabs collected in the Harbor Trawl survey, and for mature crabs collected in the Creek Trawl survey. These results suggest effective population sampling, but a potential influence on abundance of blue crab from outside factors such as fishing, habitat or environmental variables.

## Methods

Data were put through a rigorous data wrangling process to standardize each survey relative to its methods. Fisheries dependent commercial landings and fisheries independent survey abundances were truncated from statewide data to Charleston Harbor watershed data.

Surveys cover a range of habitats.

**Table 1:** Methods - SCDNR fisheries independent survey methodology. This table sums up some of the differences in methodology from each of the survey. I think it covers a range of of different methodology variables (temporal, spatial, gear, standardization, sample numbers, etc.).

Survey	Gear		Sample			Data	
	Gear Method	Gear Type	Sample Area	Sample Interval	Sample Method	N(events)	CPUE Standardization
<b>CRMS</b>							
Creek Trawl	Active	6m Trawl, 2.54cm stretch mesh	Ashley River, Wando River	Monthly, May-Sep	Fixed Stations	1827	Time
Harbor Trawl	Active	4.6m Trawl, 0.6cm D mesh	Ashley River, Charleston Harbor	Monthly	Fixed Stations	2956	Time, Gear
Ashley Fall Potting	Passive	0.6 x 0.6 x 0.46m Pot, 3.8 cm mesh	Ashley River	Monthly, Oct-Nov	Randomized Block w/in a Fixed Station	128	Time
<b>ERS</b>							
SCECAP Tidal Creeks	Active	5m trawl, 1.9cm bar mesh	Charleston Harbor Systemwide	Jun - Aug	Random Stratified	62	Volumetric
SCECAP Open Water	Active	5m trawl, 1.9cm bar mesh	Charleston Harbor Systemwide	Jun - Aug	Random Stratified	92	Volumetric
<b>IFRS</b>							
Trammel Net	Passive	183 x 2.1m trammel net	Charleston Harbor Systemwide	Monthly	Random Stratified	4736	None (Total)

**Table 2:** Lifestage data for blue crab by SCDNR fisheries independent survey. It should be mentioned in the methods what type of lifestage data is available from these surveys. The “legal” category is pretty redundant. “Legal” = “Adult, and”Sublegal” = “Juvenile” + “Subadult”.

Survey	Total CPUE	Size			Legal (Size)		Class (Sex/Maturity)			
		Juvenile	Subadult	Adult	Legal	Sublegal	Immature Female	Mature Female	Immature Male	Mature Male
CRMS										
Creek Trawl	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Harbor Trawl	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ashley Fall Potting	X				X	X				
ERS										
SCECAP Tidal Creeks	X	X	X	X	X	X				
SCECAP Open Water	X	X	X	X	X	X				
IFRS										
Trammel Net	X									

## Objective 1

Assess long-term trends in blue crab landings and fisheries-independent abundance




Figure 1: Objective 1 - This plot shows the point that there is high annual variability in blue crab catches and a potential decline in population >2002. It also shows that It should be mentioned that statewide initial analyses of the data have indicated a sharp decline but that when corrected for effort, and post implementation of proper reporting, these data may not show the severe decline in populations that have been reported.




Figure 2: Objective 1 - ...although this plot does show a decline in some of the more robust surveys (A, B, E), with disagreement from another robust survey (F) that is not long-term (>2005). The same high annual variability in the commercial landings are found in the fish-independent surveys. This plot could suggest different resiliency (? wrong word), and/or different responses of the population in different habitats. I'd love to add some sort of size/sex time series plot in

## Methods

## Discussion

Commercial landings (fig. 1) and survey abundance (fig. 2) time series show the high annual variability of blue crab populations, but also may not agree totally on the decline in populations through the decade of the 2000's.

The total pounds landed in the combined Charleston Harbor watersheds shows a trending decline from 2003 - 2010, but when these same landings data are corrected for effort in terms of number of pots pulled that trend is not observed. The year 2003 marks the first year of "trip ticket" reporting, in which all commercial blue crab license holders are required to report their catch. This is the same time frame (>2003) the Ashley and Cooper Rivers are included in commercial landings, whether that is due to not being actively fished for blue crab, underreported, or included in another reporting area. Time series data from the abundance surveys (fig 2) show a more severe decline in surveys occurring in tidal creek areas (figs 2B and 2D) than in open water areas (figs 2A, 2C, 2E) with data from the SCDNR Trammel Net survey not showing a decline but no data available for comparison before 2006. This suggests influence of habitat or environmental conditions on blue crab populations in particular areas of the estuary.

Of note: for commercial landings (fig. 1), and the longer abundance surveys (figs 2A and 2B), variability is increased when CPUEs are above the long-term mean - could this indicate less 0-catch events and do we care?

## Objective 2

Test the ability of a juvenile index, where juvenile abundance in one year predicts adult abundance in a following year

**Table 3:** Objective 2 - These are all relevant explanatory variables. Only one survey has explanatory relationships. No juveniles from any survey predict abundances in later years. Maybe the subadults with a 2-yr. lag show that juveniles in this survey could be used with a 3-yr lag, or that the survey simply does not catch juveniles effectively, or juveniles are not populating sampled micro-habitats.

Dependent Variable	Explanatory Variable	Summary Statistics			
		p-value	r2	F-statistic	Degrees of Freedom
Total CPUE	Subadult (2-yr. lag)	0.001926	0.2432	11.250	35
Total CPUE	Mature Male (1-yr. lag)	0.002197	0.2321	10.880	36
Total CPUE	Immature Male (2-yr. lag)	0.004023	0.2131	9.481	35
Total CPUE	Sublegal (1-yr. lag)	0.004317	0.2102	9.316	35
Total CPUE	Total CPUE (2-yr lag)	0.004898	0.2050	9.024	35
Total CPUE	Subadult (1-yr. lag)	0.007774	0.1809	7.949	36
Total CPUE	Immature Female (2-yr. lag)	0.010380	0.1733	7.337	35
Total CPUE	Mature Female (2-yr lag)	0.019000	0.1473	6.048	35
Total CPUE	Total CPUE (1-yr lag)	0.019060	0.1434	6.027	36
Total CPUE	Sublegal (1-yr. lag)	0.025290	0.1314	5.448	36
Total CPUE	Mature Male (2-yr. lag)	0.030760	0.1265	5.067	35
Total CPUE	Adult (1-yr. lag)	0.031200	0.1225	5.028	36
Total CPUE	Legal (1-yr. lag)	0.031200	0.1225	5.028	36
Total CPUE	Immature Male (1-yr. lag)	0.048540	0.1038	4.169	36
Total CPUE	Immature Female (1-yr. lag)	0.050070	0.1025	4.111	36




Figure 3: Objective 2 - Shows the potential to predict, but poor correlation. Prediction by subadult with a 2-yr lag suggests that either juveniles are underrepresented in sampling, or maybe they do not congregate until this size? THIS PLOT IS NOT NEEDED AND WOULD NEED CLEANUP

## Discussion

OLS regression models using all lifestages from all surveys with a 1- and 2-yr lag to predict all survey's total CPUEs were constructed to find all explanatory relationships. The CRMS Creek Trawl survey is the most consistently responsive of the surveys when used in regression modeling. Fifteen significant relationships exist between total CPUEs from the Creek Trawl survey and several 1- and 2-yr.lagged lifestage variables (Table 3). The CRMS Harbor Trawl had one significant explanatory relationship with subadults from the same survey lagged 1-yr. The Trammel Net survey had one significant explanatory relationship with mature females from the Harbor Trawl lagged 1-yr, which is the highest correlation ( $r^2=0.36$ ) of all the single regression models.

Although there were several significant regression models constructed using fisheries independent survey life stage abundance CPUEs, no relationships correlate strong enough to be effective models. Using OLS single regression modeling, the six SCDNR fisheries independent surveys used to monitor blue crab populations in the Charleston Harbor watershed are ineffective are ineffective predictors of their own abundance CPUEs.

### Objective 3

Explore predictive relationships between fisheries-independent abundance and commercial landings.

**Table 4:** Objective 3 - All significant relationships of effort corrected Charleston Harbor watershed (Ashley, Cooper and Wando Rivers and Charlesotn Harbor) commercial Landings by lifestage variables from all surveys using OLS regression. Only variables from the Harbor and Creek Trawl surveys were related to these corrected landings. Multiple variables with consistent correlations through both surveys seem to suggest the surveys are effectively measuring the population, but there may be some other driver (habitat, environmental, fishing) outside of stock/population (proper term?) variables that affect blue crab abundance.

Dependent Variable	Explanatory Variable	Summary Statistics			
		p-value	r2	F-statistic	Degrees of Freedom
Harbor Trawl (explanatory variable)					
Mean Landings CPUE	Mature Male (1-yr. lag)	0.007659	0.4330	9.928	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Subadult (1-yr. lag)	0.016680	0.3670	7.538	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Total CPUE (1-yr. lag)	0.027710	0.3208	6.140	13
Creek Trawl (explanatory variable)					
Mean Landings CPUE	Immature Male (1-yr. lag)	0.010420	0.4076	8.946	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Sublegal (1-yr. lag)	0.014850	0.3772	7.875	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Subadult (1-yr. lag)	0.019470	0.3532	7.100	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Total CPUE (1-yr. lag)	0.023880	0.3346	6.538	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Juvenile (1-yr. lag)	0.030140	0.3129	5.921	13
Mean Landings CPUE	Immature Female (1-yr. lag)	0.033210	0.3038	5.672	13

**Discussion** OLS regression models using all lifestages from all surveys with a 1- and 2-yr lag to predict Charleston Harbor watershed (Ashley River, Cooper River, Wando River and Charleston Harbor) landings CPUEs were constructed to find all explanatory relationships. All significant relationships are displayed in the following tables. The CRMS Creek Trawl is the most consistently responsive of the surveys when used in regression modeling. Nine significant relationships exist between mean annual Landings CPUE and several 1- and 2-yr.lagged lifestage variables from the CRMS Harbor and Creek Trawl surveys (Table 4). The CRMS Harbor Trawl survey's mature males 1-yr. lag and the CRMS Creek Trawl survey's immature male 1-yr. lag are the only variables with a coefficient of determination (r-squared) > 0.40.

Total landings for the integrated Charleston Harbor watershed Only two fisheries independent life stage abundance CPUEs have significant relationships with total landings. The effects from these models have very small explanatory power over total landings. It should be mentioned that >2003 is when data from all 4 reporting areas (Ashley, Cooper, Wando Rivers and Charleston Harbor) and the effort-correction (pots pulled) begin.






Figure 4: Ordinary Least Squares regression plots of select significant explanatory relationships using lagged variables to Charleston Harbor watershed Landings CPUEs. Mean annual landings CPUE by Harbor Trawl mature males with a 1-yr lag (A), and mean annual landings CPUE by Creek Trawl immature males CPUE with a 1-yr. lag (B). Because the multiple regression relationships do not have as strong a correlation as some of the single, and are more illogical, I don't think the table with multiple regression models is needed.