APPROVED

HERRING SPAWN INDEX ANALYSIS

by

J. Schweigert, D. Hay, and C. Fort

October 1993

Department of Fisheries and Oceans Biological Science Branch Pacific Biological Station Nanaimo, B.C. V9R 5K6

Not citable

"PSARC Working Papers document the scientific basis for fisheries management advice in the Pacific Region. As such, they provide one component of the assessment process, and are not intended as comprehensive treatments of stock management."

Introduction

The review of the herring stock assessment document by the PSARC Herring Subcommittee at the 1992 meeting identified an inconsistency in the abundance indices used by the two current assessment methodologies, i.e. the escapment and age-structured models. While the escapement model attempts to provide an absolute estimate of total egg deposition for each assessment region, this estimate was not being used in the age-structured model. Instead, the age-structured model used a relative index which is the sum of the total lengths of spawn adjusted by area specific but time independent estimates of average width and average intensity. The review also identified the need to re-evaluate the conversion equations used in the escapement model to calibrate surface survey observations of width and egg layers to diver widths and egg densities and suggested that this should include a consideration of the uncertainty associated with the escapement model estimate of total egg deposition.

In order to deal with both of these concerns it seemed appropriate to develop a single estimate or index of egg deposition that combined all spawn data sources and presented the best estimate of total escapement. This index could then be used as auxiliary data in the age-structured model to estimate numbers at age and associated parameters. In the process of developing such a modified escapement model, an alternative index of egg deposition per unit length of beach or tonnage per kilometer was developed as one approach to estimating spawning stock biomass for small stocks outside the major assessment regions. The objectives of this document are therefore to describe and discuss several alternative spawn indices, their strengths and weaknesses, and aspects of the estimation of error structure for these data, with a recommendation of the preferred spawn index which may require additional refinements.

Herring spawn data - types of records.

Herring spawn data has been collected systematically in some areas of coastal B.C. since 1929. Fishery Officers, working mainly in Georgia Strait and the west coast of Vancouver Island, initially noted the times and places of major herring spawning. They did not make recordings of the widths of submerged spawning. In fact, they believed that most spawn was intertidal. In 1931, Al Tester at PBS, started a cooperative coast wide herring spawn recording system with data collected by Fishery Officers throughout the B.C. coast. These data included (1) estimated spawn length; (2) estimated width; (3) estimated spawn intensity, on a scale of 1-5, with $1 =$ light and $5 =$ heavy; and (4) date of spawning. However, the collections were not complete for many sections of the coast, particularly the Queen Charlotte Islands. In 1951, some systematic changes to the data collections were made, including the estimates of spawn intensity, which changed from 1-5 to a scale of 1-9. The rationale for this change appeared to be to accommodate the practice of reporting intermediate categories (such as 3.5 for an intensity between 3 (medium) and 4 (heavy). In 1981 the intensity classification was abandoned altogether and replaced with an estimate of "egg layers". Throughout the history of the herring spawn data collections, there have been systematic changes in some of the ways the data have been collected.

In the mid-1970's, the importance of the sub-merged component of spawns was recognized. Some spawns were surveyed by divers to get better information, Concurrently, systematic research aimed at getting accurate estimates of egg density started with collections of all eggs from selected sites and numbers of eggs per $m²$ were determined from them. Further, it was recognized that many other factors were of potential importance, including the slope of the bottom, and type of vegetation used as a substrate (Haegele et al. 1979). More recently there has also been the recognition of the role of the giant kelp as a spawning substrate in the northern areas and the need to develop assessment procedures to account for spawn deposition on this algae (Haegele and Schweigert 1990).

Uses *of herring spawn data in stock assessments.*

Until the late 1970's, the roe herring fishery was managed by a fixed escapement policy, within season. The total annual catch was not determined until there was an estimate of the amount of spawn required to 'sustain' the stocks. Regardless of the efficacy of the process, there was little time available to do detailed spawn survey. At best, a 'surface' survey estimation of length and width was all that could be done within a short time.

With the initiation of the annual quota system in 1983, the importance of herring spawn data increased. The herring spawn data provided an estimate of the biomass of the spawning escapement in the previous year. This was the single most important statistic used for setting quotas. Age data was used to monitor the coming and going of strong year classes.

Since the mid-1980's the power of age-structured models has become more appreciated. The B.C. herring data was well suited for these analyses and they have taken a progressively stronger role in the annual assessments. One recommendation has been that the two disparate spawn indices used in the two prevailing assessment models (the escapement model and the age-structured model) be reconciled, so that only one spawn index be used to estimate stock abundance.

A limitation of the escapement model described by Schweigert and Stocker (1988) is that it does not recognize or deal with the time trends inherent in the spawn data. It is recognized that the early spawn data, in the 1950's and 1960's are misleading. Mainly, the estimated spawn widths are too narrow. Also, Hay and Kronlund (1987) noted systematic changes in estimated widths and intensities. These changes had more to do with changes in the methodology used to do the surveys than real changes in the spawn deposition. To deal with time trends in the data, Hay and Kronlund calculated area-specific coefficients of herring spawn. These were area-specific constant estimates of spawn width and intensity that were simply the mean estimates of the width and intensity, averaged over geographical areas called sections, or sub-divisions of the coastal statistical areas.

There are several limitations to doing this. The most severe is that there are a variety of different spawning sites within a section. It is an obvious error to take a simple average of width estimates from such different sites. The reason for this process, however, is that there are only four existing levels of geographical divisions: (1) the entire B.C. coast (2) B.C. Statistical areas, about 30 on the coast, (3) the herring 'sections', about 90 on the coast (4) geographical locations names used for the herring spawn records, about 1900 used.

The use of location names would, theoretically provide the best geographical basis for the index, but there are many reasons why this is not advisable. The use of names changed with time. Sometimes the same location will have several different names. Often, the names are not used with the same precision. For instance, sometimes Fishery Officers recorded a spawn simply as 'Lambert Channel' or 'Barkley Sound' but they provided detailed charts showing the exact spawning position. Other records provide an exact location name, such as Stopper Island in Barkley Sound, or Komas Bluff in Lambert Channel, but the record may, or may not have an accompanying map. Therefore, within the present data base, the use of precise location names can be misleading and we have developed a pooling system described below which encompasses equivalent geographical regions as much as possible.

Review of Previous Spawn Indices

Johnson

J0wf^

40^

Estimates of spawn escapement have been published annually: from 1937 until 1957 in series published by the provincial British Columbia Fisheries Department (i.e. Taylor et al. 1957) and from 1955 to the present in various informal series published by the Federal Department of Fisheries. Tester (1948) was the first to comment on a series of years of spawning data (1931-1946) for the west coast of Vancouver Island. He proposed two indices of spawn deposition: (1) the cumulative length of spawn: and (2) the cumulative length adjusted for variation in spawn intensity. His main conclusion was that spawning escapement varied substantially among years and that the magnitude of escapement had little relationship with subsequent year-class success.

Stevenson and Outram (1953) developed a relationship between the length of spawn and the number of fish that spawn in a statute mile. They adjusted the total spawn length linearly for differences in intensity relative to medium intensity. The adjustment involved an increase or decrease in the observed length as a function of intensity; the result was an estimated spawn length in statute miles, adjusted to 'medium' intensity. Taylor(1964) extended the analysis using 26 years of spawning data (1937-1962) for 7 different subdivisions of the British Columbia coast. He used the same measure of spawn (statute miles adjusted for intensity). Hourston et al. (1972) re-analyzed the spawn data and incorporated data on spawn widths: for each spawn record an estimate of total spawn area was made and the area was weighted according to the spawn intensity. Further, the British Columbia coast was divided into 110 different sections that were based mainly on the centers of spawning (Hourston and Hamer 1979). These 'spawning sections' were described as geographical sub-divisions of the well established 'statistical areas'. This approach was developed and applied in the early 1970s and was the most comprehensive and biologically realistic of any developed. Spawn data since 1951 were used and the data were grouped according to meaningful geographical divisions called sections. Estimates of spawn deposition were then incorporated into a model which also considered age and size data, and size-specific fecundity data to estimate the biomass of spawning escapement and forecast future runs (Hourston 1981; Hourston and Schweigert 1981). This approach has been modified and extended by Schweigert and Stocker (1988), who developed a method of adjusting width and intensity estimates according to empirical observations and comparisons of Fishery Officer and SCUBA diver surveys. The intent of their work is an estimate of the absolute tonnage of the herring spawning biomass.

New Spawn Indices

Modified Escapement Model

A potential weakness of the existing escapement model methodology is its reliance on a limited sample size of replicate surveyed spawn beds to develop calibration equations that adjust surface spawn width and egg layer data observations to comparable dive survey width and egg density data. The development of any modifications to this model must include a means to integrate the historical surface survey data and recent dive survey estimates of eggs on various algal substrates, estimates of eggs on physical substrates, and eggs on the giant kelp. The measurement procedures for the dive survey data have remained unchanged since they were initiated in 1987. The methodologies for dealing with the dive data have been described extensively (Schweigert et al. 1985, 1990, Haegele and Schweigert 1985, 1990). Instead, we focussed on possible adjustments to the surface spawn width estimates and the spawning intensity or more recently (since 1978) the number of egg layers.

The calibration of spawn widths has been dealt with by developing a superset of existing spawning locations which we have called spawn "pools". The database used to develop the pools consists of herring spawn deposition records collected for the British Columbia coast since 1929. The records prior to 1951 were generally too incomplete for the purposes of this analysis and so were not included. At present, all records in the database are associated with three geographic entities: a statistical area, a herring section, and a location name, the latter two as defined in Haist and Rosenfeld (1988). The herring sections subdivide the thirty-two statistical areas into three to eight subunits. The location name at this point cannot be used to reliably associate a record with a precise geographic location, with the exception of dive survey data collected in the Queen Charlotte Islands, Big Bay / Port Simpson, Kitkatla, and Barkley Sound. Location names otherwise may overlap, some may be a subset of others, and the naming of a particular piece of coastline will vary from year to year depending on the personnel doing the survey. This can lead to morphologically and biologically dissimilar beds being associated or dissociated with a specific location from year to year.

In attempting to improve the resolution of the available spawn indices, it was decided to add a layer of resolution below that of the herring section, associating locations with similar characteristics. The procedure followed to derive these pools consisted of examining the dive records within a section to identify groups of location names contiguous with each other (Hay et al. 1989) and related to coastline segments having uniform topography and vegetation. Ancillary information such as the usual ends of spawn and the usual depth of spawn was also considered during this classification. After the dive survey records had been examined and classified, the location names used in surface survey records were associated with the pools derived for the dive data. This resulted in each herring section within the major assessment areas being subdivided into between one and thirteen subunits.

Analysis of Width Data

r

c

The surface and dive survey data sets differ somewhat in their data structure. A single surface survey record represents an average or overall impression of a segment of spawn of arbitrary length. It may represent a complete spawn which is relatively consistant for width, vegetation substrates, and spawn density, or it may represent a part of a spawn which has been subdivided because of changes in these characteristics or the fact that the surveyor worked methodically along the beach, producing one record every few hundred meters.

The dive survey, on the other hand, uses a two stage subsampling methodology (Schweigert et al. 1985) which produces one record for each station along a transect, and several transect records are associated with a location record. At this final level the two types of surveys are equivalent, in that they define the length and width of a segment of spawning beach. In order to equate them, the station records on each transect were rolled up to produce a single record for each transect with a weighted mean of egg layers and vegetation cover. A transect record was then considered to provide estimates of width and layers equivalent to that for a surface survey record. The dive survey subsampling procedure occasionally includes "zero length" transect records, i.e. transects which fall where no spawn occurs. Because the procedure followed when collecting surface survey data normally excludes such bare patches from the survey these transects were also eliminated from the data set.

For each pool within each section for which dive survey data exists, mean and median spawn widths, layers, and vegetation cover were calculated. Because the spawn width data were not normally distributed the median width for each pool was used in determining the width adjustment for the pool. Surface spawn records for which no pool data existed were adjusted by applying the section data or if necessary the assessment region estimate (Appendix Tables 1 and 2). All surface survey records throughout the historical time series were assigned an adjusted width based on these summaries of dive survey information.

Analysis of Egg Density Data

The calibration of the estimates of historical surface survey data requires two steps. The first is to derive an estimate of egg layers from intensity estimates and then to convert egg layers to eggs per square meter. Prior to 1978 spawn deposition was assessed qualitatively based on an intensity scale of either 1-5 or 1-9. Based on research data these estimates can be converted to layers of eggs (Schweigert and Stocker 1988). However, these authors also indicate that for dual surveyed spawns estimates of egg layers for surface surveys tend to exceed layer estimates from dive surveys. To assess this relationhip for a larger data set, we examined the estimated mean of the median egg layer estimates from dive and surface surveys for each pool over all years from 1978 to present (Figure 1). The intent of this analysis was to determine whether it was reasonable to assume that the dive survey estimation procedure for layers was significantly different from that by the surface survey. Although the majority of the dive estimates fall below the 1:1 correspondence line as found by Schweigert and Stocker (1988), the slope of the regression line is not significantly different from zero (P=0.44). Therefore, because there is no evidence that the surface layer data need be adjusted to render them comparable to dive survey estimates, we fit the following model to the data in Figure 2:

Eggslm2 = 14.698 + 212.218 **Layers**

based on 5111 observations of eggs per square meter from collections of sample quadrats coastwide from 1976-1987 (P=0.0). This relationship was used to estimate egg density for all historical surface survey data from the observed egg layers. The combination of total length and adjusted width to estimate area of spawn deposition and egg density provides an estimate of total egg deposition or spawning escapement. Estimates of total egg abundance from surface surveys are summed with dive survey estimates for each assessment region to estimate total egg deposition for use in the agestructured model analysis.

Biomass Index per Lineal Kilometer

The second index presented here uses an area-specific estimate of spawn width based on surface surveys. We recognize that this is less accurate than the diver-based estimates. However, our intent was to examine methodologies which could be appropriate for dealing with management of smaller stocks where there have been no dive surveys of spawning areas. The comparable estimates for the assessment regions provide a calibration factor relative to the estimates from existing assessment models which would be applicable to these smaller stocks. For most of these smaller stocks, there are only estimates of surface width. Therefore, an index for these stocks should be comparable to an index for the other, harvested stocks. We used the existing surface width data with) a recommendation that when diver estimates become available, they should be substituted for the surface estimates. We used estimates of egg density taken from empirical counts of eggs from measured quadrats. During the last 15 years, nearly 6000 of these counts have been obtained from various areas along the B.C. coast (Table 3).

We combined the estimates of surface width and egg density to provide a single coefficient. In fact, the product of these two variables is an estimate of eggs per linear m of shore. This estimate, when divided by 10^5 is an estimate of kg/m or tonnes/km of shore. We derived estimates of the variance of this coefficient from the estimates of variance for the width and density which are assumed independent, following Bevington (1969) where:

$$
\frac{\sigma_e^2}{\epsilon^2} = \frac{\sigma_w^2}{w^2} \cdot \frac{\sigma_d^2}{d^2}
$$

The mean and SE of the new parameter, ε (eggs/m), when multiplied by length of spawn, provides an index of escapement, in terms of total number of eggs (Bindex). The intent of this estimate, however, is not as a new escapement estimate. We recognize that there are several reasons why this estimate of eggs should under-estimate escapement. It does not adequately account for eggs on bottom substrate below the vegetation and it does not account for any spawn deposition on the giant kelp.

Error Structure For Herring Spawn Indices

Age-Structured Model

The spawn index enters the age-structured model as auxiliary information which relates the observed spawn index data relative to predicted egg escapement based on the population structure and weight specific fecundity estimated from catch at age information. The strength of this relationship and the relative weighting of the spawn index and catch at age data in the estimation procedure is reliant on the size of the penalty weight associated with the spawn index data and is a measure of the expected variance associated with this data set. The current penalty weight for the spawn index data is 10 which translates to an average error of 18 percent. The output from this model is relatively insensitive to changes in the weighting so that moderately improved estimates of this variance are unlikely to significantly alter model estimates of stock abundance but the ability to more accurately fix this parameter would assist in more clearly understanding other aspects of model behaviour.

Escapement Model

As outlined above, any spawn index must encompass the diverse data sets which detail herring spawning locations and intensities. To do this in a comprehensive manner requires a common currency which we argue is an estimate or index of the total egg deposition. An assessment of the error structure associated with these data requires an assessment of the variance components associated with each type of data as described below. The simplest component of the total egg deposition estimate is associated with the surface survey data. We assume the surface survey estimate of the total spawn length is negligible and so is assumed to have zero variance. Because much of the spawn is subtidal, the surface survey width estimate will be an under-estimate, therefore, the width is adjusted by a relationship of the form:

$$
Wadj_i = \mu + \delta \text{FOWD}
$$

where FOWID is the surface survey width. The surface survey also estimates the average number of egg layers on various algal substrates in each spawning bed. This estimate is translated into the estimated egg density by a model of the form:

$$
\hat{y}_i = \xi + \omega \text{FOLAY}
$$

where FOLAY is the surface estimate of the number of layers of eggs. The total egg deposition is then estimated as the product of area and egg density, \hat{y}_i , by:

$$
Total Eggs_i = L_i(Wadj_i)\hat{y}_i
$$

The variance components associated with the dive survey estimates are more complex. The estimate of total egg numbers on understory algal substrates involves taking numerous samples along each of several transects which span the width of the spawn. The formula for the estimate of eggs

n

per spawn in this case is:

 $\ddot{ }$

Total Eggs_i =
$$
L_i(\frac{\sum W_k}{m})(\frac{\sum \hat{y}_k}{n})
$$

where m is the total number of transects, n is total number of sample areas in the spawn, W_k is the width of spawn along each transect, and y_k is the egg density estimate for each sampling quadrat as estimated from the usual egg prediction model (Schweigert et al. 1993):

 $\hat{y}_i = \alpha$ *Cover*^{β}*Layers*^{γ *}<i>Qsize*,</sup>

Similar estimators can be derived to describe the estimation procedure for eggs on bottom substrates and for the giant kelp, **Macrocystis** sp. The estimate of the total population of eggs in each assessment region is simply the sum of the estimated population of eggs estimated in each of the spawning beds by each of the survey techniques. The estimate of the total population of eggs in a region with a combination of surface and dive survey data would then be given by:

$$
\sum [L_i(\frac{\sum W_i}{n})(\frac{\sum \hat{y}_i}{n})] + \sum [L_j(Wadj_j)\hat{y}_j]
$$

Because each of the component relationships have an associated imprecision or variance, it is possible to sum the variances for the individual component techniques in each egg bed following Goodman (1960) since if

$$
E_{S} \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2) \wedge E_{D} \sim N(\tau, \xi^2)
$$

where E_s is the surface survey egg estimate in a bed and E_p is the dive survey egg estimate in the same egg bed, then

$$
Var(ES + ED) = \sigma2 + \xi2
$$

To estimate the variance associated with each survey technique in a particular spawn bed we require an estimate of the variance for a product of area, A, and egg density and following Goodman (1960) derive the following estimator:

$$
v(A\hat{y}) = (\overline{A})^2 var(\hat{y}) + (\overline{y})^2 var(A) - var(A) var(\hat{y})
$$

For surface spawn estimates each bed has only a single width and layer estimate making it difficult to establish the magnitude of variability for these data. It is possible, as we have done above, to approximate the variance of both width and egg density estimates from dive survey data. For the dive survey estimates of spawn, the average width and average egg density could be computed directly from the sample values taken from that specific spawn by the usual formulae. In both cases, we assume that the estimated spawn length is determined with negligible error and so can be factored out as a constant. Therefore, the equation to calculate the variance of the estimate of total egg deposition for spawn *j* is given by:

$$
var(\hat{Y}) = L_j^2[(\overline{w})^2 var(y) + (\overline{y})^2 var(w) - var(y) var(w)]
$$

and the estimated variance for the total population of eggs is given by

$$
var(\hat{E}_T) = \sum var(\hat{E}_S) + \sum var(\hat{E}_D)
$$

Propagation of Errors

j^^S

0^

MS-

It is also possible to estimate the variance of each spawn by partial derivatives, but this results in Goodman's estimate without the final cross-product term. Its formula is

$$
\sigma_{E_S}^2 \sim \sigma_A^2 (\frac{\partial E_S}{\partial A})^2 + \sigma_g^2 (\frac{\partial E_S}{\partial \hat{y}})^2
$$

and it gives an estimated variance of

$$
var(E_S) = L_j^2 [\overline{(y_i)}^2 \sigma_w^2 + (\overline{w_i})^2 \sigma_y^2]
$$

for surface surveys and a similar estimate for dive surveys, with the variances for the dive surveys coming from the sample, and the variances for the surface surveys coming from historical means or comparable dive survey data.

One can break the surface survey down further and take partial derivatives with respect to the calibration equations for egg layers and width adjustment for which the formula for the estimated variance changes somewhat as:

$$
\frac{\partial E_S}{\partial FOWID} = L_j \delta(\xi + \omega FOLAY)
$$

and

$$
\frac{\partial \hat{y}}{\partial FOLAY} = L_j \omega (\mu + \delta FOWID_j)
$$

The equation of variance for the surface survey now becomes

$$
var(E_{S}) = L_{j}^{2} [\delta^{2} (\xi + \omega FOLAY)^{2} \sigma_{FONID}^{2} + \omega^{2} (\mu + \delta FOWID_{j})^{2} \sigma_{FOLAY}^{2}]
$$

where the variances for FOWID and FOLAY would have to be assumed from simultaneous research surveys.

It should be apparent from the foregoing that although it is possible to derive analytical solutions that theoretically permit estimation of the variance associated with the estimate of total egg deposition they are not particularly tractable and because they assume normality of the various variables encompassed by them are probably not very realistic. Our conclusion is that the best approach to the estimation of variance associated with the total egg deposition estimate or escapement model biomass estimate is through a bootstrapping of all components of the estimation process, of which some component have previously been described for the dive survey data (Schweigert, 1993).

Results and Discussion

The calculated estimates for the various spawn indices described above as well as those used in previous assessments are presented in Tables 1 to 5. They include estimates of total length of spawn, total area of spawn, tonnes per kilometer of beach or Bindex and a range of stock sizes based on plus or minus one standard error of die mean Bindex, total tonnes of escapement from the modified escapement model described here, total length of spawn, estimates of total area using the new and old methods of adjusting spawn widths, total tonnes from the old escapement model, and the Hay index previously used in the age-structured model. The total spawn length used to develop the Bindex is also shown to be less than for the escapement model estimates. This represents the accidental deletion of a few records from the files generated to conduct those analyses. The discrepancy only occurs in a few years since 1985 and does not affect the overall conclusions. The correlations among the various indices are presented in Table 6. It is evident that the correlations among all the potential candidate indices are very high and there is no clear superiority of one index relative to the others. A previous analysis of similar index data and the age-structured model estimates of abundance was similarly inconclusive. We feel that the most appropriate spawn index is that which attempts to deal with interannual variation in components of egg deposition such as spawn width and egg density. Because the modified escapement modelling approach described here attempts to account as much as possible year to year changes in these components of the egg deposition it appears to be the most appropriate index at this time. In addition, the adjustments to width for many areas of the coast are based on limited data and these may be enhanced as additional diver estimates become available. The secondary index based on constant width and egg density (Bindex) provides estimates of abundance that are substantially lower than the new escapement model estimates but these may also be improved with additional dive survey data. The latter appears to provide an acceptable although very conservative approach to the estimation of spawning biomass for areas outside the major assessment regions.

An important unanswered question is whether the assumption of a time constant spawning bed width is reasonable and if so what potential biological mechanisms are involved. In any given location is would sometimes be physically impossible for one very large school of herring to deposit all of its eggs at one geographical focus. The potential spawn width and intensity are limited by the topography and surface area or foliage of the submergent and inter-tidal vegetation: steep-sided locations with narrow bands of sparse vegetation tend to have narrow, low intensity spawn deposition. In contrast, wide locations with dense vegetation have the potential for wide, high-intensity spawn deposition. However, there is clearly some interannual variation in the amount of the available substrate which is used. It is not readily evident whether this degree of variability in width

significantly affects the estimate of total stock abundance. We believe that this assumption can be assessed by incorporating the varibility within a bootstrapestimate at the level of the pools described here as a component of the total variance estimate associated with the estimated spawning escapement level in each assessment region.

The impacts of the new spawn indices on stock abundance estimates for the five assessment regions is presented in Figure 3 for the escapement model. The changes to the calibration methodologies resulted in relatively minor impacts to the estimated stock abundances in all five regions. Similarly, the use of the modified escapement model total egg estimate as the abundance index in the age-structured model spawning biomass estimates is presented in Figure 4. Again, there are relatively minor differences in estimates of spawning biomass based on the new egg index and on the Hay index used in previous assessments for all stocks but the Prince Rupert District where spawning biomass is now lower than previously estimated. Finally, the effects of assuming a much larger variance in the spawn index data is presented in Figure 5. Current stock assessments based on the age-structured model assume a penalty weight of 10 which is equivalent to a standard deviation of 0.22 in the spawn index data. Alternately, a penalty weight of 1 which is equivalent to a standard deviation of 0.71 in the spawn index data does not result in appreciably different estimates of total spawning biomass in 3 assessment regions. However, it does result in estimates of spawning biomass which are much higher than those assuming a lower variance in the spawn data for the Prince Rupert District and in much lower estimates of biomass for the Strait of Georgia. In both instances, these biomass estimates are inconsistant with other information on stock abundance suggesting that the **1^** assumption of a lower variance for the spawn index data is more appropriate.

REFERENCES

- Bevington, P.R. 1969. Data reduction and error analysis for the physical sciences. McGraw-Hill. New York. 336 p.
- Haegele, C.W., D.C. Miller, R.D. Humphreys, and A.S. Hourston. 1979. Assessment of 1978 herring spawnings in the French Creek and Qualicum herring sections, using new egg determination procedures. Fish. Mar. Serv. Tech. Rep. 896: 43p.
- Haegele, C.W., Schweigert, J.F. 1985. Estimation of egg numbers in Pacific herring spawns on giant kelp. N. Am. J. Fish. Mgt. 5: 65-71.
- Haegele, C.W., Schweigert, J.F. 1990. A model which predicts Pacific herring **{Clupea harengus pallasi)** egg deposition on giant kelp **(Macrocystis** sp.) plants from underwater observations. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2056: 17 p.
- Haist, V. and L. Rosenfeld. 1988. Definitions and Codings of Localities, Sections, and Assessment Regions for British Columbia Herring Data. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1994: 123 p.
- Hay, D.E., and A.R. Kronlund. 1987. Factors affecting the abundance and measurement of Pacific herring spawn. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 44: 1181-1194.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume I. Queen Charlotte Islands. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 135 p.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume II. North Coast. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 99 p.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume III. Upper Central Coast. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 171 p.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume IV. Lower Central Coast and Johnstone Strait. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 254 p.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume V. Strait of Georgia. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 268 p.
- Hay, D.E., P.B. McCarter, R. Kronlund and C. Roy. 1989. Spawning areas of British Columbia herring: a review, geographical analysis and classification. Volume VI. West Coast Vancouver

Island. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2019: 213 p.

- Hourston, A.S., and J.M. Hamer. 1979. Definitions and codings of localities, sections, and management units, and divisions for British Columbia herring data. Fish. Mar. Serv. MS Rep. 1533: 79p.
- Hourston, A.S. 1981. Summary tables for annual assessments of the status of British Columbia herring stocks in the 1970's. Can. Data Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 250: 381p.
- Hourston, A.S., and Outram, D.N. 1972. Millions of eggs and miles of spawn in British Columbia herring spawnings, 1951-1970 (Revised 1972). Fish. Res. Board Can. Tech. Rep. 359: 154p.
- Hourston, A.S., and J.F. Schweigert. 1981. Procedures for assessing and forecasting British Columbia herring stocks from catch, sampling, and spawn deposition data. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1000: 58p.
- Schweigert, J.F., Haegele, C.W., Stocker, M. 1985. Optimizing sampling design for herring spawn surveys in the Strait of Georgia. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 42: 1806-1814.
- Schweigert, J.F., Haegele, C.W., Stocker, M. 1990. Evaluation of sampling strategies for assessing Pacific herring spawn deposition using SCUBA surveys. N. Am. J. Fish. Manag. 10: 185- 195.
- Schweigert, J.F., Stocker, M. 1988. Escapement model for estimating Pacific herring stock size from spawn survey data and its management implications. N. Am. J. Fish. Manage. 8: 63-84.
- Schweigert, J.F. 1993. A review and evaluation of methodology for estimating Pacific herring egg deposition. Contributions in Science, no. XXX. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.(In Press, proceedings from AFS Early Life History Symposium on the estimation of biomass from egg and ichythyoplankton surveys).
- Schweigert, J. F., V. Haist, and C. Fort. 1993. Stock assessments for British Columbia herring in 1992 and forecasts of the potential catch in 1993. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 1913: 111 p.
- Stevenson, J.C., and D.N. Outram. 1953. Results of investigation of the herring populations on the west coast and lower east coast of Vancouver Island in 1952-53, with an analysis of fluctuations in population abundance since 1946-47. Rep. British Columbia Dept. Fish. for 1952: 57-84.
- Taylor, F.H.C. 1964. Life history and present status of British Columbia herring stocks. Bulletin of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 143: 81p.
- Taylor, F.H.C, A.S. Hourston, and D.N. Outram. 1957. The status of the major herring stocks in British Columbia in 1956-57. Rep. British Columbia Dept. Fish, for 1956: 45-77.

Tester, A.L. 1948. The efficacy of catch limitations in regulating the British Columbia herring fishery. Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada 42: 135-163.

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \mathbb{A}

 $\ddot{\psi}$

 $\pmb{\beta}$

 $\ddot{}$

Table 1. Spawn indicies for the Queen Charlotte Islands.

r

 $\langle \sigma \rangle$

 $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$

0^

Year	No	Hay Rec Length	Area HA	mean	$-SE$	$+SE$	Bindx Bindx Bindx New Es t.	Sum Length Area	New	Area	old old Es t.	old Hay I
51	20		33170 171.4	4379	3136	5624	31184	33170	303	552	27967	1058
52	20	19311	114.7	3092	2257	3927	19225	19311	191	200	9957	641
53	32	27755	151.3	4070	3100	5040	26926	27755	277	278	14016	961
54	29	25298	118.3	2504	1787	3221	13979	25298	200	232	9951	835
55	27	36243	134.9	2810	2048	3573	21773	36243	310	308	12738	869
56	31	28871	144.0	3374	2551	4198	15388	28871	218	291	12506	951
57	30	46631	201.2	5098	3566	6629	28377	46631	352	425	19301	1279
58	13	22697	62.6	1403	851	1954	11581	22697	185	211	8514	507
59	10	32064	228.8	6497	5043	7950	37909	32064	413	349	16197	1285
60	20	32649	155.6	3546	2557	4535	20187	32649	309	320	13146	1087
61	28	29878	148.8	3723	2647	4788	13428	29878	249	387	14482	990
62	33	48574	241.1	6130	4461	7800	26556	48574	414	496	20094	1530
63	21	20200	137.5	3617	2764	4469	15404	20200	250	384	15151	783
64	35	33028	201.9	5347	4085	6609	29402	33028	395	389	16316	1185
65	21	14180	76.6	1633	1180	2086	6170	14180	126	177	6278	501
66	6	7769	63.4	1912	1445	2378	7499	7769	137	149	5769	332
67	13	6168	38.2	967	707	1227	2677	6168	54	90	3057	222
68	33	13594	78.1	2053	1451	2655	5369	13594	125	207	6508	433
69	9	2194	12.6	296	221	371	878	2194	17	23	900	74
70	27	34541	126.8	2806	1878	3735	8958	34541	196	355	11904	886
71	32	26590	113.8	2657	1802	3512	9696	26590	209	267	9685	716
72	31	31300	158.5	4277	3038	5533	9959	31300	273	308	10896	1000
73	42	24111	118.8	2879	1993	3766	11190	24111	201	291	11112	730
74	48	21489	106.9	2679	1913	3445	8814	21489	179	259	8843	670
75	41	22813	118.8	2911	2085	3736	10188	22813	197	294	10572	814
76	106	36760	180.0	4183	2875	5501	14593	36760	267	419	15834	1158
77	121	44188	218.5	5090	3520	6667	10235	44188	310	505	15617	1438
78	80	25395	107.1	2149	1379	2920	4971	25395	167	261	7577	750
79	58	30940	111.6	2523	1690	3356	7926	30940	169	381	13730	814
80	104	50260	218.7	4636	3358	5913	13993	50260	347	529	17155	1529
81	61	42227	167.9	3528	2252	4804	10669	42227	222	483	17131	1175
82	79	39135	170.4	4453	3157	5749	12472	39135	290	427	14917	1305
83	115	58621	300.5	7039	4939	9139	19993	58621	505	796	26310	1826
84	192	63420	327.3	8034	5765	10303	22373	63420	505	828	28013	2032
85	177	55176	363.9		19800 11521 28078		35674	55176	574	776	31994	2056
86	213	57880	332.1	8887	6449	11325	32654	57880	821	920	30186	2084
87	173	83559	367.4	8616	5858	11374	32075	83559	553	1004	38140	2555
88	64	56099	267.5	7075	5170	8980	32685	65119	887	886	32092	2107
89	16	40333	190.1	4911	3597	6228	12783	40333	441	446	12931	1479
90	14	47487	280.3	7714	5783	9646	19398	47487	539	539	19398	1745
91	35	75265	388.8	9742		6964 12560	21131	77265	610	608	20843	2568
92	17	56026	330.0	8073	5578	9452	35992	56026	1052	1057	36540	1905
93	26	44386	279.2	7639	5604	9674	20916	42286	458	467	21115	1566

Table 2. Spawn indicies for the Prince Rupert District

j^flSSSfK

 ~ 0.6

 $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$

i.

 $\ddot{}$

Table 3. Spawn indicies for the Central Coast

 $\langle \sigma \rangle$, $\langle \sigma \rangle$

 ϵ

-18

Year	No	Hay Rec Length	Area HA	mean	$-SE$	Bindx Bindx Bindx New Es $+SE$		t	Sum Length Area	New	Area	Old Old Es t	old Hay I
51	65		68833 380.0										
52	94	91068	405.4			24189 17447 30930	56915		68833	649	753	34418	3080
53		117 142781	561.8			30574 23008 38149 43189 29876 56539	60960		91068	746	904	40368	3589
54		112 118117	449.2			35479 24266 46692	89231		142781	958	1327	66533	4994
55	118	131918	518.3			44478 30870 58029	85717		118117	831	1130	58643	3624
56	129	69613	238.8				61415		131918	850	1420	61857	3873
	47			20181 14493		25869	26368		69613	466	772	28653	2125
57 58		48327	203.3	16769 12295		21243	23974		48327	340	462	19469	1790
	99	71710	196.2			18126 12960 23292	17882		71710	386	715	25462	1631
59	85	93485	366.5			28474 19196 37753	42800		93485	634	858	32216	3134
60	95	83374	314.2			21912 15091 28734	34053		83374	605	731	30171	2548
61	84	75388	241.3			16407 10896 21918	25608		75388	424	661	26280	2160
62	77	51592	197.7	13345		8968 17722	20745		51592	290	499	21624	1774
63	74	62801	198.5	14644		9954 19335	27919		62801	355	557	24678	1687
64	79	62872	217.3	14908		9480 20336	20344		62872	355	573	22079	1867
65	50	49931	183.5	10795	7212	14378	18833		49931	289	407	16078	1590
66	48	26211	63.6	4835	3171	6500		5122	26211	126	237	7629	460
67	54	32116	85.9	5967	4024	7911		6505	32116	166	293	9339	635
68	66	33982	103.4	8510		6554 10466	10084		33982	191	338	12216	786
69	86	57991	163.4	12216	9227	15208	15665		57991	285	488	18191	1183
70	119	106942	377.0	25322 19206		31439	35005		106942	557	909	35144	3020
71	145	100306	349.4			25747 19615 31880	38434		100306	572	1022	38272	2841
72	130	80701	263.8			19795 15085 24505	20828		80701	434	680	23175	2044
73	115	67391	244.7			18278 13781 22775	15790		67391	360	754	25017	1830
74		121 111546	421.7			37218 28488 45948	46071		111546	721	1082	42970	3539
75		137 128514	543.2			40391 29606 51177	60775		128514	839	1212	51616	4512
76		141 111369	532.8			42630 31239 54021	47489		111369	783	1251	48153	4286
77		164 123403	688.5			48986 36462 61510	52632		123403 1069		1491	53285	5940
78		179 124623	700.8	48930 35590		62272	89059		124623 1330		1634	66163	5282
79	152	148532	756.1			51919 36297 67543	55646		148532 1160		2576	92754	6038
80	138	119094	670.3			43491 30284 56697	68788		119094 1199		1654	65613	5219
81	104	80166	498.1			32221 22641 41800	45077		80166	849	1270	44344	3567
82	99	102957	745.0	47525	34921	60129	84959		102957 1484		1907	72758	5155
83	67	74444	442.6	27454 18260		36660	43423		74444	657	1066	45673	3365
84	35	54037	322.8	20533	14383	26683	27240		54037	520	737	27340	2668
85	66	51900	294.5	17738 12529		22948	26581		51900	711	769	28121	2435
86	59	84651	527.5			33830 24582 43078	60847		84651	929	1001	63247	4550
87	40	92400	547.5	37327	26423	48231	38717		92400	913	935	38712	4543
88	32	67001	492.9	29600 19758		39443	25314		67001	833	897	28120	3758
89		64 113110	744.1	48101 34338		61865	53954		113110 1530		1695	56845	6054
90		34 118620	881.0	57393	34892	80000	58912		118620 1623		1628	58962	5528
91	28	90170	667.7	37637 25090		50183	43221		90170 1199		1240	44399	5204
92		42 107703	859.5	48729 28843		68852	79866		114803 1912		1920	80156	6291
93		46 139685	980.6			66697 46995 86399	84905		152985 2584		2630	86273	8451

Table 4. Spawn indicies for the Strait of Georgia

r^s^V

 \mathcal{L}^{max}

 $\mathbf{t}^{(n)}$.

 $\ddot{}$

Table 5. Spawn indicies for the West Coast Vancouver Island

Jf^S

 $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$

 $\langle \rangle$

Mm-

ja ja kuningan kuningan

Table 6. Correlation Matrices of herring spawn indices by assessment region. Correlations are shown for (1) 'No Rec' or the number of records of spawning each year; (2) The sum of the spawn lengths; (3) The area estimated by Hay using a combination of diver and surface widths, estimated for each area 'pool'; (4) a new index based on 'pool-specific widths and egg density counts; (5) A new escapement estimate in tonnes based on a new escapement index and biomass estimate by Schweigert; (6) a sum of lengths estimated by Schweigert (this was included only to confrim that there were significant differences in the data extraction between Hay and Schweigert; (7) a new area of spawning based on diver-estimated spawn widths; (8) the old estimate of spawn width based on previous methods used for the escapement model; (9) the old estimate of escapement, in tonnes; (10) the old index by Hay.

QCI

PRD

cc

ä,

M^

 $\tilde{}$

0S^

GS

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

Fig. 1. A comparison of the mean of the annual median surface and dive egg layer estimates for each pool described in Appendix 1 from 1977-1993. The dotted *line is the fitted regression.*

n

Fig. 3. Spawning stock biomass trends for the five assessment regions based on the old escapement model and the modified escapement model analyses.

West Coast Vancouver Island

/^^llH

Fig. 4. Spawning stock biomass trends for the five assessment regions based on the age-structured assessment model with the egg index and Hay index as spawn indices.

-28- Strait of Georgia

West Coast Vancouver Island

ji^

10\$^

Fig. 4. (cont'd). Spawning stock biomass trends for the five assessment regions based on the age-structured assessment model with the egg index and Hay index as spawn indices.

Queen Charlotte Islands

n

/^S^V

Fig. 5.Spawning stock biomass trends for the five assessment regions based on the age-structured assessment model assuming alternative penalty weights or relative variances for the total egg spawn index.

West Coast Vancouver Island

Fig. 5. (cont'd). Spawning stock biomass trends for the five assessment regions based on the age-structured assessment model assuming alternative penalty weights or relative variances for the total egg spawn index.

Section	\overline{Pool}	Sample Size	Median Width
$\overline{6}$ $\ddot{ }$	π	42	45
6	12	14	20.5
21	11	12	50.5
21	12	41	54
21	13	57	120
21	14	14	56.5
21	15	26	45
21	16	29	25
21	17	5	55
23	11	$\pmb{7}$	65
24	11	46	39
24	12	21	21
24	13	21	23
24	14	16	16
24	15	13	19
24	16	19	55
24	17	${\bf 8}$	23.5
25	11	54	32.5
25	12	$\pmb{7}$	52
25	13	17	52
25	14	12	13.5
25	15	39	58
25	16	9	90
25	17	9	80
33	11	9	30
33	12	10	50
33	13	$\boldsymbol{7}$	30
33	14	13	31
33	15	14	40.5
41	11	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	150
42	11	17	103
42	12	31	160
42	13	41	$90\,$
42	14	36	52.5
42	15	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	23
42	16	47	105
42	17	21	90
42	18	$\boldsymbol{7}$	266
42	19	73	250
43	13	12	26.5
43	14	31	40
43	15	10	26.5

Appendix Table 1. Median width estimates for each spawn pool identified within individual sections for the total egg deposition index.

÷

 \bar{z}

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$

 $\ddot{}$

Appendix Table 1 (cont'd). Median width estimates for each spawn pool identified within individual sections for the total egg deposition index.

ja politikana.
Baraton

 \mathbf{v}

 $\ddot{}$

0^

Jp^^

Section	Pool	Sample Size	Median Width
142	13	45	503
è 142	14	134	95.5
142	15	90	91
142	16	6	105.5
142	17	25	27
143	11	55	146
143	12	21	160
143	13	21	129
143	14	10	108.5
143	15	$\overline{7}$	48
172	11	13	80
173	11	9	60
173	12	39	21
173	13	49	36
173	14	111	35
173	15	60	60.5
173	16	41	72
173	17	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	22
173	18	$\overline{\mathcal{I}}$	36
173	19	$\overline{7}$	46
173	20	9	28
233	11	13	28
243	11	11	54
244	11	3	23
244	12	$\frac{3}{3}$	24
244	14		14
252	99	17	35
253	$\mathbf{1}$	27	41
253	99	90	97
272	99	83	42
273	99	100	30.5

Appendix Table 1 (cont'd). Median width estimates for each spawn pool identified within individual sections for the total egg deposition index.

 \bullet

i,

 \pmb{s}

 $\ddot{}$

 Δ

Appendix Table 2. Estimates of the median spawning bed widths for each section and assessment region based on diving survey estimates.

/0^k

 $\overline{}$

 $\hat{\textbf{z}}$

^^

c

Appendix Table 3. Pool Conversion Table for the new standardized index. The pool numbers are shown in the left column as a single digit number <u>preceeded</u> by a 3 digit number representing the Statistical area and section. The number of records used for calculation of surface width, mean and stadard deviation of width are shown. The number of records, mean and standard deviation are also shown for the egg density data that are calculated for each section. (SEC) . When no egg density data were available for specific sections, the data from a representative section were used.

ų.

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

 \boldsymbol{z}

 \sim

^

 $\ddot{}$

/"•fciv

^

/^N

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim \sim