

¹ Status of Big Skate (*Beringraja binoculata*)
² Off the U.S. Pacific Coast in 2019



⁴ Ian G. Taylor¹
⁵ Vladlena Gertseva¹
⁶ Joseph Bizzarro²
⁷ Andi Stephens³

⁸ ¹Northwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and
⁹ Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East,
¹⁰ Seattle, Washington 98112

¹¹ ²Southwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and
¹² Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 110 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz,
¹³ California 95060

¹⁴ ³Northwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and
¹⁵ Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2032 S.E. OSU Drive Newport,
¹⁶ Oregon 97365

¹⁷ DRAFT SAFE

¹⁸ Disclaimer: This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination peer review
¹⁹ under applicable information quality guidelines. It has not been formally disseminated by NOAA
²⁰ Fisheries. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency
²¹ determination or policy.

²² This report may be cited as:

²³ Taylor, I.G., Gertseva, V., Bizzarro, J., and Stephens, A. Status of Big Skate (*Beringraja*
²⁴ *binoculata*) Off the U.S. West Coast, 2019. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, OR.
²⁵ Available from <http://www.pfcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/>

26 Status of Big Skate (*Beringraja binoculata*)
27 Off the U.S. Pacific Coast in 2019

28 **Contents**

29	Executive Summary	1
30	Stock	1
31	Catches	1
32	Data and Assessment	3
33	Stock Biomass	3
34	Recruitment	6
35	Exploitation status	8
36	Ecosystem Considerations	10
37	Reference Points	10
38	Management Performance	11
39	Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties	12
40	Decision Table	12
41	Research and Data Needs	17
42	1 Fishery Data	18
43	1.1 Data	18
44	1.2 Fishery Landings and discards	18
45	1.2.1 Washington Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction	18
46	1.2.2 Oregon Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction	19
47	1.2.3 California Catch Reconstruction	20
48	1.2.4 Tribal Catch in Washington	20
49	1.2.5 Fishery Discards	20
50	2 Fishery-Independent Data Sources	22
51	2.1 Indices of abundance	22
52	2.1.1 Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) Triennial Shelf Survey	22

53	2.1.2	Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey	22
54	2.1.3	Index Standardization	23
55	2.1.4	Internation Pacific Halibut Commission Longline Survey	23
56	2.2	Biological Parameters and Data	25
57	2.2.1	Measurement Details and Conversion Factors	25
58	2.2.2	Fishery dependent length and age composition data	25
59	2.2.3	Survey length and age composition data	25
60	2.2.4	Environmental or Ecosystem Data Included in the Assessment	26
61	3	Assessment	27
62	3.1	Previous Assessments	27
63	3.1.1	History of Modeling Approaches Used for this Stock	27
64	3.2	Model Description	27
65	3.2.1	Modeling Software	27
66	3.2.2	Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas	27
67	3.2.3	Other Specifications	27
68	3.2.4	Data Weighting	28
69	3.2.5	Priors	28
70	3.2.6	Estimated and Fixed Parameters	29
71	3.3	Model Selection and Evaluation	30
72	3.3.1	Key Assumptions and Structural Choices	30
73	3.3.2	Alternate Models Considered	31
74	3.3.3	Convergence	31
75	3.4	Response to the Current STAR Panel Requests	31
76	3.5	Base Case Model Results	32
77	3.5.1	Parameter Estimates	32
78	3.5.2	Fits to the Data	32
79	3.5.3	Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	33
80	3.5.4	Retrospective Analysis	33
81	3.5.5	Likelihood Profiles	34
82	3.5.6	Reference Points	34

84	4 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables	35
85	5 Regional Management Considerations	36
86	6 Research Needs	37
87	7 Acknowledgments	37
88	8 Tables	38
89	8.1 Data Tables	38
90	8.2 Model Results Tables	44
91	9 Figures	60
92	9.0.1 Sensitivity analyses for model	88
93	References	

⁹⁴ **Executive Summary**

⁹⁵ **Stock**

⁹⁶ This assessment reports the status of the Big Skate (*Beringraja binoculata*) resource in U.S.
⁹⁷ waters off the West Coast using data through 2018.

⁹⁸ **Catches**

⁹⁹ Landings and estimated discards of Big Skate were reconstructed for this assessment from
¹⁰⁰ historical records of other species and from species composition data collected in the recent
¹⁰¹ fishery. These reflect the fishery from 1916-1994. The current fishery started in 1995. For
¹⁰² records from 1995-2017, Big Skate landings were estimated from species-composition samples
¹⁰³ and the landings of “Unspecified Skates”. Beginning in 2017, Big Skate have been recorded
¹⁰⁴ in species-specific landings.

¹⁰⁵ In the current fishery (since 1995), annual total landings of Big Skate have ranged between
¹⁰⁶ 135-528 mt, with landings in 2018 totaling 173 mt.

Table a: Recent Big Skate landings (mt)

Year	Landings
2008	366.00
2009	205.70
2010	196.20
2011	268.40
2012	269.60
2013	135.00
2014	372.40
2015	331.50
2016	411.50
2017	277.60
2018	172.60




Figure a: Catch history of Big Skate in the model.

¹⁰⁷ **Data and Assessment**

¹⁰⁸ This the first full assessment for Big Skate. It is currently managed using an OFL which was
¹⁰⁹ based on a proxy for F_{MSY} and a 3-year recent average of survey biomass. This assessment
¹¹⁰ uses the newest version of Stock Synthesis (3.30.13). The model begins in 1916, and assumes
¹¹¹ the stock was at an unfished equilibrium that year.

¹¹² **Stock Biomass**

¹¹³ The 2018 estimated spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass is
¹¹⁴ above the target of 40% of unfished spawning biomass at 72.5% (95% asymptotic interval: \pm
¹¹⁵ 55.2%-89.7%) (Figure c). Approximate confidence intervals based on the asymptotic variance
¹¹⁶ estimates show that the uncertainty in the estimated spawning biomass is high.

Table b: Recent trend in beginning of the year spawning output and depletion for the model for Big Skate.

Year	Spawning Output (million eggs)	~ 95% confidence interval	Estimated depletion	~ 95% confidence interval
2010	1059.250	(425.78-1692.72)	0.694	(0.552-0.837)
2011	1068.670	(434.08-1703.26)	0.700	(0.56-0.841)
2012	1073.990	(438.95-1709.03)	0.704	(0.564-0.843)
2013	1079.980	(444.55-1715.41)	0.708	(0.57-0.846)
2014	1094.970	(458.25-1731.69)	0.718	(0.583-0.852)
2015	1095.100	(458.91-1731.29)	0.718	(0.583-0.852)
2016	1097.700	(461.69-1733.71)	0.719	(0.586-0.853)
2017	1093.720	(458.52-1728.92)	0.717	(0.583-0.851)
2018	1097.080	(461.78-1732.38)	0.719	(0.586-0.852)
2019	1106.070	(504.33-1707.81)	0.725	(0.552-0.897)

Spawning output with ~95% asymptotic intervals




Figure b: Time series of spawning biomass trajectory (circles and line: median; light broken lines: 95% credibility intervals) for the base case assessment model.




Figure c: Estimated relative depletion with approximate 95% asymptotic confidence intervals (dashed lines) for the base case assessment model.

¹¹⁷ **Recruitment**

¹¹⁸ Recruitment was assumed to follow the Beverton-Holt stock recruit curve, so uncertainty in
¹¹⁹ estimated recruitment is due to uncertainty in spawning biomass and the unfished equilibrium
¹²⁰ recruitment R_0 (Figure d and Table c).

Table c: Recent recruitment for the model.

Year	Estimated Recruitment (1,000s)	~ 95% confidence interval
2010	3435.91	(2128.69 - 5545.9)
2011	3450.01	(2142.11 - 5556.47)
2012	3457.92	(2149.79 - 5562.03)
2013	3466.77	(2158.45 - 5568.12)
2014	3488.68	(2179.48 - 5584.31)
2015	3488.86	(2180.18 - 5583.09)
2016	3492.63	(2184.26 - 5584.72)
2017	3486.86	(2179.33 - 5578.88)
2018	3491.73	(2184.37 - 5581.57)
2019	3504.69	(2186.12 - 5618.57)




Figure d: Time series of estimated Big Skate recruitments for the base-case model with 95% confidence or credibility intervals.

¹²¹ **Exploitation status**

¹²² Harvest rates estimated by the base model indicate catch levels have been below the limits
¹²³ that would be associated with the SPR = 50% target (Table d and Figure e).

Table d: Recent trend in spawning potential ratio and exploitation for Big Skate in the model.
Relative fishing intensity is (1-SPR) divided by 50% (the SPR target) and exploitation is
catch divided by age 2+ biomass.

Year	Relative fishing intensity	~ 95% confidence interval	Exploitation rate	~ 95% confidence interval
2009	0.23	(0.12-0.34)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2010	0.22	(0.11-0.32)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2011	0.29	(0.15-0.42)	0.02	(0.01-0.02)
2012	0.29	(0.15-0.42)	0.02	(0.01-0.02)
2013	0.15	(0.08-0.22)	0.01	(0-0.01)
2014	0.39	(0.22-0.56)	0.02	(0.01-0.03)
2015	0.35	(0.19-0.5)	0.02	(0.01-0.03)
2016	0.43	(0.24-0.61)	0.02	(0.01-0.04)
2017	0.30	(0.16-0.44)	0.02	(0.01-0.02)
2018	0.19	(0.1-0.28)	0.01	(0.01-0.01)




Figure e: Estimated spawning potential ratio (SPR) for the base-case model. One minus SPR is plotted so that higher exploitation rates occur on the upper portion of the y-axis. The management target is plotted as a red horizontal line and values above this reflect harvests in excess of the overfishing proxy based on the SPR_{50%} harvest rate. The last year in the time series is 2018.

¹²⁴ **Ecosystem Considerations**

- ¹²⁵ In this assessment, ecosystem considerations were not explicitly included in the analysis.
¹²⁶ This is primarily due to a lack of relevant data and results of analyses (conducted elsewhere)
¹²⁷ that could contribute ecosystem-related quantitative information for the assessment.

¹²⁸ **Reference Points**

- ¹²⁹ This stock assessment estimates that Big Skate in the model is above the biomass target
¹³⁰ ($SB_{40\%}$), and well above the minimum stock size threshold ($SB_{25\%}$). The estimated relative
¹³¹ depletion level for the base model in 2019 is 72.5% (95% asymptotic interval: $\pm 55.2\%-89.7\%$,
¹³² corresponding to an unfished spawning biomass of 1106.07 million eggs (95% asymptotic
¹³³ interval: 504.33-1707.81 million eggs) of spawning biomass in the base model (Table [e](#)).
¹³⁴ Unfished age 1+ biomass was estimated to be 2,426 mt in the base case model. The target
¹³⁵ spawning biomass ($SB_{40\%}$) is 610 million eggs, which corresponds with an equilibrium yield
¹³⁶ of 558 mt. Equilibrium yield at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is
¹³⁷ 466 mt (Figure [f](#)).

Table e: Summary of reference points and management quantities for the base case model.

Quantity	Estimate	Low 2.5% limit	High 2.5% limit
Unfished spawning output (million eggs)	1,526	891	2,161
Unfished age 1+ biomass (mt)	2,426	1,583	3,269
Unfished recruitment (R_0)	4,004	2,395	5,612
Spawning output(2018 million eggs)	1,097	462	1,732
Depletion (2018)	0.719	0.586	0.852
Reference points based on SB_{40%}			
Proxy spawning output ($B_{40\%}$)	610	373	848
SPR resulting in $B_{40\%}$ ($SPR_{B40\%}$)	0.625	0.625	0.625
Exploitation rate resulting in $B_{40\%}$	0.047	0.043	0.051
Yield with $SPR_{B40\%}$ at $B_{40\%}$ (mt)	558	362	754
Reference points based on SPR proxy for MSY			
Spawning output	305	187	424
SPR_{proxy}	0.5		
Exploitation rate corresponding to SPR_{proxy}	0.069	0.063	0.075
Yield with SPR_{proxy} at SB_{SPR} (mt)	466	303	629
Reference points based on estimated MSY values			
Spawning output at MSY (SB_{MSY})	578	352	804
SPR_{MSY}	0.612	0.608	0.615
Exploitation rate at MSY	0.049	0.045	0.053
Dead Catch MSY (mt)	559	363	755
Retained Catch MSY (mt)	517	337	698

138 Management Performance

Table f: Recent trend in total catch (mt) relative to the management guidelines. Big skate was managed in the Other Species complex in 2013 and 2014, designated an Ecosystem Component species in 2015 and 2016, and managed with stock-specific harvest specifications since 2017.

Year	OFL (mt; ABC prior to 2011)	ABC (mt)	ACL (mt; OY prior to 2011)	Estimated total catch (mt)
2009				205.70
2010				196.20
2011				268.40
2012				269.60
2013	458.00	317.90	317.90	135.00
2014	458.00	317.90	317.90	372.40
2015				331.50
2016				411.50
2017	541.00	494.00	494.00	277.60
2018	541.00	494.00	494.00	172.60
2019	541.00	494.00	494.00	
2020	541.00	494.00	494.00	

¹³⁹ **Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties**

¹⁴⁰ **Decision Table**

Table g: Projections of landings, total mortality, OFL, and ACL values based on an SPR target of 50Category 2 Sigma which creates the buffer shown in the right-hand column.

Year	Landings (mt)	Estimated total mortality (mt)	OFL (mt)	ACL (mt)	Buffer
2019	313.16	336.35	541.00	494.00	1.00
2020	313.16	336.32	541.00	494.00	1.00
2021	1042.23	1119.74	1275.51	1119.75	0.87
2022	987.51	1062.58	1222.62	1062.58	0.86
2023	942.80	1015.91	1179.51	1015.91	0.86
2024	906.41	977.59	1145.41	977.59	0.85
2025	876.49	945.64	1118.21	945.64	0.84
2026	850.59	917.76	1095.36	917.76	0.83
2027	828.05	893.39	1075.04	893.39	0.83
2028	805.87	869.37	1056.06	869.37	0.82
2029	784.60	846.33	1037.94	846.33	0.81
2030	764.95	825.07	1020.44	825.07	0.80

Table h: Summary of 10-year projections beginning in 2020 for alternate states of nature based on an axis of uncertainty for the model. Columns range over low, mid, and high states of nature, and rows range over different assumptions of catch levels. An entry of “-” indicates that the stock is driven to very low abundance under the particular scenario.

		States of nature					
		Low M 0.05		Base M 0.07		High M 0.09	
	Year	Catch	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output
40-10 Rule, Low M	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
40-10 Rule	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
40-10 Rule, High M	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average Catch	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table i: Base case results summary.

Quantity	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Landings (mt)	313.160	313.160	1042.228	987.509	942.796	906.409	876.485	850.594	828.055	805.865
Total Est. Catch (mt)	336.345	336.325	1119.745	1062.581	1015.907	977.592	945.644	917.761	893.393	869.365
OFL (mt)	541.00	541.00	1275.51	1222.62	1179.51	1145.41	1118.21	1095.36	1075.04	1056.06
ACL (mt)	494.000	494.000	1119.750	1062.580	1015.910	977.592	945.643	917.762	893.393	869.365
(1-SPR)(1-SPR _{50%})	0.22	0.29	0.29	0.15	0.39	0.35	0.43	0.30	0.19	
Exploitation rate	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	
Age 1+ biomass (mt)	17752.6	17914.2	18070.4	18140.7	18203.3	18389.4	18320.0	18306.6	18214.4	18273.9
Spawning Output	1059.2	1068.7	1074.0	1080.0	1095.0	1095.1	1097.7	1093.7	1097.1	1106.1
95% CI	(425.78- 1692.72)	(434.08- 1703.26)	(438.95- 1709.03)	(444.55- 1715.41)	(458.25- 1731.69)	(458.91- 1731.29)	(461.69- 1733.71)	(458.52- 1728.92)	(461.78- 1732.38)	(504.33- 1707.81)
Depletion	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
95% CI	(0.552-0.837)	(0.56-0.841)	(0.564-0.843)	(0.57-0.846)	(0.583-0.852)	(0.583-0.852)	(0.586-0.853)	(0.583-0.851)	(0.586-0.852)	(0.552-0.897)
Recruits	3435.91	3450.01	3457.92	3466.77	3488.68	3488.86	3492.63	3486.86	3491.73	3504.69
95% CI	(2128.69 - 5545.9)	(2142.11 - 5556.47)	(2149.79 - 5562.03)	(2158.45 - 5568.12)	(2179.48 - 5584.31)	(2180.18 - 5583.09)	(2184.26 - 5584.72)	(2179.33 - 5578.88)	(2184.37 - 5581.57)	(2186.12 - 5618.57)




Figure f: Equilibrium yield curve for the base case model. Values are based on the 2018 fishery selectivity and with steepness fixed at 0.718.

¹⁴¹ **Research and Data Needs**

¹⁴² We recommend the following research be conducted before the next assessment:

¹⁴³ 1. **Data!:**

¹⁴⁴ 2. **xxxx:**

¹⁴⁵ 3. **xxxx:**

¹⁴⁶ 4. **xxxx:**

¹⁴⁷ 5. **xxxx:**

¹⁴⁸ **1 Fishery Data**

¹⁴⁹ **1.1 Data**

¹⁵⁰ Data used in the Big Skate assessment are summarized in Figure 2. Descriptions of the data
¹⁵¹ sources are in the following sections.

¹⁵² **1.2 Fishery Landings and discards**

¹⁵³ Catch information for Big Skate is very limited, in part because the requirement to sort
¹⁵⁴ landings of Big Skate in the shore-based Individual Fishing Quota fishery from landings in
¹⁵⁵ the “Unidentified Skate” category was not implemented until June 2015. The historical catch
¹⁵⁶ of Big Skate therefore relies on the historical reconstruction of the landings of all skates as
¹⁵⁷ well as an analysis of discards of Longnose Skate. The estimated landings for each state and
¹⁵⁸ the tribal fishery are provided in Table 1 and shown in Figure 3.

¹⁵⁹ **1.2.1 Washington Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction**

¹⁶⁰ Estimates of landings of Big Skate in Washington state were estimated as a fraction of total
¹⁶¹ skate landings as described in (Gertseva, V. 2019a). The approach relied on trawl survey
¹⁶² estimates of depth distributions for each species, combined with logbook estimates of fishing
¹⁶³ depths in each year.

¹⁶⁴ The WCGBT Survey data was used to estimate proportions of longnose and big skates by
¹⁶⁵ depth (aggregated into 100m bins) and year for the period of the survey (between 2003 and
¹⁶⁶ 2018). Big Skate were primarily found in the 0–100m and 100–200m. Trawl logbook data
¹⁶⁷ include information on the amount of retained catch of skate (all species combined) within
¹⁶⁸ each haul as well depth of catch. The proportion of Big Skate for each depth bin was assigned
¹⁶⁹ to the skate catch for each haul within those depth bins and summed to get a total for each
¹⁷⁰ year. When survey skate information was available (2003–2018), survey skate proportions
¹⁷¹ were applied by depth and year to account for inter-annual variability in those proportions.
¹⁷² Prior to 2003, average proportions from 2003–2007 within each depth bin were applied.

¹⁷³ These estimated annual proportion of Big Skate relative to all skates from the logbook
¹⁷⁴ analysis was then applied to total Washington skate landings by year (provided by WDFW)
¹⁷⁵ to account for landings that weren’t included in the available logbook data. Prior to 1987
¹⁷⁶ (when no logbook data were available), the average proportion Big Skate within the combined
¹⁷⁷ skate category, calculated from 1987–1992 logbook data, was applied to total skate landings
¹⁷⁸ in Washington. Estimated Big Skate landings provided by WDFW were used for the period
¹⁷⁹ from 2004 forward.

180 **1.2.2 Oregon Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction**

181 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) provided newly reconstructed commercial
182 landings for all observed skate species for the 2019 assessment cycle (1978 – 2018). In
183 addition, the methods were reviewed at a pre-assessment workshop. Historically, skates were
184 landed as a single skate complex in Oregon. In 2009, longnose skates were separated into
185 their own single-species landing category, and in 2014, big skates were also separated. The
186 reconstruction methodology differed by these three time blocks in which species composition
187 collections diverged (1978 – 2008; 2009 – 2014; 2015 – 2018).

188 Species compositions of skate complexes from commercial port sampling are available
189 throughout this time period but are generally limited, which precluded the use of all strata
190 for reconstructing landings. Quarter and port were excluded, retaining gear type, PMFC
191 area, and market category for stratifying reconstructed landings within the three time
192 blocks. Bottom trawl gear types include multiple bottom trawl gears, and account for
193 greater than 98% of skate landings . Minor gear types include primarily bottom longline
194 gear, but also include mid-water trawl, hook and line, shrimp trawl, pot gear and scallop
195 dredge.

196 For bottom trawl gears, trawl logbook areas and adjusted skate catches were matched with
197 strata-specific species compositions. In Time Block 1 (1978 – 2008), all bottom trawl gear
198 types were aggregated due to a lack of specificity in the gear recorded on the fish tickets.
199 However, in Time Blocks 2 and 3, individual bottom trawl gear types were retained. Some
200 borrowing of species compositions was required (31% of strata) and when necessary, borrowed
201 from the closest area or from the most similar gear type . Longline gear landings were
202 reconstructed in a similar fashion as to bottom trawl and required some borrowing among
203 strata as well (25%).

204 Due to insufficient species compositions, mid-water trawl landings were reconstructed using a
205 novel depth-based approach. Available compositions indicate that the proportion by weight
206 of big skates within a composition drops to zero at approximately 100 fathoms, and an inverse
207 relationship is observed for longnose skate, where the proportion by weight is consistently
208 one beyond 100 – 150 fathoms . Complex-level landings were assigned a depth from logbook
209 entries and these species specific depth associations were used to parse out landings by
210 species. The approach differed somewhat by time block . Landings from shrimp trawls were
211 handled using a similar methodology. Finally, very minor landings from hook and line, pot
212 gear and scallop dredges were assigned a single aggregated species composition, as they lack
213 any gear-specific composition samples. Landings from within a time block were apportioned
214 by year using the proportion of the annual ticket landings.

215 Results indicate that the species-specific landings from this reconstruction are very similar
216 to those from Oregon's commercial catch reconstruction (Karnowski et al. 2014) during the
217 overlapping years but cover a greater time period with methodology more applicable to skates
218 in particular. ODFW intends to incorporate reconstructed skate landings into PacFIN in
219 the future (A. Whitman, ODFW; pers. comm.).

220 **1.2.3 California Catch Reconstruction**

221 A reconstruction of historical skate landings from California waters was developed for the
222 1916–2017 time period using a combination of commercial catch data (spatially explicit block
223 summary catches and port sample data from 2009-2017) and fishery-independent survey data
224 (Bizzarro, J. [2019](#)). Virtually all landings in California were of “unspecified skate” until
225 species-composition sampling of skate market categories began in 2009.

226 From 2009 through 2017, catch estimates were based on these market category species-
227 composition samples, and the average of those species-compositions was hindcast to 2002,
228 based on the assumption that those data were representative of the era of large area closures
229 in the post-2000 period.

230 For the period from 1936-1980, spatially explicit landings data (the California Department
231 of Fisheries and Wildlife (CDFW) block summary data) were merged with survey data to
232 provide species-specific estimates.

233 For years 1981-2001, a “blended” product of these two approaches was taken, in which
234 a linear weighting scheme blended the two sets of catch estimates through that period.
235 Landings estimates were also scaled upwards by an expansion factor for skates landed as
236 “dressed” based on fish ticket data. Prior to 1981 these data had not been reported and
237 skate landings were scaled by the “average” percentage landed as dressed in the 1981-1985
238 time period, but by the late 1980s nearly all skates were landed round.

239 As no spatial information on catch is available from 1916-1930, and the block summary
240 data were very sparse in the first few years of the CDFW fish ticket program (1931-1934),
241 spatial information from the late 1930’s was used to hindcast to the 1916–1935 time period.
242 However, since Washington and Oregon did not have catch estimates for this year period,
243 the California estimates of catch prior to 1938 were not used as they were subsumed into an
244 estimated of the total catch across all states increasing linearly from 1916 to 1950.

245 **1.2.4 Tribal Catch in Washington**

246 Tribal catch of Big Skate was provided by WDFW as all landings took place in Washington
247 State. The landings were estimated from limited state sampling of species compositions in
248 combined skate category. Anecdotal evidence suggest that most of the catch in tribal fishery
249 is retained, and discard is minimal.

250 **1.2.5 Fishery Discards**

251 Fishery discards of Big Skate are highly uncertain. The method used to estimate discards for
252 Longnose Skate was based on a strong correlation ($R^2 = 95.7\%$) between total mortality of

253 that species, and total mortality of Dover Sole for the years 2009–2017 during which Longnose
254 were landed separately from other skates. In contrast, the sorting requirement for Big Skate
255 occurred too recently to provide an adequate range of years for this type of correlation.
256 Furthermore, there is greater uncertainty in the total mortality for the shallow-water species
257 with which Big Skate most often co-occurs, such as Sand Sole and Starry Flounder, than
258 there is for Dover Sole, which has been the subject of recurring stock assessments.

259 Both what discard rate information is available and anecdotal information from those in-
260 volved in the fishery for both skate species indicate that discarding for Big Skate and Long-
261 nose Skate in the years prior to 1995 were driven by the same market forced and the discard
262 rates were similar. Therefore, the discard rate for Longnose Skate was used as a proxy for
263 the discards of Big Skate in order to estimate Big Skate discards.

264 The reconstructed landings of Big Skate for the period 1950–1995 had a mean of 63.1 t with
265 no significant trend (a linear model fit to the data increased from 62.8 t in 1950 to 63.5 in
266 1995. The estimated tribal catch prior to 1995 averaged less than 1 t and was not included
267 in this analysis of Big Skate discards for the years prior to 1995.

268 The mean discard rate for LN was 92.46%, also with no significant linear trend (the linear
269 fit decreased from 92.8% in 1950 to 92.1% in 1995). An estimate of the mean annual discard
270 amount can therefore be calculated as from the mean discard rate and the mean landings as
271 $\bar{L}/(1 - \bar{d})$ where \bar{L} is the mean landings across that time period and \bar{d} is the mean discards
272 (Figure ??).

273 Two alternative methods were used to estimate the mean annual discard amount: applying
274 the annual LN discard rates to the annual BS catch, and applying 3-year moving averages
275 of these two quantities. The use of the annual values resulted in an implausibly high degree
276 of annual variability among the estimates, with the most extreme being a spike of 2146.4 in
277 1979 compared to 1032.7 t the year before and 654.0 the year after. The use of the 3-year
278 moving average dampened this variability and these estimates were retained for a sensitivity
279 analysis (Figure ??).

280 A discard mortality rate of 50 percent was assumed for all discards, following the assumption
281 used for the Longnose Skate assessment conducted for the U.S. West Coast in 2007 (???)
282 The same rate has been used for skates in the trawl fishery in British Columbia, based on
283 an approximate average of these reported rates. In 2015, PFMC’s Groundfish Management
284 Team (GMT) conducted a comprehensive literature review of skate discard mortality, and
285 concluded that the current assumption regarding Big Skate discard mortality is consistent
286 with existing reported rates for other similar species.

287 Estimation of discard rates (discards amount relative to total catch) during the period of the
288 West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP), which began in 2002, was hindered
289 by the landings of Big Skate primarily occurring in the “unspecified skate” category prior
290 to 2015. Therefore, a discard rate was computed using the combination of Big Skate and
291 unspecified skate under the assumption that the vast majority of the unspecified skates were

²⁹² Big Skate. A coefficient of variation was calculated for the by bootstrapping vessels within
²⁹³ ports because the observer program randomly chooses vessels within ports to be observed.
²⁹⁴ For the years after the catch share program was implemented in 2011, the trawl fishery was
²⁹⁵ subject to 100% observer coverage and discarding is assumed to be known with minimal
²⁹⁶ error (CV = 0.01).

²⁹⁷ The mean body weight of discarded Big Skates, calculated from the weight and count of
²⁹⁸ baskets of discarded Big Skate, was available for the years 2002–2017.

²⁹⁹ 2 Fishery-Independent Data Sources

³⁰⁰ 2.1 Indices of abundance

³⁰¹ 2.1.1 Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) Triennial Shelf Survey

³⁰² Research surveys have been used since the 1970s to provide fishery-independent information
³⁰³ about the abundance, distribution, and biological characteristics of Big Skate. A coast-
³⁰⁴ wide survey was conducted in 1977 (Gunderson, Donald Raymond and Sample, Terrance M.
³⁰⁵ [1980](#)) by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, and repeated every three years through 2001.
³⁰⁶ The final year of this survey, 2004, was conducted by the NWFSC according to the AFSC
³⁰⁷ protocol. We refer to this as the **Triennial Survey**.

³⁰⁸ The survey design used equally-spaced transects from which searches for tows in a specific
³⁰⁹ depth range were initiated. The depth range and latitudinal range was not consistent across
³¹⁰ years, but all years in the period 1980–2004 included the area from 40° 10'N north to the
³¹¹ Canadian border and a depth range that included 55–366 meters, which spans the range
³¹² where the vast majority of Big Skate encountered in all trawl surveys. Therefore the index
³¹³ was based on this depth range. The survey as conducted in 1977 had incomplete coverage
³¹⁴ and is not believed to be comparable to the later years, and is not used in the index.

³¹⁵ 2.1.2 Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl ³¹⁶ Survey

³¹⁷ In 2003, the NWFSC took over an ongoing slope survey the AFSC had been conducting,
³¹⁸ and expanded it spatially to include the continental shelf. This survey, referred to in this
³¹⁹ document as the “WCGBT Survey” or “WCGBTS”, is conducted annually. It uses a random-
³²⁰ grid design covering the coastal waters from a depth of 55 m to 1,280 m from late-May
³²¹ to early-October (Bradburn, M.J. and Keller, A.A and Horness, B.H. [2011](#), Keller, A.A.
³²² and Wallace, J.R. and Methot, R.D. [2017](#)). Four chartered industry vessels are used each
³²³ year (with the exception of 2013 when the U.S. federal-government shutdown curtailed the
³²⁴ survey).

325 **2.1.3 Index Standardization**

326 The index standardization methods for the two bottom trawl surveys matched that used for
327 Longnose Skate and additional detail is provided in (Gertseva, V. 2019a). The data from both
328 surveys was analyzed using a spatio-temporal delta-model (Thorson, J. T. and Shelton, A.
329 O. and Ward, E. J. and Skaug, H. J. 2015), implemented as an R package VAST (Thorson,
330 James T. and Barnett, Lewis A. K. 2017) and publicly available online (<https://github.com/James-Thorson/VAST>). Spatial and spatio-temporal variation is specifically included
332 in both encounter probability and positive catch rates, a logit-link for encounter probability,
333 and a log-link for positive catch rates. Vessel-year effects were included for each unique
334 combination of vessel and year in the database for the WCGBT Survey but not the Triennial
335 survey. Further details regarding model structure are available in the user manual (https://github.com/James-Thorson/VAST/blob/master/examples/VAST_user_manual.pdf).
336

337 Spatial patterns in the survey estimates show Big Skate widely distributed along the coast,
338 with higher densities in the central and more northern areas and closer to shore 7.

339 **2.1.4 Internation Pacific Halibut Commission Longline Survey**

340 The IPHC has conducted an annual longline survey for Pacific Halibut off the coast of Oregon
341 and Washington since 1997 (no surveys were performed in 1998 or 2000). Beginning in 1999,
342 this has been a fixed station design, with 84 locations in this area (station locations differed
343 in 1997, and are therefore not comparable with subsequent surveys). 400 to 800 hooks have
344 been deployed at each station in 100-hook groups (typically called “skates” although that
345 term will be avoided here to avoid confusion). The gear used to conduct the survey was
346 designed to efficiently sample Pacific Halibut and used 16/0 (#3) circle hooks baited with
347 Chum Salmon.

348 In some years from 2011 onward, additional stations were added to the survey to sample
349 Yelloweye Rockfish. These stations were excluded from the analysis, as were additional
350 stations added in 2013, 2014, and 2017, off the coast of California (south of 42 degrees
351 latitude). Some variability in exact sampling location is practically unavoidable, and leeway
352 is given in the IPHC methods to center the set on the target coordinates while allowing wind
353 and currents to dictate the actual direction in which the gear is deployed. This can result in
354 different habitats being accessed at each fixed deployment location across years. One station
355 that was very close to the U.S. Canada border had the mid-point of the set in Canada in 2
356 out of the 19 years of the survey. For consistency among years, all samples from this station
357 were included in the analysis, including those in Canada.

358 In most years, bycatch of non-halibut species has been recorded during this survey on the
359 first 20 hooks of each 100-hook group, although in 2003 only 10% of the hooks were observed
360 for bycatch, and starting in 2012, some stations had 100% of the hooks observed for bycatch.
361 Combining these observation pattern with the number of hooks deployed each year, resulted

362 in most stations having 80, 100, 120, 140, or 160 hooks observed, with a mean of 144 hooks
363 and a maximum of 800 hooks observed. The depth range of the 84 stations considered was
364 42—530 m, thus extending beyond the range of Big Skate, but 74% of the stations were
365 shallower than 200 m. Big Skate have been observed at 51 of the 84 the standard stations
366 that were retained for this analysis, but no station had Big Skates observed in more than 12
367 out of the 19 years of survey data, and only 10% of the station/year combinations had at
368 least one observed Big Skate (Figure X). Of those station/year combinations with at least
369 one Big Skate observed, the Big Skates were observed on an average of 1.3% of the hooks
370 observed. The highest proportion was 10 Big Skates out of 81 hooks observed at one station.

371 The IPHC longline survey catch data were standardized using a Generalized Linear Model
372 (GLM) with binomial error structure. Catch-per-hook was modeled, rather than catch per
373 station due to the variability in the number of hooks deployed and observed each year. The
374 binomial error structure was considered logical, given the binary nature of capturing (or not)
375 a Longnose Skate on each longline hook. The modeling approach is identical to that which
376 has been applied in the past for Yelloweye Rockfish (???), and Spiny Dogfish (Gertseva,
377 V. 2019b). MCMC sampling of the GLM parameters was used to estimate the variability
378 around each index estimate. The median index estimates themselves were approximately
379 equal to the observed mean catch rate in each year (Figure Y). In recent years, the IPHC
380 standardization of the index of halibut abundance has included an adjustment to account
381 for missing baits on hooks returned empty in an effort to account for reduced catchability
382 of the gear that may result from the lost bait. This adjustment was not included in the
383 analysis for Big Skate although it could be considered in future years.

³⁸⁴ **2.2 Biological Parameters and Data**

³⁸⁵ **2.2.1 Measurement Details and Conversion Factors**

³⁸⁶ Some size measurements were taken as either disc width or inter-spiracle width rather than
³⁸⁷ total length. A conversion from disc width to total length was estimated as $L = 1.3399 * W$
³⁸⁸ based on from 95 samples from WCGBT Survey where both measurements collected (R-
³⁸⁹ squared = 0.9983). Little sex difference observed, so using single relationship for both sexes.
³⁹⁰ This estimate is similar to the conversion estimated by Ebert (2008) for Big Skate in Alaska.
³⁹¹ The inter-spiracle width to total length was converted based on estimates from Downs &
³⁹² Cheng (???:

³⁹³
$$L = 12.111 + 9.761 * ISW \text{ (females),}$$

³⁹⁴
$$L = 3.824 + 10.927 * ISW \text{ (males).}$$

³⁹⁵ **2.2.2 Fishery dependent length and age composition data**

³⁹⁶ Fishery length composition data was available from PacFIN were available for the years
³⁹⁷ 1995–2018 (with the exception of 2000) as shown in Table 3. Ages were available from only
³⁹⁸ 2004, 2008–2012, and 2018. These were all represented as conditioned on length in order to
³⁹⁹ provide more detailed information about the relationship between age and length, to reduce
⁴⁰⁰ any influence of size-based selectivity on the age composition, and to ensure independence
⁴⁰¹ from the length samples. Furthermore, the samples from Washington in 2009 were sampled
⁴⁰² using a length-stratified system, so should only be treated as conditioned on length.

⁴⁰³ Length compositions of Big Skate discarded in commercial fisheries measured by the West
⁴⁰⁴ Coast Groundfish Observer program were available for the years 2010–2017.

⁴⁰⁵ The input sample sizes for the length compositions were calculated via the Stewart Method
⁴⁰⁶ (Ian Stewart, personal communication, IPHC):

⁴⁰⁷
$$\text{Input } N = N_{\text{hauls}} + 0.138 * N_{\text{fish}} \text{ if } N_{\text{fish}}/N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ is } < 44,$$

⁴⁰⁸
$$\text{Input } N = 7.06 * N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ if } N_{\text{fish}}/N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ is } \geq 44.$$

⁴⁰⁹ However, no haul had greater than 44 Big Skate sampled, so only the first formula was used.

⁴¹⁰ **2.2.3 Survey length and age composition data**

⁴¹¹ Lengths of Big Skate were only collected form the Triennial survey in 1998, 2001, and 2004,
⁴¹² but 1998 had only 3 samples and were excluded from this analysis. Length compositions were

⁴¹³ available for all years of the WCGBT Survey. Sample sizes for both surveys are provided in
⁴¹⁴ Table 4. The WCGBT Survey used disc width for the years 2006 and 2007 and total length
⁴¹⁵ in all other years. Those samples where only disc width was measured were converted to
⁴¹⁶ total length using the formula above.

⁴¹⁷ The length compositions from the fishery and each of the two surveys aggregated across all
⁴¹⁸ years is shown in Figure 9.

⁴¹⁹ Ages were available from the WCGBT Survey in the years 2009, 2010, 2016, 2017, and 2018.
⁴²⁰ No ages were available from the Triennial Survey.

⁴²¹ Ageing Precision and Bias

⁴²² Ages of Big Skate were all estimated based on growth band counts of sectioned vertebrae.
⁴²³ Ageing precision and bias were estimated using double-reads of 518 Big Skate vertebrae using
⁴²⁴ the approach of Punt et al. (???). The results showed strong agreement among readers
⁴²⁵ (Figure ??), with a standard deviation of the ageing error increasing from about 0.4 at age
⁴²⁶ 0 to 1.6 years at age 15 (Figure 13).

⁴²⁷ Weight-Length

⁴²⁸ The mean weight as a function of length was estimated from 1159 samples from the WCGBT
⁴²⁹ Survey using a linear regression on a log-log scale. Sex was not found to be a significant
⁴³⁰ predictor, so a single relationship was estimated: $Weight = 0.0000074924 * Length^{2.9925}$
⁴³¹ (Figure 14).

⁴³² Sex Ratio, Maturity, and Fecundity

⁴³³ The female maturity relationship was based on visual maturity estimates from port sam-
⁴³⁴ plers ($n = 278$, of which 241 were from Oregon and 37 from Washington, with 24 mature
⁴³⁵ specimens) as well as 55 samples from the WCGBT Survey (of which 4 were mature). The
⁴³⁶ resulting relationship was $L_{50\%} = 148.2453$ with a slope parameter of $Beta = -0.13155$ in
⁴³⁷ the relationship $M = (1 + Beta(L - L_{50\%}))^{-1}$ (Figure 15).

⁴³⁸ 2.2.4 Environmental or Ecosystem Data Included in the Assessment

⁴³⁹ In this assessment, neither environmental nor ecosystem considerations were explicitly in-
⁴⁴⁰ cluded in the analysis. This is primarily due to a lack of relevant data or results of analyses
⁴⁴¹ that could contribute ecosystem-related quantitative information for the assessment.

442 **3 Assessment**

443 **3.1 Previous Assessments**

444 **3.1.1 History of Modeling Approaches Used for this Stock**

445 No previous stock assessment has been conducted for Big Skate. The current management
446 is based on an OFL estimate calculated from a proxy for F_{MSY} and average survey biomass
447 from the WCGBT Survey during the years 2010–2012 (???). The F_{MSY} estimate was based
448 on the product of an assumed F_{MSY}/M ratio and an M estimate of 0.162 based on the
449 maximum age of 26 reported by McFarlane and King (McFarlane GA and King JR 2006).
450 Values were sampled from an assumed distribution around all these quantities to develop a
451 measure of uncertainty around the OFL estimate.

452 **3.2 Model Description**

453 **3.2.1 Modeling Software**

454 The STAT team used Stock Synthesis version 3.30.13 (Methot, Richard D. and Wetzel,
455 Chantell R. (2013), (??)). The r4ss package version 1.35.1 (Taylor et al. 2019) was used to
456 post-process the output data from Stock Synthesis.

457 **3.2.2 Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas**

458 Catch is divided among 4 fleets in the base model: *Fishery (current)* combines all non-tribal
459 sources of catch for the years 1995 onward, *Discard (historical)* includes the estimated discard
460 amount calculated from the estimated Longnose Skate discard rate as described above. The
461 input catch for this fleet was 50% of the total estimate to account for the assumed 50%
462 discard mortality rate. This data covers the period 1916–1994. *Fishery (historical)* includes
463 the reconstructed landings estimates from each of the three states for 1916–1994. *Tribal*
464 includes the estimates of catch of Big Skate by treaty tribes.

465 **3.2.3 Other Specifications**

466 This assessment covers the U.S. West Coast stock of Big Skate in off the coasts of Washington,
467 Oregon and California, the area bounded by the U.S.-Canada border to the north, and the
468 U.S.-Mexico border to the south. The population is treated as a single coastwide stock

469 with no net movement in or out of the area. Females and males are modeled separately as
470 there is evidence for differences in growth based on both the age and length data, as well as
471 patterns in the sex ratios associated with the length composition data. Natural Mortality
472 is estimated within the model using natural mortality prior developed by Hamel (2015). A
473 Beverton-Holt stock-recruit function is assumed with no deviations from the spawner-recruit
474 curve estimated.

475 The length composition data are stratified into 37 5-cm bins, ranging between 20 and 200
476 cm and the age data are stratified into ages 0–15+, conditioned on the same length bin
477 structure. The population dynamics are computed over a larger range of lengths age ages,
478 with the 5-cm length bins extending up to 250 cm and the numbers-at-age computed up to
479 age 20.

480 3.2.4 Data Weighting

481 The Francis (2011) data weighting method “TA1.8” as implemented in the r4ss package was
482 used for all length and age composition data.

483 3.2.5 Priors

484 *Natural mortality*

485 A log-normal prior for natural mortality was based on a meta-analysis completed by Hamel
486 (2015). The Hamel prior for M is $\text{lognormal}(\ln(5.4/\text{max age}), .438)$, which based on the
487 single 15-year-old fish observed out of 1034 ages from the WCGBT Survey. This results in
488 $\text{lognormal}(\log(0.36)=-1.021651, 0.438)$ prior.

489 *Survey catchability*

490 The lack of contrast in the data resulted in unstable model results under a variety of con-
491 figurations. To keep biomass estimates within a plausibel range, a prior was applied to the
492 catchability parameter (q) for the WCGBT Survey. This same prior was developed for the
493 2007 Longnose Skate assessment (???) and is being used for the current Longnose Skate
494 assessment (Gertseva, V. 2019a). The prior for the WCGBT Survey was derived as follows.

495 The WCGBT Survey covers the full latitudinal range of longnose skate modeled in the
496 assessment, and thus, the latitudinal availability factor was assumed to be one (complete
497 latitudinal coverage). The survey coverage exceeds the maximum depth distribution of
498 longnose skate but may not fully cover the shallow end of the skate distribution. A range of
499 95 to 100 percent was assumed for the depth availability. A range of 75 to 95 percent was
500 assumed for vertical availability on the basis that longnose skate are known to bury in the

501 mud and therefore some may be unavailable to the bottom trawl gear. The largest bounds
502 were placed on the probability of capture, given a fish is in the net path. It is known that
503 flatfish can be herded by trawl gear, and it is possible that this could also occur for skates.
504 However, it is also possible that skate could avoid the trawl nets. For capture probability,
505 a range of 75 to 150 percent was assumed. Best estimates for each factors were set at the
506 midpoint of the range for individual factors, except for the probability of capture, which was
507 given a value of one. The overall estimate for the survey catchability was thus estimated to
508 be 0.83 and the consequent bounds on catch, and the best assumption are: (0.53, 1.43) and
509 0.83 respectively. The best estimate was equated to the median of a lognormal distribution
510 and the bounds to 99 percent of that distribution. This resulted in a normal prior on $\log(q)$,
511 with a mean of -0.188, and standard deviation of 0.187.

512 3.2.6 Estimated and Fixed Parameters

513 A full list of all estimated and fixed parameters is provided in Tables 6.

514 The base model has a total of 44 estimated parameters in the following categories:

- 515 • 1 natural mortality parameter,
- 516 • 6 parameters related to female growth and the variability in length age age,
- 517 • 2 parameters related to male growth relative to female growth,
- 518 • 1 stock-recruit parameter ($\log(R_0)$) controlling equilibrium recruitment)
- 519 • 3 catchability parameters (1 for the WCGBT Survey and 1 each for the early and late
520 periods of the Triennial Survey)
- 521 • 2 extra standard deviation parameters (1 for each survey), and
- 522 • 29 selectivity parameters, including 16 related to time-varying retention rate

523 The estimated parameters are described in greater detail below and a full list of all estimated
524 and parameters is provided in Table 6.

525 *Growth.*

526 Examination of patterns of age-at-length and length-at-age indicated unusual patterns of
527 growth for Big Skate, including almost linear growth for the early years during which both
528 sexes appeared to have similar average size, followed by strong differences in size at older
529 ages. This led to the choice to model growth using the “growth cessation model” recently
530 developed by Maunder et al. (2018). This model provided two key advantages over the more
531 common von Bertalanffy growth model in the case of Big Skate: it allowed essentially linear

532 growth for the early years and it allowed growth for the earlier ages to be similar between
533 females and males while diverging at older ages. The growth cessation model also improve
534 the negative log likelihood by 45 units relative to the von Bertalanffy growth model.

535 *Natural Mortality.*

536 Male natural mortality was assumed equal to the value estimated for females. Sensitivity
537 analyses were used to test the impact of both the prior on natural mortality and the
538 assumption of equal natural mortality for both sexes.

539 *Selectivity.*

540 A double-normal selectivity function was used for all fleets to allow consideration of both
541 asymptotic and dome-shaped patterns. For the fishery and the Triennial survey, the dif-
542 ference in likelihood between dome-shaped and asymptotic patterns was very small and in
543 the case of the Triennial survey, the dome-shape occurred at a length beyond almost all
544 observations, indicating that this shape was likely driven by fit to other data sources, such
545 as the index, rather than the length composition data. The WCGBT Survey was allowed
546 to remain dome-shaped as this survey had the selectivity peak at a smaller length than the
547 other fleets and the likelihood was improved by the dome-shape. The WCGBT Survey also
548 has the shortest hauls, with 15 minutes or less of bottom contact, so larger skates may be
549 better able to escape the net.

550 In order to fit a strong skew in the sex ratios toward males for the length bins in which
551 the majority of the samples were found, it was necessary to estimate a sex-specific offset
552 of selectivity. Two offset parameters were estimated for all fleets, one for the difference in
553 length at peak selectivity and another for the maximum selectivity. The ascending slope was
554 assumed equal in all cases, as was the descending slope for the WCGBT Survey.

555 *Other Estimated Parameters.*

556 *Other Fixed Parameters.*

557 Steepness was fixed at 0.4.

558 3.3 Model Selection and Evaluation

559 3.3.1 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices

560 **To be added**

561 **3.3.2 Alternate Models Considered**

562 **To be added**

563 **3.3.3 Convergence**

564 **To be added**

565 **3.4 Response to the Current STAR Panel Requests**

566 **Request No. 1:**

567

568 **Rationale:** xxx

569 **STAT Response:** xxx

570 **Request No. 2:**

571

572 **Rationale:** xxx

573 **STAT Response:** xxx

574 **Request No. 3:**

575

576 **Rationale:** x.

577 **STAT Response:** xxx

578 **Request No. 4:**

579

580 **Rationale:** xxx

581 **STAT Response:** xxx

582 **Request No. 5:**

583

584 **Rationale:** xxx

585 **STAT Response:** xxx

586 **3.5 Base Case Model Results**

587 The following description of the model results reflects a base model that incorporates all of
588 the changes made during the STAR panel (see previous section). The base model parameter
589 estimates and their approximate asymptotic standard errors are shown in Table 6 and the
590 likelihood components are in Table 7. Estimates of derived reference points and approximate
591 95% asymptotic confidence intervals are shown in Table e. Time-series of estimated stock
592 size over time are shown in Table 8.

593 **3.5.1 Parameter Estimates**

594 The additional survey variability (process error added directly to each year's input variabil-
595 ity) for all surveys was estimated within the model.

596 (Figure 29).

597 The stock-recruit curve ... Figure 30 with estimated recruitments also shown.

598 **3.5.2 Fits to the Data**

599 Model fits to the indices of abundance, fishery length composition, survey length composition,
600 discard rates, mean body weight, and conditional age-at-length observations are all discussed
601 below.

602 The observed indices show much more variability than the model expectation, with the fit to
603 the WCGBT Survey essentially a flat line (Figure 17) and the fit to the Triennial Survey only
604 showing a noticeable change over time due to the separate catchability parameter estimated
605 for the early and late periods (Figure 18).

606 The fits to the length data are much better thanks to the combination of the growth cessation
607 model and the sex-specific offsets to selectivity (Figures 19–20).

608 The conditional age-at-length data is likewise fit reasonably well, with some patterns in
609 residuals showing variability among years, but no clear pattern that is consistent across
610 years (Figures 21 and 22).

611 Sex ratio data is not included in the likelihood as such, but a part of the length composition
612 likelihood in which the proportions of females and males are included in a single vector
613 compared to the model expectations in the multinomial likelihood. The patterns in sex ratio
614 by length bin show fewer females than males for the middle range of sizes (70–120 cm), with
615 a shift to almost 100% females for the largest size bins (over 130 cm). The use of sex-specific

616 growth curves was adequate to fit the ratios for the largest bins, but ratio skews toward
617 males at lengths where the mean ages are similar for females and males. The fit to this part
618 of the sex ratio pattern required an offset is selectivity.

619 **3.5.3 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses**

620 A number of sensitivity analyses were conducted, including:

- 621 1. Setting all selectivity curves to be asymptotic
- 622 2. Setting all selectivity curves to be dome-shaped
- 623 3. Removing the sex-specific offset on the selectivity curves
- 624 4. Removing the prior on catchability for the WCGBT Survey
- 625 5. Estimating a single catchability for all years in the Triennial Survey
- 626 6. Estimating separate natural mortality parameters for males and females
- 627 7. Removing the prior on natural mortality
- 628 8. Using the von Bertalanffy growth model
- 629 9. Using the Richards growth model
- 630 10. Tuning the sample sizes using the McAllister-Ianelli method
- 631 11. Estimating historic discards based on 3yr average of discard rates and landings
- 632 12. Changeing discard mortality from 0.5 to 0.4
- 633 13. Changeing discard mortality from 0.5 to 0.6

634 Results of these sensitivities are shown in Figures 32 to 34, and Tables 9 to 11.

635 **Additional text to be added**

636 **3.5.4 Retrospective Analysis**

637 **To be added**

638 **3.5.5 Likelihood Profiles**

639 Likelihood profiles were conducted over $\log(R_0)$, stock-recruit steepness (h) and natural
640 mortality (M).

641 Results of these profiles are shown in Figures 36 to 41.

642 **Additional text to be added**

643 **3.5.6 Reference Points**

644 Reference points were calculated using the estimated selectivities and catch distribution
645 among fleets in the most recent year of the model, (2017). Sustainable total yield (landings
646 plus discards) were 466 mt when using an $SPR_{50\%}$ reference harvest rate and with a 95%
647 confidence interval of 303 mt based on estimates of uncertainty. The spawning biomass
648 equivalent to 40% of the unfished level ($SB_{40\%}$) was 610 mt.

649 (Figure 27

650 The 2018 spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass is
651 above/below the target of 40% of unfished levels (Figure 28). The relative fishing intensity,
652 $(1 - SPR)/(1 - SPR_{50\%})$, has been xxx the management target for the entire time series
653 of the model.

654 Table e shows the full suite of estimated reference points for the base model and Figure 42
655 shows the equilibrium curve based on a steepness value xxx.

⁶⁵⁶ 4 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables

⁶⁵⁷ The forecasts of stock abundance and yield were developed using the final base model, with
⁶⁵⁸ the forecasted projections of the OFL presented in Table [g](#).

⁶⁵⁹ The forecasted projections of the OFL for each model are presented in Table [h](#).

660 **5 Regional Management Considerations**

₆₆₁ **6 Research Needs**

₆₆₂ There are a number of areas of research that could improve the stock assessment for Big
₆₆₃ Skate. Below are issues identified by the STAT team and the STAR panel:

₆₆₄ 1. Data!:

₆₆₅ 2. xxxx:

₆₆₆ 3. xxxx:

₆₆₇ 4. xxxx:

₆₆₈ 5. xxxx:

₆₆₉ **7 Acknowledgments**

₆₇₀ The authors gratefully acknowledge the time and effort reviewers Stacey Miller, Jim Hastie
₆₇₁ and Owen Hamel put into making this a polished document.

⁶⁷² **8 Tables**

⁶⁷³ **8.1 Data Tables**

Table 1: Landings by source. Landings are reconstructed histories 1916-1995.

Year	CA (mt)	OR (mt)	WA (mt)	Tribal (mt)	Total (mt)
1916	78.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	78.30
1917	80.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.10
1918	101.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	101.20
1919	75.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.20
1920	122.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	122.00
1921	17.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.80
1922	30.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.80
1923	34.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	34.20
1924	33.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.40
1925	46.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.70
1926	59.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.30
1927	67.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.10
1928	116.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.70
1929	107.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	107.50
1930	70.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	70.80
1931	43.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.60
1932	73.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	73.30
1933	46.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.50
1934	57.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.40
1935	70.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	70.60
1936	87.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	87.70
1937	115.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	115.40
1938	99.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.40
1939	90.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	90.90
1940	60.30	5.30	0.00	0.00	65.70
1941	53.10	56.40	0.00	0.00	109.40
1942	27.00	34.40	0.00	0.00	61.40
1943	20.40	0.90	0.00	0.00	21.30
1944	7.80	1.60	0.00	0.00	9.50
1945	13.30	0.30	0.00	0.00	13.50
1946	17.10	1.80	0.00	0.00	18.90
1947	24.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.10
1948	30.70	5.70	0.00	0.00	36.30
1949	31.90	0.00	7.20	0.00	39.10
1950	32.20	2.10	2.10	0.00	36.40
1951	21.70	4.70	3.90	0.00	30.30

Continued on next page

Table 1: Landings by source. Landings are reconstructed histories 1916-1995.

Year	CA (mt)	OR (mt)	WA (mt)	Tribal (mt)	Total (mt)
1952	39.10	0.10	7.80	0.00	46.90
1953	124.90	1.20	1.60	0.00	127.60
1954	38.80	2.30	1.20	0.00	42.40
1955	45.70	35.60	1.60	0.00	82.90
1956	40.40	2.60	3.10	0.00	46.10
1957	49.50	0.00	2.50	0.00	52.00
1958	38.80	0.00	0.20	0.00	38.90
1959	46.50	0.00	0.80	0.00	47.30
1960	39.20	0.00	0.70	0.00	39.80
1961	54.40	40.90	4.60	0.00	99.80
1962	44.40	27.90	5.20	0.00	77.60
1963	53.20	30.40	2.10	0.00	85.70
1964	49.90	28.30	2.70	0.00	80.90
1965	34.30	12.80	3.50	0.00	50.60
1966	36.40	20.10	0.60	0.00	57.00
1967	53.30	15.60	6.60	0.00	75.50
1968	55.30	45.40	8.80	0.00	109.50
1969	32.50	33.80	6.60	0.00	72.90
1970	16.30	11.90	0.10	0.00	28.20
1971	18.50	3.10	0.00	0.00	21.60
1972	33.50	2.00	0.10	0.00	35.60
1973	40.70	0.90	0.00	0.00	41.70
1974	21.90	5.90	0.10	0.00	27.80
1975	39.80	2.00	0.00	0.00	41.80
1976	20.70	31.30	0.20	0.00	52.20
1977	32.80	31.50	0.60	0.00	64.90
1978	67.70	77.30	4.00	0.00	149.10
1979	90.50	75.50	30.40	0.00	196.40
1980	17.60	34.10	5.20	0.00	56.90
1981	138.00	14.80	6.50	0.00	159.30
1982	78.30	5.20	14.60	0.00	98.10
1983	55.30	14.20	8.90	0.00	78.40
1984	26.20	4.90	1.60	0.00	32.70
1985	60.30	0.40	4.90	0.00	65.60
1986	27.20	1.60	8.90	0.00	37.80
1987	22.60	1.90	18.40	1.00	43.90
1988	15.30	0.30	10.90	1.20	27.60
1989	18.90	0.20	6.20	0.00	25.30
1990	25.10	0.00	9.60	0.10	34.90
1991	22.80	0.20	21.50	0.10	44.60
1992	24.60	0.30	11.20	0.00	36.10

Continued on next page

Table 1: Landings by source. Landings are reconstructed histories 1916-1995.

Year	CA (mt)	OR (mt)	WA (mt)	Tribal (mt)	Total (mt)
1993	29.00	0.20	21.00	0.60	50.70
1994	27.70	2.50	20.50	0.10	50.70
1995	43.00	41.20	21.80	0.10	106.00
1996	146.70	138.50	22.80	0.10	308.10
1997	228.40	215.40	84.00	0.20	528.00
1998	120.50	51.40	22.70	0.20	194.90
1999	109.50	131.30	41.40	0.40	282.60
2000	69.40	193.60	97.70	0.30	361.00
2001	75.30	115.10	26.70	0.40	217.50
2002	34.70	102.80	70.80	4.80	213.10
2003	48.80	223.00	65.70	5.40	342.80
2004	45.20	105.90	98.00	4.60	253.80
2005	33.40	151.30	113.10	15.70	313.40
2006	102.40	206.60	66.20	24.90	400.00
2007	35.50	190.40	29.10	19.90	274.90
2008	46.00	280.10	36.80	3.20	366.00
2009	9.60	162.00	16.50	17.50	205.70
2010	1.20	157.50	25.00	12.50	196.20
2011	0.50	231.50	10.00	26.40	268.40
2012	6.80	216.30	5.00	41.60	269.60
2013	20.90	92.30	13.00	8.80	135.00
2014	41.00	286.00	16.80	28.60	372.40
2015	35.20	218.80	1.00	76.60	331.50
2016	15.00	317.50	1.20	77.80	411.50
2017	28.00	188.00	1.40	60.20	277.60
2018	23.80	115.80	2.40	30.60	172.60

Table 2: Index inputs.

Year	WCGBTS		Triennial		IPHC	
	Obs	se_log	Obs	se_log	Obs	se_log
1980			467.83	0.53		
1983			911.85	0.30		
1986			996.75	0.29		
1989			1431.65	0.22		
1992			2426.18	0.20		
1995			497.24	0.26		
1998			2437.75	0.20		
1999					0.00	0.17
2001			1669.73	0.23	0.00	0.29
2002					0.00	0.53
2003	8170.51	0.20			0.00	0.43
2004	14349.00	0.18	3674.14	0.19	0.00	0.20
2005	12122.52	0.16			0.00	0.18
2006	9273.79	0.18			0.00	0.64
2007	8137.47	0.18			0.00	0.34
2008	5494.76	0.21			0.00	0.81
2009	10721.30	0.17			0.00	0.48
2010	11475.29	0.14			0.00	0.24
2011	8029.69	0.16			0.00	0.20
2012	11593.79	0.16			0.00	0.61
2013	11521.85	0.17			0.00	0.20
2014	19855.79	0.13			0.00	0.19
2015	19251.41	0.13			0.00	0.16
2016	17141.95	0.15			0.00	0.17
2017	13237.37	0.14			0.00	0.18
2018	14568.79	0.14			0.00	0.26

Table 3: PacFIN Samples.

Year	CA		OR		WA		All Landings		Discards	
	Ntows	Nfish	Ntows	Nfish	Ntows	Nfish	Ntows	Nfish	Ntows	Nfish
Lengths										
1995			6	55			6	55		
1996			3	8			3	8		
1997			1	14			1	14		
1998			1	2			1	2		
1999			1	8			1	8		
2000										
2001			3	43			3	43		
2002			6	199			6	199		
2003			9	202			9	202		
2004			2	27	2	12	4	39		
2005			7	123	6	87	13	210		
2006			13	310	15	191	28	501		
2007	1	1	10	128	9	172	20	301		
2008			10	94	8	94	18	188		
2009	8	32	17	234	1	18	26	284		
2010	2	8	15	186			17	194	149	349
2011	2	2	29	418	4	9	35	429	554	1518
2012	3	43	24	477	3	38	30	558	544	1405
2013	11	201	11	252	8	168	30	621	443	987
2014	15	217	11	237	5	249	31	703	676	1625
2015	25	237	21	411	2	5	48	653	688	1557
2016	14	181	34	444	7	98	55	723	652	1456
2017	14	239	50	668	12	47	76	954	508	1248
2018	15	133	46	552	14	98	75	783		
Ages										
2004					2	11	2	11		
2008			8	80			8	80		
2009			10	87	8	65	18	152		
2010			10	102			10	102		
2011			21	202			21	202		
2012			12	120			12	120		
2018			6	39	13	93	19	132		

Table 4: Samples from the surveys.

NA.	Triennial		WCGBTS		IPHC	
	Triennial	NA..1	WCGBTS	NA..2	IPHC	NA..3
Year	Ntows	Nfish	Ntows	Nfish	Nsets	Nfish
Lengths						
2001	41	81				
2003			60	197		
2004	39	100	81	262		
2005			99	328		
2006			67	154		
2007			76	192		
2008			53	159		
2009			82	305		
2010			130	466		
2011			99	360		
2012			104	395		
2013			84	316		
2014			149	552	14	54
2015			134	546		
2016			105	422		
2017			125	496		
2018			123	331		
Ages						
2009			77	230		
2010			124	333		
2016			100	138		
2017			110	164		
2018			118	169		

₆₇₅ **8.2 Model Results Tables**

Table 5: Results from 100 jitters from the base case model.

Description	Value	NA	NA
Returned to base case	-	-	-
Found local minimum	-	-	-
Found better solution	-	-	-
Error in likelihood	-	-	-
Total	100	100	100

Table 6: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD)).

No.	Parameter	Value	Phase	Bounds	Status	SD	Prior (Exp.Val, SD)
1	NatM_p_1_Fem_GP_1	0.384	1	(0.01, 0.8)	OK	0.014	Log_Norm (-1.02165, 0.0438)
2	L_at_Amin_Fem_GP_1	20.393	2	(10, 40)	OK	1.020	None
3	Linf_Fem_GP_1	176.000	2	(100, 300)	OK	3.927	None
4	VonBert_K_Fem_GP_1	11.994	1	(0.005, 30)	OK	0.312	None
5	Cessation_Fem_GP_1	3.877	3	(0.1, 5)	OK	6.181	None
6	SD_young_Fem_GP_1	5.683	5	(1, 20)	OK	0.916	None
7	SD_old_Fem_GP_1	7.378	5	(1, 20)	OK	0.886	None
8	Wtlen_1_Fem_GP_1	0.000	-3	(0, 3)			None
9	Wtlen_2_Fem_GP_1	2.993	-3	(2, 4)			None
10	Mat50%_Fem_GP_1	148.245	-3	(10, 140)			None
11	Mat_slope_Fem_GP_1	-0.132	-3	(-0.09, -0.05)			None
12	Eggs/kg_inter_Fem_GP_1	0.500	-3	(-3, 3)			None
13	Eggs/kg_slope_wt_Fem_GP_1	0.000	-3	(-3, 3)			None
14	NatM_p_1_Mal_GP_1	0.000	-2	(-3, 3)			None
15	L_at_Amin_Mal_GP_1	0.000	-2	(-1, 1)			None
16	Linf_Mal_GP_1	-0.381	2	(-1, 1)	OK	0.025	None
17	VonBert_K_Mal_GP_1	0.109	3	(-10, 20)	OK	0.032	None
18	Cessation_Mal_GP_1	0.200	-3	(-3, 3)			None
19	SD_young_Mal_GP_1	0.000	-5	(-1, 1)			None
20	SD_old_Mal_GP_1	0.000	-5	(-1, 1)			None
21	Wtlen_1_Mal_GP_1	0.000	-3	(0, 3)			None
22	Wtlen_2_Mal_GP_1	2.993	-3	(2, 4)			None
23	CohortGrowDev	1.000	-5	(0, 2)			None
24	FracFemale_GP_1	0.500	-99	(0.001, 0.999)			None
25	SR_LN(R0)	8.295	1	(5, 15)	OK	0.205	None
26	SR_BH_stEEP	0.400	-3	(0.2, 1)			None

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD)).

No.	Parameter	Value	Phase	Bounds	Status	SD	Prior (Exp.Val, SD)
27	SR_sigmaR	0.300	-2	(0, 0.4)			None
28	SR_regime	0.000	-1	(-2, 2)			None
29	SR_autocorr	0.000	-99	(0, 0)			None
78	LnQ_base_WCGBT5(5)	-0.144	1	(-2, 2)	OK	0.187	Normal (-0.188, 0.187)
79	Q_extraSD_WCGBT5(5)	0.161	5	(0, 2)	OK	0.057	None
80	LnQ_base_Triennial(6)	-1.382	1	(-10, 2)	OK	0.559	None
81	Q_extraSD_Triennial(6)	0.365	5	(0, 2)	OK	0.146	None
82	LnQ_base_Triennial(6)_1995	-1.065	1	(-7, 0)	OK	0.559	None
83	Size_DblN_peak_(1)	86.826	4	(80, 150)	OK	4.112	None
84	Size_DblN_top_logit_(1)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None
85	Size_DblN_ascend_se_(1)	7.064	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.126	None
86	Size_DblN_descend_se_(1)	20.000	-5	(-1, 20)			None
87	Size_DblN_start_logit_(1)	-999.000	-4	(-999, 9)			None
88	Size_DblN_end_logit_(1)	-999.000	-5	(-999, 9)			None
89	Retain_L_infl_(1)	66.645	2	(15, 150)	OK	0.629	None
90	Retain_L_width_(1)	4.962	2	(0.1, 10)	OK	0.350	None
91	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_(1)	2.111	3	(-10, 20)	OK	0.352	None
92	Retain_L_maleoffset_(1)	0.000	-3	(0, 0)			None
93	DiscMort_L_infl_(1)	5.000	-4	(5, 15)			None
94	DiscMort_L_width_(1)	0.000	-4	(0.001, 10)			None
95	DiscMort_L_level_old_(1)	0.500	-5	(0, 1)			None
96	DiscMort_L_male_offset_(1)	0.000	-5	(0, 0)			None
97	SzSel_Fem_Peak_(1)	-4.986	4	(-50, 50)	OK	2.038	None
98	SzSel_Fem_Ascend_(1)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None
99	SzSel_Fem_Descend_(1)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None
100	SzSel_Fem_Final_(1)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None
101	SzSel_Fem_Scale_(1)	0.774	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.083	None

9†

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD)).

No.	Parameter	Value	Phase	Bounds	Status	SD	Prior	(Exp.Val, SD)
102	Size_DblN_peak_WCGBT5(5)	72.392	4	(50, 150)	OK	5.639	None	
103	Size_DblN_top_logit_WCGBT5(5)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None	
104	Size_DblN_ascend_se_WCGBT5(5)	6.440	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.371	None	
105	Size_DblN_descend_se_WCGBT5(5)	10.061	5	(-1, 20)	OK	1.621	None	
106	Size_DblN_start_logit_WCGBT5(5)	-5.000	-4	(-999, 9)			None	
107	Size_DblN_end_logit_WCGBT5(5)	-999.000	-5	(-999, 9)			None	
108	SzSel_Fem_Peak_WCGBT5(5)	-7.134	4	(-50, 50)	OK	3.982	None	
109	SzSel_Fem_Ascend_WCGBT5(5)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
110	SzSel_Fem_Descend_WCGBT5(5)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
111	SzSel_Fem_Final_WCGBT5(5)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
112	SzSel_Fem_Scale_WCGBT5(5)	0.743	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.121	None	
113	Size_DblN_peak_Triennial(6)	176.755	4	(50, 180)	OK	26.076	None	
114	Size_DblN_top_logit_Triennial(6)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None	
115	Size_DblN_ascend_se_Triennial(6)	8.481	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.381	None	
116	Size_DblN_descend_se_Triennial(6)	20.000	-5	(-1, 20)			None	
117	Size_DblN_start_logit_Triennial(6)	-4.025	4	(-15, 9)	OK	0.527	None	
118	Size_DblN_end_logit_Triennial(6)	-999.000	-5	(-999, 9)			None	
119	SzSel_Fem_Peak_Triennial(6)	0.000	-4	(-50, 50)			None	
120	SzSel_Fem_Ascend_Triennial(6)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
121	SzSel_Fem_Descend_Triennial(6)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
122	SzSel_Fem_Final_Triennial(6)	0.000	-4	(-5, 5)			None	
123	SzSel_Fem_Scale_Triennial(6)	0.600	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.128	None	
124	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2005	2.325	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.562	None	
125	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2006	3.330	4	(-10, 20)	OK	1.315	None	
126	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2007	4.000	4	(-10, 20)	OK	2.027	None	
127	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2008	11.158	4	(-10, 20)	OK	111.095	None	

Continued on next page

Table 6: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD)).

No.	Parameter	Value	Phase	Bounds	Status	SD	Prior	(Exp.Val, SD)
128	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2009	4.991	4	(-10, 20)	OK	3.975	None	
129	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2010	13.248	4	(-10, 20)	OK	88.075	None	
130	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2011	14.665	4	(-10, 20)	OK	73.786	None	
131	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2012	13.918	4	(-10, 20)	OK	81.260	None	
132	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2013	3.475	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.337	None	
133	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2014	3.653	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.279	None	
134	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2015	3.430	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.263	None	
135	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2016	2.901	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.193	None	
136	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2017	2.822	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.192	None	

Table 7: Likelihood components from the base model.

Likelihood component	Value
TOTAL	1097.30
Catch	0.00
Survey	-98.12
Length composition	763.02
Age composition	421.52
Recruitment	10.88
Forecast recruitment	0.00
Parameter priors	0.00
Parameter soft bounds	0.01

Table 8: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model. Relative exploitation rate is $(1 - SPR)/(1 - SPR_{50\%})$.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1916	24263	1526	0.000	4004	0	0.00	1.00
1917	24263	1526	0.000	4004	12	0.00	0.99
1918	24251	1525	0.999	4003	25	0.00	0.99
1919	24228	1524	0.998	4001	37	0.00	0.98
1920	24196	1521	0.997	3999	49	0.00	0.98
1921	24156	1518	0.995	3996	62	0.00	0.97
1922	24108	1514	0.992	3992	74	0.00	0.97
1923	24054	1510	0.989	3987	86	0.00	0.96
1924	23994	1504	0.986	3982	99	0.00	0.96
1925	23928	1498	0.982	3976	111	0.00	0.95
1926	23857	1492	0.977	3969	123	0.01	0.95
1927	23780	1485	0.973	3962	136	0.01	0.94
1928	23699	1477	0.968	3954	148	0.01	0.94
1929	23614	1469	0.963	3946	160	0.01	0.93
1930	23524	1461	0.957	3938	172	0.01	0.92
1931	23430	1453	0.952	3929	185	0.01	0.92
1932	23332	1444	0.946	3920	197	0.01	0.91
1933	23231	1435	0.940	3911	210	0.01	0.91
1934	23126	1426	0.934	3901	222	0.01	0.90
1935	23018	1416	0.928	3890	234	0.01	0.90
1936	22907	1406	0.921	3880	246	0.01	0.89
1937	22794	1396	0.915	3868	259	0.01	0.89
1938	22677	1386	0.908	3857	271	0.01	0.88
1939	22558	1375	0.901	3845	329	0.02	0.86
1940	22393	1361	0.892	3830	329	0.02	0.86
1941	22242	1348	0.884	3815	363	0.02	0.84
1942	22069	1334	0.874	3798	351	0.02	0.84
1943	21922	1320	0.865	3783	343	0.02	0.85
1944	21794	1308	0.857	3769	350	0.02	0.84
1945	21669	1296	0.850	3754	364	0.02	0.84
1946	21539	1284	0.842	3740	379	0.02	0.83
1947	21402	1272	0.834	3725	394	0.02	0.82
1948	21258	1260	0.826	3710	412	0.02	0.81
1949	21106	1248	0.818	3694	426	0.02	0.81
1950	20951	1235	0.809	3679	424	0.02	0.81
1951	20808	1223	0.802	3664	418	0.02	0.81
1952	20681	1212	0.794	3650	434	0.02	0.80

Continues next page

Table 8: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model. Relative exploitation rate is $(1 - SPR)/(1 - SPR_{50\%})$.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1953	20546	1201	0.787	3634	515	0.03	0.76
1954	20341	1185	0.776	3613	430	0.02	0.80
1955	20232	1174	0.770	3599	470	0.02	0.78
1956	20090	1162	0.762	3583	434	0.02	0.79
1957	19992	1153	0.755	3570	439	0.02	0.79
1958	19892	1144	0.750	3558	426	0.02	0.80
1959	19809	1136	0.745	3547	435	0.02	0.79
1960	19720	1129	0.740	3537	427	0.02	0.79
1961	19641	1122	0.735	3528	487	0.03	0.77
1962	19506	1113	0.729	3515	465	0.03	0.77
1963	19401	1105	0.724	3504	473	0.03	0.77
1964	19293	1097	0.719	3492	468	0.03	0.77
1965	19197	1090	0.714	3481	438	0.02	0.78
1966	19136	1084	0.710	3473	444	0.02	0.78
1967	19071	1078	0.706	3464	463	0.03	0.77
1968	18991	1071	0.702	3453	497	0.03	0.76
1969	18881	1062	0.696	3440	460	0.03	0.77
1970	18812	1056	0.692	3432	416	0.02	0.79
1971	18788	1054	0.690	3427	409	0.02	0.79
1972	18770	1052	0.689	3424	423	0.02	0.79
1973	18737	1049	0.687	3420	429	0.02	0.78
1974	18697	1046	0.686	3416	415	0.02	0.79
1975	18671	1045	0.684	3414	429	0.02	0.78
1976	18631	1042	0.683	3410	440	0.02	0.78
1977	18584	1039	0.681	3406	452	0.03	0.77
1978	18527	1036	0.679	3400	536	0.03	0.73
1979	18393	1027	0.673	3387	584	0.03	0.71
1980	18224	1015	0.665	3368	444	0.03	0.77
1981	18202	1011	0.663	3362	547	0.03	0.72
1982	18083	1001	0.656	3346	486	0.03	0.75
1983	18030	995	0.652	3336	466	0.03	0.76
1984	17998	991	0.649	3329	420	0.02	0.78
1985	18008	989	0.648	3327	453	0.03	0.76
1986	17981	987	0.647	3323	425	0.03	0.78
1987	17977	987	0.647	3323	431	0.03	0.77
1988	17965	987	0.647	3324	415	0.02	0.78
1989	17965	989	0.648	3326	413	0.02	0.78

Continues next page

Table 8: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model. Relative exploitation rate is $(1 - SPR)/(1 - SPR_{50\%})$.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1990	17967	991	0.649	3329	422	0.02	0.78
1991	17960	991	0.650	3330	432	0.03	0.77
1992	17944	991	0.649	3329	424	0.02	0.78
1993	17938	990	0.649	3329	438	0.03	0.77
1994	17921	989	0.648	3326	438	0.03	0.77
1995	17905	987	0.647	3323	119	0.01	0.93
1996	18199	1003	0.657	3348	347	0.02	0.82
1997	18257	1006	0.659	3353	594	0.03	0.71
1998	18075	994	0.651	3334	219	0.01	0.88
1999	18268	1004	0.658	3351	318	0.02	0.83
2000	18354	1010	0.662	3360	406	0.02	0.79
2001	18349	1010	0.662	3361	245	0.01	0.87
2002	18500	1021	0.669	3377	239	0.01	0.87
2003	18643	1032	0.676	3394	385	0.02	0.80
2004	18635	1034	0.677	3397	285	0.02	0.85
2005	18723	1042	0.683	3409	347	0.02	0.82
2006	18747	1046	0.685	3416	429	0.02	0.79
2007	18697	1045	0.685	3414	292	0.02	0.85
2008	18786	1051	0.689	3423	387	0.02	0.81
2009	18783	1050	0.688	3422	217	0.01	0.89
2010	18946	1059	0.694	3436	207	0.01	0.89
2011	19107	1069	0.700	3450	282	0.02	0.86
2012	19180	1074	0.704	3458	282	0.02	0.86
2013	19245	1080	0.708	3467	144	0.01	0.92
2014	19436	1095	0.718	3489	397	0.02	0.81
2015	19370	1095	0.718	3489	351	0.02	0.83
2016	19357	1098	0.719	3493	441	0.02	0.79
2017	19265	1094	0.717	3487	297	0.02	0.85
2018	19324	1097	0.719	3492	185	0.01	0.90
2019	19491	1106	0.725	3505			

Table 9: Sensitivity of the base model to assumptions about selectivity and catchability.

Label	Base model	Sel all asymptotic	Sel all domed	Sel no sex offset	Q no prior on WCGBTS	Q no offset on triennial
TOTAL like	441.63	441.41	441.63	441.63	441.13	444.19
Survey like	-9.78	-9.78	-9.78	-9.78	-10.06	-8.37
Length comp like	366.25	366.14	366.25	366.25	366.93	366.81
Age comp like	110.51	110.44	110.51	110.51	110.12	110.30
Parm priors like	1.12	1.09	1.12	1.12	0.66	1.99
Size at age like	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Recr Virgin millions	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.00	2.81	3.33
log(R0)	8.29	8.28	8.29	8.29	7.94	8.11
NatM Female	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.39
NatM Male	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.39
Linf Female	176.00	175.90	176.00	176.00	175.97	176.05
Linf Male	120.24	120.20	120.24	120.24	120.38	120.21
Q WCGBTS	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.87	1.48	1.03
SSB Virgin thousand mt	1.53	1.52	1.53	1.53	1.16	1.22
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.11	1.10	1.11	1.11	0.65	0.78
Bratio 2019	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.56	0.64
SPRratio 2018	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.31	0.25
Ret Catch MSY	517.36	513.43	517.36	517.36	380.95	425.03
Dead Catch MSY	559.33	555.07	559.33	559.33	410.59	458.73

Table 10: Sensitivity of the base model to assumptions about catches.

Label	Base model	Discards based on 3yr averages	Discard mortality 0 4	Discard mortality 0 6
TOTAL like	441.63	440.89	441.18	442.05
Survey like	-9.78	-10.00	-10.08	-9.50
Length comp like	366.25	365.86	366.41	366.12
Age comp like	110.51	110.53	110.46	110.54
Parm priors like	1.12	1.13	1.06	1.17
Size at age like	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Recr Virgin millions	4.00	3.91	4.02	4.01
log(R0)	8.29	8.27	8.30	8.30
NatM Female	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
NatM Male	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
Linf Female	176.00	176.08	176.04	175.95
Linf Male	120.24	120.24	120.25	120.24
Q WCGBTS	0.87	0.90	0.88	0.85
SSB Virgin thousand mt	1.53	1.49	1.55	1.51
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.11	1.03	1.09	1.13
Bratio 2019	0.72	0.69	0.70	0.75
SPRratio 2018	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.19
Ret Catch MSY	517.36	505.17	532.98	506.35
Dead Catch MSY	559.33	545.81	567.38	555.88

Table 11: Sensitivity of the base model to assumptions about biology and misc.

Label	Base model	Bio separate M by sex	Bio no M prior	Bio von bertalanffy growth	Bio Richards growth	Misc McAllister Janelli tuning
TOTAL like	441.63	441.14	437.95	486.39	497.09	1132.64
Survey like	-9.78	-9.86	-9.71	-9.80	-9.73	-9.76
Length comp like	366.25	364.91	365.51	404.62	387.88	572.70
Age comp like	110.51	111.02	108.63	117.88	144.80	594.48
Parm priors like	1.12	1.45	0.01	0.04	0.01	4.59
Size at age like	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Recr Virgin millions	4.00	3.47	6.29	3.26	0.00	4.82
log(R0)	8.29	8.15	8.75	8.09	8.02	8.48
NatM Female	0.38	0.39	0.45	0.36	0.36	0.41
NatM Male	0.38	0.36	0.45	0.36	0.36	0.41
Linf Female	176.00	176.07	175.91		2666.88	177.98
Linf Male	120.24	119.90	120.98		137.29	120.30
Q WCGBTS	0.87	0.88	0.81	0.83	0.85	0.87
SSB Virgin thousand mt	1.53	1.28	1.12	1.37	0.00	1.42
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.11	0.86	0.84	0.90	0.00	1.04
Bratio 2019	0.72	0.67	0.75	0.65	0.00	0.73
SPRratio 2018	0.19	0.23	0.17	0.24	0.89	0.19
Ret Catch MSY	517.36	456.10	564.75	446.68	0.00	530.89
Dead Catch MSY	559.33	492.46	610.56	482.14	0.00	573.72

Table 12: Summaries of key assessment outputs and likelihood values from the retrospective analysis. Note that male growth parameters are exponential offsets from female parameters, and depletion and SPR ratio are for the year of 2017. The base model includes all of the data. Retro1 removes the last year of data (2016), Retro2 removes the last two years of data, Retro3 removes three years and Retro4 removes four years.

Label	Base	Retro1	Retro2	Retro3	Retro4
Female natural mortality	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.26
Steepness	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72
lnR0	8.16	8.09	8.07	8.04	8.08
Total Biomass (mt)	2796.86	2593.78	2568.77	2498.07	2650.36
Depletion	57.41	53.57	50.74	50.72	54.78
SPR ratio	0.72	0.76	0.79	0.80	0.74
Female Lmin	12.43	12.45	12.90	12.63	13.03
Female Lmax	33.31	33.50	33.39	33.37	33.46
Female K	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.23
Male Lmin (offset)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Lmax (offset)	-0.16	-0.16	-0.15	-0.16	-0.15
Male K (offset)	-0.29	-0.30	-0.43	-0.41	-0.56
Negative log-likelihood	1097.30	1047.56	1009.37	961.81	897.04
No. parameters	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Equilibrium catch	-98.12	-92.00	-89.12	-81.75	-80.59
Survey	763.02	739.90	720.39	700.10	670.66
Length composition	421.52	390.56	369.97	336.26	299.84
Age composition	10.88	9.09	8.12	7.20	7.12
Recruitment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Forecast Recruitment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parameter priors	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01

Table 13: Summaries of key assessment outputs and likelihood values from selected likelihood profile runs on virgin recruitment ($\ln R_0$) and steepness. Note that male growth parameters are exponential offsets from female parameters, and depletion and SPR ratio are for the year of 2017.

Table 14: Summaries of key assessment outputs and likelihood values from selected likelihood profile runs on female natural mortality. Note that male growth parameters are exponential offsets from female parameters, and depletion and SPR ratio are for the year of 2017.

Label	M0220	M0260	M0300	M0350	M0400
Female M	0.22	0.26	0.30	0.35	0.40
Steepness	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72
lnR0	7.67	8.20	8.95	12.21	31.00
Total biomass (m)	2259.39	2861.79	4632.81	89473.50	9753570000000.00
Depletion (%)	47.72	58.15	68.08	79.27	79.74
SPR ratio	0.97	0.70	0.41	0.02	0.00
Female Lmin	12.39	12.44	12.43	12.39	12.24
Female Lmax	33.23	33.31	33.31	33.25	33.73
Female K	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.24
Male Lmin (offset)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Male Lmax (offset)	-0.16	-0.16	-0.15	-0.15	-0.15
Male K (offset)	-0.27	-0.30	-0.31	-0.32	-0.36
Negative log-likelihood					
TOTAL	1102.66	1096.96	1092.96	1089.92	1091.52
Catch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Equil_catch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Survey	-97.79	-98.14	-98.33	-98.33	-98.95
Length_comp	765.50	762.85	760.88	759.19	755.26
Age_comp	422.97	421.41	420.05	418.75	425.16
Recruitment	11.91	10.82	10.30	10.05	9.54
Forecast_Recruitment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parm_priors	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.25	0.51
Parm_softbounds	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Parm_devs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Crash_Pen	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 15: Projection of potential OFL, spawning biomass, and depletion for the base case model.

Yr	OFL contribution (mt)	ACL landings (mt)	Age 5+ biomass (mt)	Spawning Biomass (mt)	Depletion
2019	1274.290	1185.906	18438.000	1106.070	0.725
2020	1211.220	1125.230	17564.900	1048.210	0.687
2021	1159.120	1074.895	16847.100	993.337	0.651
2022	1117.470	1034.993	16248.300	941.818	0.617
2023	1083.860	1003.371	15744.500	893.809	0.586
2024	1055.150	976.699	15309.700	849.368	0.557
2025	1029.120	952.644	14919.700	808.738	0.530
2026	1004.390	929.838	14555.100	772.649	0.506
2027	980.334	907.640	14202.800	742.174	0.486
2028	956.747	885.819	13859.300	717.965	0.470
2029	933.761	864.469	13527.100	699.544	0.458
2030	911.621	843.793	13209.600	684.888	0.449




Figure 1: Map showing the distribution of Big Skate within the area covered by the West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey aggregated over the years 2003–2018.

676 9 Figures




Figure 2: Summary of data sources used in the model.




Figure 3: Reconstructed landings by area. Tribal catch was all landed in Washington.




Figure 4: Estimated total catch using different assumptions for discards.




Figure 5: Catch data input to the model under assumed fleet structure. The historical discards shown in green have been scaled to account for an assumed 50% discard mortality. Discards during the period from 1995 onward are not represented here as they are estimated within the model.




Figure 6: Map of estimated density by year for Big Skate in the Triennial survey.
65




Figure 7: Map of estimated density by year for Big Skate in the WCGBT Survey.

Big Skate per 100 observed hooks in IPHC longline survey





Figure 8: Map of catch rates by year for Big Skate in the International Pacific Halibut Commission longline survey.



677

678 Reader 1 vs Reader 2.png




Figure 9: Length comp data, aggregated across time by fleet.




Figure 10: Length comp data for all years and fleets. Bubble size indicates the observed proportions, with females in red and males in blue.




Figure 11: Conditional age-at-length data from the fishery.




Figure 12: Conditional age-at-length data from the WCGBT Survey.




Figure 13: Estimated ageing imprecision.




Figure 14: Estimated relationship between length and weight (left) and disc-width and length (right) for Big Skate. Colored points show observed values and the black line indicates the estimated relationship $W = 0.0000074924L^{2.9925}$.




Figure 15: Estimated maturity relationship for female Big Skate. Gray points indicate average observed functional maturity within each length bin with point size proportional to the number of samples (indicated by text within each point).




Figure 16: Selectivity at length for all of the fleets in the base model.

679 file:




Figure 17: Fit to index data for WCGBT Survey. Lines indicate 95% uncertainty interval around index values. Thicker lines indicate input uncertainty before addition of estimated additional uncertainty parameter. The blue line indicates the model estimate.




Figure 18: Fit to index data for Triennial Survey. Lines indicate 95% uncertainty interval around index values. Thicker lines indicate input uncertainty before addition of estimated additional uncertainty parameter. The blue line indicates the model estimate with a change between 1992 and 1995 associated with the estimated change in catchability.




Figure 19: Fits to length comp data, aggregated across time by fleet.




Figure 20: Pearson residuals for length comp data for all years and fleets, with females in red and males in blue.




Figure 21: Pearson residuals for the fit to conditional age-at-length data from the fishery.




Figure 22: Pearson residuals for the fit to conditional age-at-length data from the WCGBT Survey.




Figure 23: Observed sex ratios (points) from the fishery length comp data with 75% intervals (vertical lines) calculated as a Jeffreys interval based on the adjusted input sample size. The model expectation is shown in the blue line.




Figure 24: Observed sex ratios (points) from the WCGBT Survey length comp data with 75% intervals (vertical lines) calculated as a Jeffreys interval based on the adjusted input sample size. The model expectation is shown in the blue line.




Figure 25: Fit to the discard fraction estimates. Points are model estimates with 95% uncertainty intervals. The model estimate is shown in the blue lines.




Figure 26: Fit to the mean weight of the discards. Points are model estimates with 95% uncertainty intervals. The model estimate is shown in the blue lines.

680 9.0.1 Sensitivity analyses for model




Figure 27: Estimated spawning biomass (mt) with approximate 95% asymptotic intervals.




Figure 28: Estimated spawning depletion with approximate 95% asymptotic intervals.




Figure 29: Estimated time-series of recruitment for Big Skate.




Figure 30: Estimated recruitment and the assumed stock-recruit relationship.




Figure 31: Estimated total catch including discards estimated within the model. The historical discards shown in green have been scaled to account for an assumed 50% discard mortality but the discards in the recent period show both live and dead discards.




Figure 32: Time series of spawning output estimated in sensitivity analyses related to selectivity and catchability.




Figure 33: Time series of spawning output estimated in sensitivity analyses related to historic catch and discards.




Figure 34: Time series of spawning output estimated in sensitivity analyses related to biology and other assumptions.




Figure 35: Comparison of the estimated growth curves from the sensitivities analyses.




Figure 36: Likelihood profile over the log of equilibrium recruitment (R_0).




Figure 37: Time series of spawning output estimated for the models included in the profile over the log of equilibrium recruitment (R_0).




Figure 38: Likelihood profile over stock-recruit steepness (h).




Figure 39: Time series of spawning output estimated for the models included in the profile over stock-recruit steepness (h).




Figure 40: Likelihood profile over natural mortality (M).




Figure 41: Time series of spawning output estimated for the models included in the profile over natural mortality (M).




Figure 42: Equilibrium yield curve for the base case model. Values are based on the 2018 fishery selectivity and with steepness fixed at 0.718.

681 #Appendix A. Detailed fits to length composition data {-}




Figure A43: Length comps, retained, Fishery. ‘N adj.’ is the input sample size after data_weighting adjustment. N eff. is the calculated effective sample size used in the McAlister_Iannelli tuning method.




Figure A44: Length comps, discard, Fishery. ‘N adj.’ is the input sample size after data_weighting adjustment. N eff. is the calculated effective sample size used in the McAlister_Iannelli tuning method.




Figure A45: Length comps, whole catch, WCGBT Survey. ‘N adj.’ is the input sample size after data_weighting adjustment. N eff. is the calculated effective sample size used in the McAllister_Iannelli tuning method.




Figure A46: Length comps, whole catch, Triennial Survey. ‘N adj.’ is the input sample size after data_weighting adjustment. N eff. is the calculated effective sample size used in the McAllister_Iannelli tuning method.

682 **References**

- 683 Bizzarro, J. 2019. Manuscript in preparation.
- 684 Bradburn, M.J. and Keller, A.A and Horness, B.H. 2011. The 2003 to 2008 US West
685 Coast bottom trawl surveys of groundfish resources off Washington, Oregon, and Califor-
686 nia: estimates of distribution, abundance, length, and age composition. NOAA Technical
687 Memorandum NMFS NOAA-TM-NMFS-NWFSC-114: 323 pp.
- 688 Ebert, D.A., Smith, W.D., and Cailliet, G.M. 2008. Reproductive biology of two commer-
689 cially exploited skates, *r. binoculata* and *r. Rhina*, in the western gulf of alaska. Fisheries
690 Research **94**(1): 48–57. Elsevier.
- 691 Francis, R.I.C.C. 2011. Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. Cana-
692 dian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **68**: 1124–1138.
- 693 Gertseva, V. 2019a. Manuscript in preparation.
- 694 Gertseva, V. 2019b. Manuscript in preparation.
- 695 Gunderson, Donald Raymond and Sample, Terrance M. 1980. Distribution and
696 abundance of rockfish off Washington, Oregon and California during 1977. North-
697 west and Alaska Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. Available from
698 [{http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/mfr423-4/mfr423-42.pdf}](http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/mfr423-4/mfr423-42.pdf).
- 699 Hamel, Owen S. 2015. A method for calculating a meta-analytical prior for the natural
700 mortality rate using multiple life history correlates. ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal
701 du Conseil **72**(1): 62–69. doi: [{10.1093/icesjms/fsu131}](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu131).
- 702 Keller, A.A. and Wallace, J.R. and Methot, R.D. 2017. The Northwest Fisheries Science
703 Center's West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey: History, Design, and Description.
704 NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS NOAA-TM-NMFS-NWFSC-136: 38 pp.
- 705 Maunder, M.N., Deriso, R.B., Schaefer, K.M., Fuller, D.W., Aires-da-Silva, A.M., Minte-
706 Vera, C.V., and Campana, S.E. 2018. The growth cessation model: A growth model for
707 species showing a near cessation in growth with application to bigeye tuna (*thunnus obesus*).
708 Marine biology **165**(4): 76. Springer.
- 709 McFarlane GA and King JR. 2006. Age and growth of big skate (*Raja binoculata*) and
710 longnose skate (*Raja rhina*) in British Columbia waters. Fisheries Research **May 1 (2-3)**:
711 169–78.
- 712 Methot, Richard D. and Wetzel, Chantell R. 2013. Stock synthesis: A biological and statis-
713 tical framework for fish stock assessment and fishery management. Fisheries Research **142**:
714 86–99.

- 715 Taylor, I.G., Stewart, I.J., Hicks, A.C., Garrison, T.M., Punt, A.E., Wallace, J.R., Wetzel,
716 C.R., Thorson, J.T., Takeuchi, Y., Ono, K., Monnahan, C.C., Stawitz, C.C., A'mar, Z.T.,
717 Whitten, A.R., Johnson, K.F., Emmet, R.L., Anderson, S.C., Lambert, G.I., Stachura,
718 M.M., Cooper, A.B., Stephens, A., Klaer, N.L., McGilliard, C.R., Iwasaki, W.M., Doering,
719 K., and Havron, A.M. 2019. R4ss: R code for stock synthesis. Available from <https://github.com/r4ss>.
- 721 Thorson, James T. and Barnett, Lewis A. K. 2017. Comparing estimates of abundance
722 trends and distribution shifts using single- and multispecies models of fishes and
723 biogenic habitat. ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil: fsw193. doi:
724 [{10.1093/icesjms/fsw193}](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw193).
- 725 Thorson, J. T. and Shelton, A. O. and Ward, E. J. and Skaug, H. J. 2015. Geostatistical
726 delta-generalized linear mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices
727 for West Coast groundfishes. ICES Journal of Marine Science **72**(5): 1297–1310. doi:
728 [{10.1093/icesjms/fsu243}](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu243).