

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



⁴ Ian G. Taylor¹
⁵ Vladlena Gertseva¹
⁶ Andi Stephens²
⁷ Joseph Bizzarro³

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 ²Northwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and
¹² Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2032 S.E. OSU Drive Newport,
¹³ Oregon 97365

¹⁴ ³Southwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and
¹⁵ Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 110 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz,
¹⁶ California 95060

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., Stephens, A. and Bizzarro, J. 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.p council.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/>

²⁶ **Acronyms used in this Document**

ABC	Allowable Biological Catch
ACL	Annual Catch Limit
AFSC	Alaska Fisheries Science Center
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
DFO	Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans
DW	Disk Width
IFQ	Individual Fishing Quota
IPHC	International Pacific Halibut Commission
ISW	Interspiracular Width
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NWFSC	Northwest Fisheries Science Center
ODFW	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
OFL	Overfishing Limit
OY	Optimum Yield
PacFIN	Pacific Fisheries Information Network
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
SPR	Spawning Potential Ratio
SSC	Scientific and Statistical Committee
SWFSC	Southwest Fisheries Science Center
TL	Total Length
VAST	Vector Autoregressive Spatio-Temporal Package
WCGBT	West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey
WCGOP	West Coast Groundfish Observer Program
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

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

29 **Contents**

30 Executive Summary	1
31 Stock	1
32 Catches	2
33 Data and Assessment	4
34 Stock Biomass	5
35 Recruitment	7
36 Exploitation Status	9
37 Reference Points	11
38 Ecosystem Considerations	12
39 Management Performance	12
40 Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties	12
41 Decision Table	13
42 Projected Landings, OFLs and Time-varying ACLs	13
43 Research and Data Needs	17
44 1 Introduction	18
45 1.1 Biology	18
46 1.2 Distribution and Life History	19
47 1.3 Ecosystem Considerations	20
48 1.4 Fishery Information	21
49 1.5 Stock Status and Management History	21
50 1.6 Fisheries Off Alaska, Canada and Mexico	22
51 1.6.1 Alaska	22
52 1.6.2 Canada	23
53 1.6.3 Mexico	23

54	2 Fishery Data	24
55	2.1 Data	24
56	2.2 Fishery Landings and Discards	24
57	2.2.1 Washington Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction	24
58	2.2.2 Oregon Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction	25
59	2.2.3 California Catch Reconstruction	26
60	2.2.4 Tribal Catch in Washington	26
61	2.2.5 Fishery Discards	27
62	3 Fishery-Independent Data Sources	28
63	3.1 Indices of abundance	28
64	3.1.1 Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) Triennial Shelf Survey	28
65	3.1.2 Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom	
66	Trawl Survey	28
67	3.1.3 Index Standardization	29
68	3.1.4 International Pacific Halibut Commission Longline Survey	29
69	4 Biological Parameters and Data	31
70	4.1 Measurement Details and Conversion Factors	31
71	4.2 Fishery dependent length and age composition data	31
72	4.3 Survey length and age composition data	31
73	4.4 Environmental or Ecosystem Data Included in the Assessment	32
74	5 Assessment	33
75	5.1 Previous Assessments	33
76	5.2 Model Description	33
77	5.2.1 Modeling Software	33
78	5.2.2 Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas	33
79	5.2.3 Other Specifications	34
80	5.2.4 Data Weighting	34
81	5.2.5 Priors	34
82	5.2.6 Estimated Parameters	35
83	5.2.7 Fixed Parameters	37
84	5.3 Model Selection and Evaluation	37

85	5.3.1 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices	37
86	5.3.2 Alternate Models Considered	37
87	5.3.3 Convergence	37
88	5.4 Response to the Current STAR Panel Requests	37
89	5.5 Base Case Model Results	38
90	5.5.1 Parameter Estimates	38
91	5.5.2 Fits to the Data	39
92	5.5.3 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	40
93	5.5.4 Retrospective Analysis	43
94	5.5.5 Likelihood Profiles	43
95	5.5.6 Reference Points	44
96	6 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables	45
97	7 Regional Management Considerations	46
98	8 Research Needs	47
99	9 Acknowledgments	47
100	10 Tables	48
101	10.1 Data Tables	48
102	10.2 Model Results Tables	54
103	11 Figures	66
104	11.1 Data Figures	66
105	11.2 Biology Figures	75
106	11.3 Model Results Figures	83
107	11.3.1 Growth and Selectivity	83
108	11.3.2 Fits to the Data	89
109	11.3.3 Time Series Figures	99
110	11.3.4 Sensitivity Analyses and Retrospectives	104
111	11.3.5 Likelihood Profiles	112
112	11.3.6 Reference Points and Forecasts	118

¹¹³ Appendix A. Detailed fits to length composition data

119

¹¹⁴ References

¹¹⁵ **Executive Summary**

¹¹⁶ **Stock**

¹¹⁷ This assessment reports the status of the Big Skate (*Beringraja binoculata*) resource in U.S.
¹¹⁸ waters off the West Coast using data through 2018. A map showing the area of the U.S.
¹¹⁹ West Coast Exclusive Economic Zone covered by this stock assessment is provided in Figure
¹²⁰ a.



Figure a: U.S. West Coast Exclusive Economic zone covering the area in which this stock assessment is focused.

¹²¹ **Catches**

¹²² Landings and estimated discards of Big Skate were reconstructed for this assessment from
¹²³ historical records of other species and from species composition data collected in the recent
¹²⁴ fishery. These reflect the fishery from 1916-1994. The current fishery started in 1995. For
¹²⁵ records from 1995-2017, Big Skate landings were estimated from species-composition samples
¹²⁶ and the landings of “Unspecified Skates”. Beginning in 2017, Big Skate have been recorded
¹²⁷ in species-specific landings.

¹²⁸ In the current fishery (since 1995), annual total landings of Big Skate have ranged between
¹²⁹ 135-528 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 b: Catch history of Big Skate in the model.

130 **Data and Assessment**

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

135 The assessment relies on two bottom trawl survey indices of abundance, the Triennial Survey
136 from an index covering the period 1980–2004 was used here and the West Coast Groundfish
137 Bottom Trawl (WCGBT) Survey, which began in 2003 and for which data is available through
138 2018. The triennial survey shows an increasing trend over the 25 year period it covers, which
139 the model is not able to fit as this includes the peak period of the fishery when the stock
140 would have been expected to be declining. The WCGBT Survey also shows an increasing
141 trend, with the 5 most recent observations (2014–2018) all falling in the top 6 ever observed
142 (2004 was the 5th highest observation). The model estimates an increasing trend during
143 this period but the slope is more gradual than the trend in the survey. The misfit to these
144 survey indices could be due to some combination of incorrect estimation of the catch history,
145 variability in recruitment which is not modeled here, or biological or ecological changes for
146 which data are not available.

147 Length composition data from the fishery is available starting in 1995 but is sparse until the
148 past decade. Most of the ages are also from 2008 onward. This limits the ability of the model
149 to estimate any changes composition of the population during the majority of the history of
150 the fishery. Estimates of discard rates and mean body weight of discards are available for
151 the years 2002 onward and discard length compositions are available starting in 2010.

152 The age and length data provide evidence for growth patterns and sex-specific differences
153 in selectivity that are unusual among groundfish stocks that have been assessed within the
154 U.S. West Coast and are not found in Longnose Skate where the data show little difference
155 between the sexes. Growth appears to be almost linear and similar between females and
156 males up to about age 7 or over 100 cm at which point male growth appears to stabilize
157 while females continue to grow. However, in spite of the similar growth pattern for ages prior
158 to 7, males are observed more frequently, with the 70–100 cm length bins often showing 60%
159 males. Sex-specific differences in selectivity were included in the model in order to better
160 match patterns in the sex ratios in the length composition data. The length and age data
161 do not cover enough years or show enough evidence of distinct cohorts to reliably estimate
162 deviations in recruitment around the stock-recruit curve.

163 The scale of the population is not reliably informed by the data due to the combination of
164 surveys that show trends which can't be matched by the structure of the model and length
165 and age data which inform growth and selectivity but provide relatively little information
166 about changes in stock structure over time. Therefore, a prior on catchability of the WCGBT
167 Survey (centered at 0.83) was applied in order to provide more stable results.

168 Although the assessment model requires numerous simplifying assumptions, it represents an

¹⁶⁹ improvement over the simplistic status-quo method of setting management limits, which re-
¹⁷⁰ lies on average survey biomass and an assumption about F_{MSY} . The use of an age-structured
¹⁷¹ model with estimated growth, selectivity, and natural mortality likely provide a better esti-
¹⁷² mate of past dynamics and the impacts of fishing in the future.

¹⁷³ Stock Biomass

¹⁷⁴ The 2018 estimated spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass is
¹⁷⁵ above the target of 40% of unfished spawning biomass at 75.0% (95% asymptotic interval:
¹⁷⁶ $\pm 63.9\%-86.0\%$) (Figure 34). Approximate confidence intervals based on the asymptotic
¹⁷⁷ variance estimates show that the uncertainty in the estimated spawning biomass is high,
¹⁷⁸ although even the lower range of the 95% interval for %unfished is above the 40% reference
¹⁷⁹ point, and all sensitivity analyses explore also show the stock to be at a high level.

Table b: Recent trend in beginning of the year spawning output and (spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass)

Year	Spawning Output (mt)	~ 95% confidence interval	Estimated %unfished	~ 95% confidence interval
2010	1603.690	(726.67-2480.71)	0.721	(0.6-0.842)
2011	1617.560	(738.18-2496.94)	0.727	(0.608-0.847)
2012	1625.610	(745.16-2506.06)	0.731	(0.613-0.849)
2013	1634.790	(753.17-2516.41)	0.735	(0.618-0.852)
2014	1657.340	(772.22-2542.46)	0.745	(0.631-0.859)
2015	1657.020	(772.35-2541.69)	0.745	(0.632-0.859)
2016	1659.820	(774.79-2544.85)	0.746	(0.634-0.859)
2017	1652.180	(768.4-2535.96)	0.743	(0.63-0.856)
2018	1655.400	(770.86-2539.94)	0.744	(0.632-0.857)
2019	1667.190	(780.42-2553.96)	0.750	(0.639-0.86)

Spawning biomass (mt) with ~95% asymptotic intervals




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

¹⁸⁰ **Recruitment**

¹⁸¹ Recruitment was assumed to follow the Beverton-Holt stock recruit curve, so uncertainty in
¹⁸² estimated recruitment is due to uncertainty in spawning biomass and the unfished equilibrium
¹⁸³ recruitment R_0 (Figure d and Table c).

Table c: Recent recruitment for the model.

Year	Estimated Recruitment (1,000s)	~ 95% confidence interval
2010	5393.54	(2966.19 - 9807.3)
2011	5414.62	(2982.16 - 9831.17)
2012	5426.77	(2991.46 - 9844.65)
2013	5440.55	(3002 - 9859.94)
2014	5474.01	(3027.33 - 9898.09)
2015	5473.54	(3027.82 - 9894.77)
2016	5477.66	(3031.98 - 9896.09)
2017	5466.40	(3024.88 - 9878.58)
2018	5471.15	(3029.62 - 9880.26)
2019	5488.48	(3043.55 - 9897.46)

Age-0 recruits (1,000s) with ~95% asymptotic intervals




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

¹⁸⁴ **Exploitation Status**

¹⁸⁵ Harvest rates estimated by the base model indicate catch levels have been below the limits
¹⁸⁶ 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	0.21	(0.12-0.3)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2010	0.20	(0.11-0.29)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2011	0.26	(0.15-0.38)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2012	0.26	(0.15-0.38)	0.01	(0.01-0.02)
2013	0.14	(0.08-0.2)	0.01	(0-0.01)
2014	0.36	(0.21-0.5)	0.02	(0.01-0.03)
2015	0.32	(0.19-0.45)	0.02	(0.01-0.03)
2016	0.39	(0.23-0.55)	0.02	(0.01-0.03)
2017	0.28	(0.16-0.39)	0.02	(0.01-0.02)
2018	0.18	(0.1-0.25)	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.

187 **Reference Points**

188 This stock assessment estimates that Big Skate in the model is above the biomass target
 189 ($SB_{40\%}$), and well above the minimum stock size threshold ($SB_{25\%}$). The estimated %un-
 190 fished level for the base model in 2019 is 75.0% (95% asymptotic interval: $\pm 63.9\%-86.0\%$,
 191 corresponding to an unfished spawning biomass of 1667.19 mt (95% asymptotic interval:
 192 780.42-2553.96 mt) of spawning biomass in the base model (Table e). Unfished age 2+
 193 biomass was estimated to be 2,523 mt in the base case model. The target spawning biomass
 194 ($SB_{40\%}$) is 890 mt, which corresponds with an equilibrium yield of 602 mt. Equilibrium yield
 195 at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is 507 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 (mt)	2,224	1,246	3,202
Unfished age 2+ biomass (mt)	2,523	1,705	3,341
Unfished recruitment (R_0)	6,176	2,760	9,592
Spawning output(2018 mt)	1,655	771	2,540
Depletion (2018)	0.744	0.632	0.857
Reference points based on $SB_{40\%}$			
Proxy spawning output ($B_{40\%}$)	890	498	1,281
SPR resulting in $B_{40\%}$ ($SPR_{B40\%}$)	0.625	0.625	0.625
Exploitation rate resulting in $B_{40\%}$	0.048	0.042	0.055
Yield with $SPR_{B40\%}$ at $B_{40\%}$ (mt)	602	395	810
Reference points based on SPR proxy for MSY			
Spawning output	445	249	640
SPR_{proxy}	0.5		
Exploitation rate corresponding to SPR_{proxy}	0.071	0.061	0.08
Yield with SPR_{proxy} at SB_{SPR} (mt)	507	333	681
Reference points based on estimated MSY values			
Spawning output at MSY (SB_{MSY})	833	458	1,207
SPR_{MSY}	0.609	0.604	0.614
Exploitation rate at MSY	0.051	0.045	0.057
Dead Catch MSY (mt)	604	396	812
Retained Catch MSY (mt)	559	367	750

¹⁹⁶ **Ecosystem Considerations**

¹⁹⁷ In this assessment, neither environmental nor ecosystem considerations were explicitly included in the analysis. This is primarily due to a lack of relevant data or results of analyses
¹⁹⁸ that could contribute ecosystem-related quantitative information for the assessment.
¹⁹⁹

²⁰⁰ **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	

²⁰¹ **Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties**

²⁰² The data provide little information about the scale of the population, necessitating the use
²⁰³ of a prior on catchability to maintain stable model results. The prior was developed for the
²⁰⁴ 2007 Longnose Skate stock assessment and has not been revised to account for any differences
²⁰⁵ between the two species.

²⁰⁶ There is little evidence that the population is overfished or experiencing overfishing, but fore-
²⁰⁷ casts of overfishing limits vary considerably among the sensitivity analyses explored (though
²⁰⁸ all remain well above the recent average catch).

²⁰⁹ The fit to the length data was significantly improved by estimating a difference between
²¹⁰ female and male selectivity, with females having a lower maximum selectivity than males,
²¹¹ but the behavioral processes that might contribute to this difference are not understood.

₂₁₂ **Decision Table**

₂₁₃ **Template in Table h and associated discussion to be filled in during the STAR panel**

₂₁₄ **Projected Landings, OFLs and Time-varying ACLs**

₂₁₅ Potential OFLs projected by the model are shown in Table 13. These values are based on
₂₁₆ an SPR target of 50%, a P* of 0.45, and a time-varying Category 2 Sigma which creates the
₂₁₇ buffer shown in the right-hand column. The OFL and ACL values for 2019 and 2020 are the
₂₁₈ current harvest specifications (also shown in Table f) while the landings for 2019 and 2020
₂₁₉ represent the average landings over the most recent 5 years (2014–2018).

Table g: Projections of landings, total mortality, OFL, and ACL values.

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 State		Base State		High State	
	Year	Catch	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output
Default harvest, for Low State	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
Default harvest, for Base State	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
Default harvest, for High State	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%})	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.14	0.36	0.32	0.39	0.28	0.18	
Exploitation rate	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	
Age 2+ biomass (mt)	18810.9	18968.2	19113.5	19171.0	19221.9	19394.4	19315.6	19300.1	19211.4	19275.8
Spawning Output	1603.7	1617.6	1625.6	1634.8	1657.3	1657.0	1659.8	1652.2	1655.4	1667.2
95% CI	(726.67- 2480.71)	(738.18- 2496.94)	(745.16- 2506.06)	(753.17- 2516.41)	(772.22- 2542.46)	(772.35- 2541.69)	(774.79- 2544.85)	(768.4-2535.96)	(770.86- 2539.94)	(780.42- 2553.96)
Depletion	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
95% CI	(0.6-0.842)	(0.608-0.847)	(0.613-0.849)	(0.618-0.852)	(0.631-0.859)	(0.632-0.859)	(0.634-0.859)	(0.63-0.856)	(0.632-0.857)	(0.639-0.86)
Recruits	5393.54	5414.62	5426.77	5440.55	5474.01	5473.54	5477.66	5466.40	5471.15	5488.48
95% CI	(2966.19 - 9807.3)	(2982.16 - 9831.17)	(2991.46 - 9844.65)	(3002 - 9859.94)	(3027.33 - 9898.09)	(3027.82 - 9894.77)	(3031.98 - 9896.09)	(3024.88 - 9878.58)	(3029.62 - 9880.26)	(3043.55 - 9897.46)




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.

²²⁰ **Research and Data Needs**

²²¹ We recommend the following research be conducted before the next assessment:

²²² 1. **Data!:**

²²³ 2. **xxxx:**

²²⁴ 3. **xxxx:**

²²⁵ 4. **xxxx:**

²²⁶ 5. **xxxx:**

²²⁷ **To be continued**

228 1 Introduction

229 Skates are the largest and most widely distributed group of batoid fish with approximately
230 245 species ascribed to two families (Ebert and Compagno (2007), McEachran and Miyake
231 (1990)). Skates are benthic fish that are found in all coastal waters but are most common
232 in cold temperatures and polar waters (Ebert and Compagno 2007).

233 There are eleven species of skates in three genera (*Amblyraja*, *Bathyraja*, and *Raja*) present
234 in the Northeast Pacific Ocean off California, Oregon and Washington (Ebert 2003). Of that
235 number, just three species (Longnose Skate, *Raja rhina*; Big Skate, *Raja binoculata*; and
236 Sandpaper Skate, *Bathyraja interrupta*) make up over 95 percent of West Coast Ground-
237 fish Bottom Trawl Survey (WCGBTS) catches in terms of biomass and numbers, with the
238 Longnose Skate leading in both categories (with 62 percent of biomass and 56 percent of
239 numbers).

240 Big Skate (*Raja binoculata*) is the largest of the skate species in North America with a docu-
241 mented maximum length of 244 cm total length and a maximum weight of 91 kg (Eschmeyer
242 and Herald 1983). The species name “binoculata” (two-eyed) refers to the prominent ocellus
243 at the base of each pectoral fin. Big Skates are usually seen buried in sediment with only
244 their eyes showing.

245 1.1 Biology

246 Big Skate is oviparous, and is one of two skate species that have multiple embryos per
247 egg case (Ebert et al. 2008). From 1–8 embryos can be contained in a single, large egg
248 capsule, but most have 3–4 (DeLacy and Chapman 1935, Hitz 1964, Ford 1971). Eggs
249 are deposited year-round on sand or mud substrates at depths of ~50–150 m (Hitz 1964,
250 Ebert and Compagno 2007). Embryos hatch from eggs after 6–20 months, with shorter
251 developmental periods associated with warmer temperatures (Hoff, GR 2009). In captivity,
252 Big Skate females may produce > 350 eggs/year (average of 2 embryos/egg case; Chiquillo,
253 Kelcie L and Ebert, David A and Slager, Christina J and Crow, Karen D (2014)) from long-
254 term sperm storage . Size at birth is 18–23 cm TL (Ebert 2003). Maximum size is 244 cm
255 TL [Eschmeyer and Herald (1983), with females growing to larger sizes].

256 Size at maturity has been variably estimated for Big Skate populations off California, British
257 Columbia, and Alaska. Off central California, Zeiner and Wolf (1993) reported sizes at first
258 maturity of ~129 cm TL (females) and ~100 cm TL (males). A similar size at maturity was
259 estimated for females from the Gulf of Alaska (first = 126 cm TL, 50% = 149 cm TL), but
260 male estimates were considerably greater (first = 124 cm TL, 50% = 119 cm TL; Ebert et
261 al. (2008)). Much smaller sizes at first (female = 60 cm TL, male = 50 cm TL) and 50%
262 (female = 90 cm TL, male = 72 cm TL) maturity were generated for the Longnose Skate
263 populations off British Columbia (McFarlane GA and King JR 2006); however, maturity

264 evaluation criteria were flawed (subadults were considered to be mature), and these results
265 are therefore not considered valid.

266 Age and growth parameters have been established from California, British Columbia, and
267 the Gulf of Alaska. Maximum ages off central California (females = 12, males = 11; Zeiner,
268 S.J. and P. Wolf. (1993)) and in the Gulf of Alaska (females = 14, males = 15; Gburski et
269 al. 2007) were similar, but estimates off British Columbia were much greater (females = 26,
270 males = 25; McFarlane and King 2006). It is important to note that age estimates are based
271 on an unvalidated method and geographic differences in size or age may reflect differences
272 in sampling or ageing criteria. In the Gulf of Alaska, Big Skates reach 50% maturity at 10
273 years and 7 years for females and males, respectively (Gburski, C.M. and Gaichas, S.K. and
274 Kimura, D.K. (2007), Ebert et al. (2008)). Generation length estimates range from 11.5
275 (Zeiner, S.J. and P. Wolf. 1993) to 17 years (McFarlane GA and King JR 2006).

Table 1: Regional comparison of life history parameter estimates.

	California		British Columbia		Gulf of Alaska	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
1st Maturity (TL cm)	129	100	60	50	126	124
50% Maturity (TL cm)			90	72	149	119
Max Age (year)	12	11	26	25	14	15
1st Maturity (year)	12	10	6	5	7	9
50% Maturity (year)			8	10	10	7

276 1.2 Distribution and Life History

277 The Big Skate is most common in soft-sediment habitats in coastal waters of the continental
278 shelf (Bizzarro, JJ and Broms, KM and Logsdon, MG and Ebert, DA and Yoklavich, MM
279 and Kuhnz, LA and Summers, AP (2014), Farrugia et al. (2016)). Use of mixed substrate
280 (e.g., mud with boulders) increases with ontogeny but hard substrates are largely avoided
281 (Bizzarro (2015)). In the GOA, the Big Skate is the most commonly encountered skate
282 species in continental shelf waters at 100–200 m depth, and is most abundant in the central
283 and western areas of the GOA (Stevenson, DE and Orr, JW and Hoff, GR and McEachran,
284 JD (2008); Bizzarro, JJ and Broms, KM and Logsdon, MG and Ebert, DA and Yoklavich,
285 MM and Kuhnz, LA and Summers, AP (2014)). Off the U.S. Pacific Coast, the Big Skate is
286 most densely distributed on the inner continental shelf (< 100 m; Bizzarro, JJ and Broms,
287 KM and Logsdon, MG and Ebert, DA and Yoklavich, MM and Kuhnz, LA and Summers,
288 AP (2014)). Eggs are mainly deposited between 70–90 m on sand or mud substrates (Hitz
289 (1964); NMFS-NWFSC-FRAM, unpub. data). Juveniles typically occur in shallower waters
290 than adults (Bizzarro (2015)). Core habitat regions of Big Skate off the U.S. Pacific Coast
291 and in the Gulf of Alaska are spatially segregated from those of other species (Bizzarro, JJ

²⁹² and Broms, KM and Logsdon, MG and Ebert, DA and Yoklavich, MM and Kuhnz, LA and
²⁹³ Summers, AP ([2014](#))).

²⁹⁴ Big Skates are highly mobile and capable of long range (> 2000 km) movements
²⁹⁵ (KingandMcF2010; Farrugia et al. ([2016](#))). For example, in British Columbia, a study
²⁹⁶ revealed that ~75% of tagged individuals were recaptured within 21 km of the tagging
²⁹⁷ locations, but 15 of the tagged individuals (0.1%) moved over 1,000 km (max = 2340 km;
²⁹⁸ King, JR and McFarlane, GA ([2010](#))). In the Gulf of Alaska, a year of satellite tag data
²⁹⁹ showed that six of twelve tagged individuals moved over 100 km, with one skate moving >
³⁰⁰ 2,000 km (Farrugia et al. [2016](#)). Although primarily benthic, Big Skates utilize the entire
³⁰¹ water column including surface waters (Farrugia et al. ([2016](#))). They have broad thermal
³⁰² tolerances 2–19° C that enable their occurrence from boreal to subtropical latitudes (Love,
³⁰³ Milton S ([2011](#)); Farrugia et al. ([2016](#))).

³⁰⁴ The Big Skate is broadly distributed, occurring from the southeastern Bering Sea (Mecklen-
³⁰⁵ burg, CW and Mecklenburg, TA and Thorsteinson, LK [2002](#)) to southern Baja California
³⁰⁶ (22.90° N, 110.03° W; (Castro-Aguirre et al. [1993](#))) and the Gulf of California (Castro-
³⁰⁷ Aguirre and Pérez [1996](#)). It has been reported at depths of 2–501 m (min: Miller et al.
³⁰⁸ ([1980](#)); max: Farrugia et al. ([2016](#))) but is most common on the inner continental shelf (<
³⁰⁹ 100 m; (Love, Milton S [2011](#)); (Bizzarro [2015](#))). Big Skates are highly mobile and capable
³¹⁰ of long range (> 2000 km) movements ((King and McFarlane [2009](#)); (Farrugia et al. [2016](#))).

³¹¹ In 2012, the Big Skate was moved from genus *Raja* to the new genus *Beringraja* together
³¹² with the Mottled Skate (*B. pulchra*) (Ishihara et al. [2012](#)). These are the only two skates
³¹³ with multiple embryos per egg case, and they are very similar morphologically and genetically
³¹⁴ (Bizzarro, J. [2019](#)).

³¹⁵ 1.3 Ecosystem Considerations

³¹⁶ Big Skates are opportunistic, generalist mesopredators with highly variable spatio-temporal
³¹⁷ trophic roles (Ebert and Compagno ([2007](#)); Bizzarro ([2015](#))). Off central California, diet of
³¹⁸ Big Skates is composed mainly of fishes, shrimps, and crabs (in descending order), with larger
³¹⁹ skates incorporating more fishes (Bizzarro et al. ([2007](#))); however, in the Gulf of Alaska, Big
³²⁰ Skate diet consists mainly of crabs (esp. Tanner Crabs) throughout ontogeny, with relatively
³²¹ small portions of fishes and shrimps (Bizzarro ([2015](#))). Correspondingly, trophic level and
³²² general diet composition estimates differ significantly between California and Gulf of Alaska
³²³ Big Skate populations (Bizzarro ([2015](#))).

³²⁴ Big Skates and their egg cases are preyed upon by a variety of vertebrates and invertebrates.
³²⁵ Snails and other molluscs bore holes in egg cases to feed on developing embryos and especially
³²⁶ their protein rich yolk-sacs (Bizzarro, pers. obs; Hoff, GR ([2009](#))). Sevengill Sharks, Brown
³²⁷ Rockfish, and Stellar Sea Lions are known predators of juvenile and adult Big Skates (Ebert
³²⁸ ([2003](#)), Love, Milton S ([2011](#))). Northern Sea Lions consume free-living Big Skates and their
³²⁹ egg cases (Ebert ([2003](#)), Love, Milton S ([2011](#))).

³³⁰ In this assessment, neither environmental nor ecosystem considerations were explicitly included in the analysis. This is primarily due to a lack of relevant data or results of analyses ³³¹ that could contribute ecosystem-related quantitative information for the assessment. ³³²

³³³ 1.4 Fishery Information

³³⁴ Big Skate are caught in commercial and recreational fisheries on the West Coast using line ³³⁵ and trawl gears. There is a limited market for pectoral fins (skate wings).

³³⁶ The history of Big Skate is not well documented. They were used as a food source by the ³³⁷ native Coastal and Salish Tribes (Batdorf, C [1990](#)) long before Europeans settled in the ³³⁸ Pacific Northwest and then as fertilizer by the settlers (Bowers, G. M. [1909](#)). No directed ³³⁹ fishery for Big Skate has been documented; rather, they were taken along with other skates ³⁴⁰ and rays as “scrap fish” and used for fertilizer, fish meal and oil (Lippert [2019](#)).

³⁴¹ Skates have been regarded as a predator on desirable market species such as Dungeness ³⁴² crab, and were thought of as nuisance fish with no appeal as a food item save for small ³⁴³ local markets. They had been discarded or harvested at a minimal level until their livers ³⁴⁴ became valued along with those of other cartilaginous fishes for the extraction of vitamin A ³⁴⁵ in the 1940s. Chapman (Chapman, W.M. [1944](#)) recorded that “At present they are being ³⁴⁶ fished heavily, in common with the other elasmobranchs of the coast, for the vitamins in ³⁴⁷ their livers. The carcasses are either thrown away at sea or made into fish meal. Little use ³⁴⁸ is made of the excellent meat of the wings”.

³⁴⁹ Little information is available about the historic Washington fishery for Big Skate. In records ³⁵⁰ before 2000, they are lumped together with other skates or in market categories (Lippert ³⁵¹ [2019](#)); this necessitates considerable attention to reconstructing the fishery by observing ³⁵² the composition of skate catches in the modern fishery and applying those to the recently ³⁵³ reconstructed historical records.

³⁵⁴ Very little information is known about the Big Skate historical fishery in Oregon. The information ³⁵⁵ we do have is mainly from historical landing data and species composition samples ³⁵⁶ starting in the mid-nineties. The bulk of the catch is from the bottom trawl and longline ³⁵⁷ fisheries, with smaller amounts as by-catch in mid-water trawl and the shrimp trawl fishery. ³⁵⁸ Big Skate was lumped into the nominal “Skate” category until 2015 when it was separated ³⁵⁹ into its own market category. Species composition data have been vitally important in ³⁶⁰ reconstructing the pre-2015 historical catch (Calavan [2019](#)).

³⁶¹ 1.5 Stock Status and Management History

³⁶² The history of Big Skate management is documented in (Pacific Fishery Management Council ³⁶³ [2018](#)), reproduced here.

³⁶⁴ Big Skate were managed in the “Other Fish” complex until 2015 when they were designated
³⁶⁵ an Ecosystem Component (EC) species. Catches of Big Skate are estimated to have averaged
³⁶⁶ 95 mt from 2007–2011, along with large landings of “Unspecified Skate”. Analysis of Oregon
³⁶⁷ port-sampling data indicates that about 98 percent of the recent Unspecified Skate landings
³⁶⁸ in Oregon were comprised of Big Skate. Such large landings indicates targeting of Big Skate
³⁶⁹ has occurred and an EC designation was not warranted. Based on this evidence, Big Skate
³⁷⁰ was redesignated as an actively-managed species in the fishery. Big skate has been managed
³⁷¹ with stock-specific harvest specifications since 2017.

³⁷² The recent OFL of 541 mt was calculated by applying approximate MSY harvest rates to
³⁷³ estimates of stock biomass from the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) West
³⁷⁴ Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey. This survey-based biomass estimate is likely un-
³⁷⁵ derestimated since Big Skate are distributed all the way to the shoreline and no West Coast
³⁷⁶ trawl surveys have been conducted in water shallower than 55 meters. This introduces an
³⁷⁷ extra source of uncertainty to management and suggests that increased precaution is needed
³⁷⁸ to reduce the risk of overfishing the stock.

³⁷⁹ There has been consideration for managing Big Skate in a complex with Longnose Skate,
³⁸⁰ the other actively-managed West Coast skate species, but the two species have disparate
³⁸¹ distributions and fishery interactions (Longnose Skate is much more deeply distributed than
³⁸² Big Skate) and that option was not endorsed. The Pacific Fishery Management Council has
³⁸³ chosen to set the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) equal to the Allowable Biological Catch (ABC)
³⁸⁴ with a buffer for management uncertainty (P^*) of 0.45.

³⁸⁵ 1.6 Fisheries Off Alaska, Canada and Mexico

³⁸⁶ 1.6.1 Alaska

³⁸⁷ In Alaska, skates were primarily taken as bycatch in both longline and trawl fisheries until
³⁸⁸ 2003, when a directed skate fishery developed in the Gulf of Alaska, where Longnose and
³⁸⁹ Big skates comprise the majority of the skate biomass.

³⁹⁰ The Gulf of Alaska (GOA) skate complex is managed as three units. Big skates and Longnose
³⁹¹ Skates each have separate harvest specifications, with acceptable biological catches (ABCs)
³⁹² specified for each GOA regulatory area (western, central, and eastern). A single gulfwide
³⁹³ overfishing level (OFL) is specified for each stock. All remaining skate species are managed as
³⁹⁴ an “Other Skates” group with gulfwide harvest specifications. All GOA skates are managed
³⁹⁵ as Tier 5 stocks, where OFL and ABC are based on survey biomass estimates and natural
³⁹⁶ mortality rate (Alaska Fisheries Science Center 2018).

³⁹⁷ In the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands, skates are assessed as a group rather than as separate
³⁹⁸ species.

³⁹⁹ **1.6.2 Canada**

⁴⁰⁰ In Canada historic information regarding skate catches goes back to the 1950's. Prior to
⁴⁰¹ 1990's skates were taken mostly as bycatch and landings were reported as part of a skate
⁴⁰² complex (not by species). As with the West Coast, the trawl fishery is responsible for the
⁴⁰³ largest amount of bycatch. Skate catches off British Columbia accelerated in the early 1990's,
⁴⁰⁴ partly due to emerging Asian markets. Since 1996, longnose skate has been targeted by the
⁴⁰⁵ B.C. trawl fishery and, as a result, catches have been more accurately reported.

⁴⁰⁶ Assessments of Longnose Skate and Big Skate were conducted by Canada's Division of Fish-
⁴⁰⁷ eries and Oceans in 2015(King, J.R., Surry, A.M., Garcia, S., and P.J. Starr [2015](#)). For Big
⁴⁰⁸ Skate, a Bayesian surplus production model failed to provide plausible results, and two data-
⁴⁰⁹ limited approaches were investigated: Depletion-Corrected Average Catch Analysis (DCAC),
⁴¹⁰ and a Catch-MSY (maximum sustainable yield) Approach.

⁴¹¹ DCAC produced a range of potential yield estimates that were above the long-term average
⁴¹² catch, with an upper bound that was three orders of magnitude larger than the long-term
⁴¹³ average catch. The Catch-MSY approach was found to be quite sensitive to assumptions
⁴¹⁴ and was not recommended as the sole basis of advice to managers.

⁴¹⁵ The recommendation for management for both skate species was that they should be man-
⁴¹⁶ aged with harvest yields based on mean historic catch, with consideration given to survey
⁴¹⁷ trends and to the ranges of maximum sustainable yield estimates identified by the Catch-
⁴¹⁸ MSY Approach. However, the analysis found no significant trends in abundance indices for
⁴¹⁹ Big Skate, and mean historical catches were below the maximum MSY estimate from the
⁴²⁰ catch-MSY results.

⁴²¹ **1.6.3 Mexico**

⁴²² No information is available on any fishery for Big Skate in Mexican waters, where they rarely
⁴²³ occur, however they may be taken in the artisanal fishery.

424 **2 Fishery Data**

425 **2.1 Data**

426 Data used in the Big Skate assessment are summarized in Figure 1. Descriptions of the data
427 sources are in the following sections.

428 **2.2 Fishery Landings and Discards**

429 Catch information for Big Skate is very limited, in part because the requirement to sort
430 landings of Big Skate in the shore-based Individual Fishing Quota fishery from landings in
431 the “Unidentified Skate” category was not implemented until June 2015. The historical catch
432 of Big Skate therefore relies on the historical reconstruction of the landings of all skates as
433 well as an analysis of discards of Longnose Skate. The estimated landings for each state and
434 the tribal fishery are provided in Table 2 and shown in Figure 3.

435 **2.2.1 Washington Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction**

436 New estimates of landings in Washington were developed in collaboration between NWFSC
437 and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Landings from 1940–2003 were
438 estimated as a fraction of the total skate landings based on ratios of species compositions by
439 depth as described in more detail in (Gertseva, V. 2019). The approach relied on trawl
440 survey estimates ratios among all skates by depth bin combined with logbook estimates of
441 fishing depths in each year.

442 The WCGBT Survey data was used to estimate proportions of Longnose and Big Skates
443 by depth (aggregated into 100m bins) and year for the period of the survey (between 2003
444 and 2018). Big Skate were primarily found in the 0–100m and 100–200m. Trawl logbook
445 data include information on the amount of retained catch of skate (all species combined)
446 within each haul as well depth of catch. The proportion of Big Skate for each depth bin
447 was assigned to the skate catch for each haul within those depth bins and summed to get a
448 total for each year. When survey skate information was available (2003–2018), survey skate
449 proportions were applied by depth and year to account for inter-annual variability in those
450 proportions. Prior to 2003, average proportions from 2003–2007 within each depth bin were
451 applied.

452 These estimated annual proportion of Big Skate relative to all skates from the logbook
453 analysis was then applied to total Washington skate landings by year (provided by WDFW)
454 to account for landings that weren’t included in the available logbook data. Prior to 1987
455 (when no logbook data were available), the average proportion Big Skate within the combined

456 skate category, calculated from 1987-1992 logbook data, was applied to total skate landings
457 in Washington. Estimated Big Skate landings provided by WDFW were used for the period
458 from 2004 forward. This later period had adequate species composition sampling to divide
459 the unspecified skate category by species with reasonable accuracy.

460 2.2.2 Oregon Commercial Skate Landings Reconstruction

461 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) provided newly reconstructed commercial
462 landings for all observed skate species for the 2019 assessment cycle (1978 – 2018). In
463 addition, the methods were reviewed at a pre-assessment workshop. Historically, skates
464 were landed as a single skate complex in Oregon. In 2009, Longnose Skate was separated
465 into its own single-species landing category, and Big Skate was separated in 2014. The
466 reconstruction methodology differed by these three time blocks in which species composition
467 collections diverged (1978 – 2008; 2009 – 2014; 2015 – 2018).

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

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

484 Due to insufficient species compositions, mid-water trawl landings were reconstructed using a
485 novel depth-based approach. Available compositions indicate that the proportion by weight
486 of Big Skate within a composition drops to zero at approximately 100 fathoms, and an inverse
487 relationship is observed for Longnose Skate, where the proportion by weight is consistently
488 one beyond 100 – 150 fathoms . Complex-level landings were assigned a depth from logbook
489 entries and these species specific depth associations were used to parse out landings by
490 species. The approach differed somewhat by time block . Landings from shrimp trawls were
491 handled using a similar methodology. Finally, very minor landings from hook and line, pot
492 gear and scallop dredges were assigned a single aggregated species composition, as they lack
493 any gear-specific composition samples. Landings from within a time block were apportioned
494 by year using the proportion of the annual ticket landings.

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

500 2.2.3 California Catch Reconstruction

501 A reconstruction of historical skate landings from California waters was developed for the
502 1916–2017 time period using a combination of commercial catch data (spatially explicit block
503 summary catches and port sample data from 2009-2017) and fishery-independent survey data
504 (Bizzarro, J. 2019). Virtually all landings in California were of “unspecified skate” until
505 species-composition sampling of skate market categories began in 2009.

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

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

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

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

525 2.2.4 Tribal Catch in Washington

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

530 **2.2.5 Fishery Discards**

531 Fishery discards of Big Skate are highly uncertain. The method used to estimate discards for
532 Longnose Skate was based on a strong correlation ($R^2 = 95.7\%$) between total mortality of
533 that species, and total mortality of Dover Sole for the years 2009–2017 during which Longnose
534 were landed separately from other skates. In contrast, the sorting requirement for Big Skate
535 occurred too recently to provide an adequate range of years for this type of correlation.
536 Furthermore, there is greater uncertainty in the total mortality for the shallow-water species
537 with which Big Skate most often co-occurs, such as Sand Sole and Starry Flounder, than
538 there is for Dover Sole, which has been the subject of recurring stock assessments.

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

544 The reconstructed landings of Big Skate for the period 1950–1995 had a mean of 63.1 t with
545 no significant trend (a linear model fit to the data increased from 62.8 t in 1950 to 63.5 in
546 1995). The estimated tribal catch prior to 1995 averaged less than 1 t and was not included
547 in this analysis of Big Skate discards for the years prior to 1995.

548 The mean discard rate for Longnose Skate was 92.46%, also with no significant linear trend
549 (the linear fit decreased from 92.8% in 1950 to 92.1% in 1995). An estimate of the mean
550 annual discard amount can therefore be calculated as from the mean discard rate and the
551 mean landings as $\bar{L}/(1 - \bar{d})$ where \bar{L} is the mean landings across that time period and \bar{d} is
552 the mean discards (Figure 4).

553 Two alternative methods were used to estimate the mean annual discard amount: applying
554 the annual Longnose Skate discard rates to the annual Big Skate catch, and applying 3-
555 year moving averages of these two quantities. The use of the annual values resulted in an
556 implausibly high degree of annual variability among the estimates, with the most extreme
557 being a spike of 2146.4 in 1979 compared to 1032.7 t the year before and 654.0 the year
558 after. The use of the 3-year moving average dampened this variability and these estimates
559 were retained for a sensitivity analysis (Figure 4).

560 A discard mortality rate of 50 percent was assumed for all discards, following the assumption
561 used for the Longnose Skate assessment conducted for the U.S. West Coast in 2007 (Gertseva,
562 V and Schirippa, MJ 2007) The same rate has been used for skates in the trawl fishery in
563 British Columbia, based on an approximate average of these reported rates. In 2015, PFMC's
564 Groundfish Management Team (GMT) conducted a comprehensive literature review of skate
565 discard mortality, and concluded that the current assumption regarding Big Skate discard
566 mortality is consistent with existing reported rates for other similar species.

567 Estimation of discard rates (discards amount relative to total catch) during the period of the
568 West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP), which began in 2002, was hindered

569 by the landings of Big Skate primarily occurring in the “unspecified skate” category prior
570 to 2015. Therefore, a discard rate was computed using the combination of Big Skate and
571 unspecified skate under the assumption that the vast majority of the unspecified skates were
572 Big Skate. A coefficient of variation was calculated for the by bootstrapping vessels within
573 ports because the observer program randomly chooses vessels within ports to be observed.
574 For the years after the catch share program was implemented in 2011, the trawl fishery was
575 subject to 100% observer coverage and discarding is assumed to be known with minimal
576 error (CV = 0.01).

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

579 3 Fishery-Independent Data Sources

580 3.1 Indices of abundance

581 3.1.1 Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) Triennial Shelf Survey

582 Research surveys have been used since the 1970s to provide fishery-independent information
583 about the abundance, distribution, and biological characteristics of Big Skate. A coast-
584 wide survey was conducted in 1977 (Gunderson, Donald Raymond and Sample, Terrance M.
585 1980) by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, and repeated every three years through 2001.
586 The final year of this survey, 2004, was conducted by the NWFSC according to the AFSC
587 protocol. We refer to this as the **Triennial Survey**.

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

595 3.1.2 Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl 596 Survey

597 In 2003, the NWFSC took over an ongoing slope survey the AFSC had been conducting,
598 and expanded it spatially to include the continental shelf. This survey, referred to in this
599 document as the “WCGBT Survey” or “WCGBTS”, is conducted annually. It uses a random-
600 grid design covering the coastal waters from a depth of 55 m to 1,280 m from late-May

601 to early-October (Bradburn, M.J. and Keller, A.A and Horness, B.H. 2011 , Keller, A.A.
602 and Wallace, J.R. and Methot, R.D. 2017). Four chartered industry vessels are used each
603 year (with the exception of 2013 when the U.S. federal-government shutdown curtailed the
604 survey).

605 3.1.3 Index Standardization

606 The index standardization methods for the two bottom trawl surveys matched that used
607 for Longnose Skate and additional detail is provided in (Gertseva, V. 2019). The data
608 from both surveys was analyzed using a spatio-temporal delta-model (Thorson, J. T. and
609 Shelton, A. O. and Ward, E. J. and Skaug, H. J. 2015), implemented as an R package
610 VAST (Thorson, James T. and Barnett, Lewis A. K. 2017) and publicly available on-
611 line (<https://github.com/James-Thorson/VAST>). Spatial and spatio-temporal variation is
612 specifically included in both encounter probability and positive catch rates, a logit-link for
613 encounter probability, and a log-link for positive catch rates. Vessel-year effects were in-
614 cluded for each unique combination of vessel and year in the database for the WCGBT
615 Survey but not the Triennial survey. Further details regarding model structure are avail-
616 able in the user manual (https://github.com/James-Thorson-NOAA/VAST/blob/master/manual/VAST_model_structure.pdf).

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

620 3.1.4 International Pacific Halibut Commission Longline Survey

621 The IPHC has conducted an annual longline survey for Pacific Halibut off the coast of Oregon
622 and Washington since 1997 (no surveys were performed in 1998 or 2000). This survey was
623 considered for inclusion in the assessment model but the encounters of Big Skate are relatively
624 infrequent compared to Longnose Skate and including the survey in early model explorations
625 was found to make little difference in the model results. A description of the survey methods
626 and analysis are below for consideration in future Big Skate assessments.

627 Beginning in 1999, this has been a fixed station design, with 84 locations in this area (station
628 locations differed in 1997, and are therefore not comparable with subsequent surveys). 400 to
629 800 hooks have been deployed at each station in 100-hook groups (typically called “skates”
630 although that term will be avoided here to avoid confusion). The gear used to conduct the
631 survey was designed to efficiently sample Pacific Halibut and used 16/0 (#3) circle hooks
632 baited with Chum Salmon.

633 In some years from 2011 onward, additional stations were added to the survey to sample
634 Yelloweye Rockfish. These stations were excluded from the analysis, as were additional
635 stations added in 2013, 2014, and 2017, off the coast of California (south of 42 degrees

latitude). Some variability in exact sampling location is practically unavoidable, and leeway is given in the IPHC methods to center the set on the target coordinates while allowing wind and currents to dictate the actual direction in which the gear is deployed. This can result in different habitats being accessed at each fixed deployment location across years. One station that was very close to the U.S. Canada border had the mid-point of the set in Canada in 2 out of the 19 years of the survey. For consistency among years, all samples from this station were included in the analysis, including those in Canada.

In most years, bycatch of non-halibut species has been recorded during this survey on the first 20 hooks of each 100-hook group, although in 2003 only 10% of the hooks were observed for bycatch, and starting in 2012, some stations had 100% of the hooks observed for bycatch. Combining these observation pattern with the number of hooks deployed each year, resulted in most stations having 80, 100, 120, 140, or 160 hooks observed, with a mean of 144 hooks and a maximum of 800 hooks observed. The depth range of the 84 stations considered was 42–530 m, thus extending beyond the range of Big Skate, but 74% of the stations were shallower than 200 m. Big Skate have been observed at 51 of the 84 the standard stations that were retained for this analysis, but no station had Big Skates observed in more than 12 out of the 19 years of survey data, and only 10% of the station/year combinations had at least one observed Big Skate (Figure X). Of those station/year combinations with at least one Big Skate observed, the Big Skates were observed on an average of 1.3% of the hooks observed. The highest proportion was 10 Big Skates out of 81 hooks observed at one station.

The IPHC longline survey catch data were standardized using a Generalized Linear Model (GLM) with binomial error structure. Catch-per-hook was modeled, rather than catch per station due to the variability in the number of hooks deployed and observed each year. The binomial error structure was considered logical, given the binary nature of capturing (or not) a Longnose Skate on each longline hook. The modeling approach is identical to that which has been applied in the past for Yelloweye Rockfish (Stewart et al. 2009), and Spiny Dogfish (Gertseva and Taylor 2011). MCMC sampling of the GLM parameters was used to estimate the variability around each index estimate. The median index estimates themselves were approximately equal to the observed mean catch rate in each year (Figure Y). In recent years, the IPHC standardization of the index of halibut abundance has included an adjustment to account for missing baits on hooks returned empty in an effort to account for reduced catchability of the gear that may result from the lost bait. This adjustment was not included in the analysis for Big Skate although it could be considered in future years.

669 **4 Biological Parameters and Data**

670 **4.1 Measurement Details and Conversion Factors**

671 Some size measurements were taken as either disc width or inter-spiracle width rather than
672 total length. A conversion from disc width to total length was estimated as $L = 1.3399 * W$
673 based on from 95 samples from WCGBT Survey where both measurements collected (R-
674 squared = 0.9983). Little sex difference observed, so using single relationship for both sexes
675 (Figure 15). This estimate is similar to the conversion estimated by Ebert (2008) for Big
676 Skate in Alaska. The inter-spiracle width to total length was converted based on estimates
677 from Downs & Cheng (2013):

678
$$L = 12.111 + 9.761 * ISW \text{ (females),}$$

679
$$L = 3.824 + 10.927 * ISW \text{ (males).}$$

680 **4.2 Fishery dependent length and age composition data**

681 Fishery length composition data was available from PacFIN were available for the years
682 1995–2018 (with the exception of 2000) as shown in Table 4. Ages were available from only
683 2004, 2008–2012, and 2018. These were all represented as conditioned on length in order to
684 provide more detailed information about the relationship between age and length, to reduce
685 any influence of size-based selectivity on the age composition, and to ensure independence
686 from the length samples. Furthermore, the samples from Washington in 2009 were sampled
687 using a length-stratified system, so should only be treated as conditioned on length.

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

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

692
$$\text{Input } N = N_{\text{hauls}} + 0.138 * N_{\text{fish}} \text{ if } N_{\text{fish}}/N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ is } < 44,$$

693
$$\text{Input } N = 7.06 * N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ if } N_{\text{fish}}/N_{\text{hauls}} \text{ is } \geq 44.$$

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

695 **4.3 Survey length and age composition data**

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

available for all years of the WCGBT Survey. Sample sizes for both surveys are provided in Table 5. The WCGBT Survey used disc width for the years 2006 and 2007 and total length in all other years. Those samples where only disc width was measured were converted to total length using the formula above.

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

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

Ageing Precision and Bias

Ages of Big Skate were all estimated based on growth band counts of sectioned vertebrae. Ageing precision and bias were estimated using double-reads of 518 Big Skate vertebrae using the approach of Punt et al. (2008). The results showed strong agreement among readers (Figure 13), with a standard deviation of the ageing error increasing from about 0.4 at age 0 to 1.6 years at age 15 (Figure 14).

Weight-Length

The mean weight as a function of length was estimated from 1159 samples from the WCGBT Survey using a linear regression on a log-log scale. Sex was not found to be a significant predictor, so a single relationship was estimated: $Weight = 0.00000749 * Length^{2.9925}$ (Figure 15).

Sex Ratio, Maturity, and Fecundity

The female maturity relationship was based on visual maturity estimates from port samplers ($n = 278$, of which 241 were from Oregon and 37 from Washington, with 24 mature specimens) as well as 55 samples from the WCGBT Survey (of which 4 were mature). The resulting relationship was $L_{50\%} = 148.245$ with a slope parameter of $Beta = -0.13155$ in the relationship $M = (1 + Beta(L - L_{50\%}))^{-1}$ (Figure 16). This result is consistent with the estimated maturity of Big Skate in Alaska (Table 1).

4.4 Environmental or Ecosystem Data Included in the Assessment

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

728 **5 Assessment**

729 **5.1 Previous Assessments**

730 No previous stock assessment has been conducted for Big Skate. The current management
731 is based on an OFL estimate calculated from a proxy for F_{MSY} and average survey biomass
732 from the WCGBT Survey during the years 2010–2012 (Taylor IG and Cope, J and Hamel
733 O and Thorson, J [2013](#)). The F_{MSY} estimate was based on the product of an assumed
734 F_{MSY}/M ratio and an M estimate of 0.162 based on the maximum age of 26 reported by
735 McFarlane and King (McFarlane GA and King JR [2006](#)). Values were sampled from an
736 assumed distribution around all these quantities to develop a measure of uncertainty around
737 the OFL estimate.

738 **5.2 Model Description**

739 **5.2.1 Modeling Software**

740 The STAT team used Stock Synthesis version 3.30.13 (Methot, Richard D. and Wetzel,
741 Chantell R. [\(2013\)](#), Methot, RD Jr. and Wetzel, CR and Taylor, IG [\(2019\)](#)). The r4ss
742 package version 1.35.1 (Taylor et al. [2019](#)) was used to post-process the output data from
743 Stock Synthesis.

744 **5.2.2 Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas**

745 Catch is divided among 4 fleets in the base model:

- 746 • Fishery (current) combines all non-tribal sources of catch for the years 1995 onward,
- 747 • Discard (historical) includes the estimated discard amount calculated from the esti-
748 mated Longnose Skate discard rate as described above. The input catch for this fleet
749 was 50
- 750 • Fishery (historical) includes the reconstructed landings estimates from each of the three
751 states for 1916–1994.
- 752 • Tribal includes the estimates of catch of Big Skate by treaty tribes.

753 **5.2.3 Other Specifications**

754 This assessment covers the U.S. West Coast stock of Big Skate in off the coasts of Washington,
755 Oregon and California, the area bounded by the U.S.-Canada border to the north, and the
756 U.S.-Mexico border to the south. The population is treated as a single coastwide stock
757 with no net movement in or out of the area. Females and males are modeled separately as
758 there is evidence for differences in growth based on both the age and length data, as well as
759 patterns in the sex ratios associated with the length composition data. Natural Mortality is
760 estimated within the model using a natural mortality prior developed by Hamel (2015). A
761 Beverton-Holt stock-recruit function is assumed with no deviations from the spawner-recruit
762 curve estimated.

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

768 **5.2.4 Data Weighting**

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

771 **5.2.5 Priors**

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

776 *Survey Catchability* The lack of contrast in the data resulted in unstable model results
777 under a variety of configurations. To keep biomass estimates within a plausible range,
778 the assessment uses a prior on the WCGBTS survey catchability parameter (q) that was
779 originally developed for the 2007 Longnose Skate assessment (Gertseva, V and Schirippa,
780 MJ 2007 p. @Dorn2007), and is being used for the concurrent Longnose Skate assessment
781 (Gertseva, V. 2019). The prior for the WCGBT Survey was derived as follows.

782 The prior is based on consideration of the availability of longnose skate to the survey gear
783 and the probability that a skate in the path of the gear would be caught and retained by the
784 gear. The methodology for developing the prior involves specifying the potential range in the

785 proportion of fish that are available to the gear and the potential range in the vulnerability
786 to the gear, and “best guesses” for the individual probabilities. These values are translated
787 into a lognormal prior where the median of the lognormal is the “best guess” and the range
788 of plausible values covers 99% of the lognormal distribution.

789 Several factors inform catchability in the survey. The WCGBT Survey covers the full latitudi-
790 nal range of Longnose Skate modeled in the assessment, and thus, the latitudinal availability
791 factor was assumed to be one (complete latitudinal coverage). The survey coverage exceeds
792 the maximum depth distribution of Longnose Skates but doesn’t fully cover the shallow end
793 of the skate distribution. A range of 95 to 100 percent was assumed for the depth availability.
794 A range of 75 to 95 percent was assumed for vertical availability on the basis that skates are
795 known to bury in the mud, and therefore some may be unavailable to the bottom trawl gear.

796 The largest bounds were placed on the probability of capture, given that a fish is in the net
797 path. It is known that flatfish can be herded by trawl gear, and it is possible that this could
798 also occur for skates. However, it is also possible that skates could avoid the trawl nets. For
799 capture probability, a range of 75 to 150 percent was assumed. The best estimates for each
800 of these factors were set at the midpoint of the range for individual factors, except for the
801 probability of capture, which was given a value of one. The overall estimate for the survey
802 catchability was the product of the best estimates, 0.83. The bounds on catchability are the
803 products of the low and high values for factor ranges, respectively, which are 0.53 and 1.43.
804 The best guess was equated to the median of a lognormal distribution and the bounds to
805 99% of that distribution. This gave a normal prior on $\log(q)$, with mean -0.188 and standard
806 deviation 0.187.

807 5.2.6 Estimated Parameters

808 A full list of all estimated and fixed parameters is provided in Tables 7.

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

- 810 • 1 natural mortality parameter applied to both sexes,
- 811 • 6 parameters related to female growth and the variability in length at age
- 812 • 2 parameters relating male growth to female growth,
- 813 • 1 stock-recruit parameter ($\log(R_0)$) controlling equilibrium recruitment)
- 814 • 3 catchability parameters (1 for the WCGBT Survey and 1 each for the early and late
815 periods of the Triennial Survey)
- 816 • 2 extra standard deviation parameters (1 for each survey)
- 817 • 29 selectivity parameters, including 16 related to time-varying retention rate

818 The estimated parameters are described in greater detail below and a full list of all estimated
819 and parameters is provided in Table 7.

820 *Growth.* Examination of patterns of age-at-length and length-at-age indicated unusual pat-
821 terns of growth for Big Skate. The youngest fish show near-linear growth, and average size
822 for both sexes is similar. However, older fish show considerable sex-based differences in size.
823 This led to the choice to model growth using the “growth cessation model” recently devel-
824 oped by Maunder et al. (2018). The estimated growth curves are shown in Figure 17. The
825 growth cessation model provided two key advantages over the more common von Bertalanffy
826 growth model in the case of Big Skate: it allowed essentially linear growth for the early years
827 and it allowed growth for the earlier ages to be similar between females and males while
828 diverging at older ages. The growth cessation model also improve the negative log-likelihood
829 by 45 units relative to the von Bertalanffy growth model.

830 *Natural Mortality.* Male natural mortality was assumed equal to the value estimated for
831 females. Sensitivity analyses were used to test the impact of both the prior on natural
832 mortality and the assumption of equal natural mortality for both sexes.

833 *Selectivity.*

834 A double-normal selectivity function was used for all fleets to allow consideration of both
835 asymptotic and dome-shaped patterns. No length compositions data was available for the
836 historical fishery, the historical discards, or the tribal fishery, so selectivity was assumed
837 equal for all fisheries in all time periods, and will be referenced simply as “the fishery”
838 in many areas below. For the fishery and the Triennial survey, the difference in likelihood
839 between dome-shaped and asymptotic patterns was very small and in the case of the Triennial
840 survey, the dome-shape occurred at a length beyond almost all observations, indicating that
841 this shape was likely driven by fit to other data sources, such as the index, rather than the
842 length composition data. The WCGBT Survey was allowed to remain dome-shaped as this
843 survey had the selectivity peak at a smaller length than the other fleets and the likelihood
844 was improved by the dome-shape. The WCGBT Survey also has the shortest hauls, with 15
845 minutes or less of bottom contact, so larger skates may be better able to escape the net.

846 In order to fit a strong skew in the sex ratios toward males for the length bins in which
847 the majority of the samples were found, it was necessary to estimate a sex-specific offset
848 of selectivity. Two offset parameters were estimated for all fleets, one for the difference in
849 length at peak selectivity and another for the maximum selectivity at that peak (allowing
850 one sex to have a maximum of 1.0 at the peak and the other to have a maximum less than
851 1.0). The ascending slope was assumed equal in all cases, as was the descending slope for
852 the WCGBT Survey.

853 Fishery retention was estimated as a logistic function applied to the selected catch from 1995
854 onward to estimate discards within the model. Discards prior to 1995 were estimated outside
855 the model and input as the historical discard fleet as discussed above. Three retention pa-
856 rameters were estimated, the length at 50% retention, a slope parameter, and the asymptotic
857 retention rate. The asymptotic retention rate was estimated as time-varying with separate

parameters covering 1995–2004, individual years from 2005 to 2016, and 2017–onward. The choice of these time blocks was made to allow the model to fit well the discard rates during the 2005–2016 period with the most information about discard rates, while using the first three years with data on discard rates and mean body weight of the discarded fish (2002–2004) as the basis for the estimate applied to the earlier years without discard data.

5.2.7 Fixed Parameters

The steepness of the Beverton-Holt stock-recruit curve was fixed at 0.4. The same value was used in the 2007 Longnose Skate assessment (Gertseva, V and Schirippa, MJ 2007) and is being considered for the ongoing 2019 Longnose Skate assessment. This value reflects a K-type reproductive strategy associated with elasmobranchs in general. The influence of the assumption of $h = 0.4$ on model output was explored via a likelihood profile analysis.

5.3 Model Selection and Evaluation

5.3.1 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices

To be added prior to May 20 CIE pre-review deadline.

5.3.2 Alternate Models Considered

To be added prior to May 20 CIE pre-review deadline.

5.3.3 Convergence

One hundred sets of jittered starting values were generated using the jitter function built into Stock Synthesis, with used with jitter input = 0.1. The same likelihood as the base model was returned by 51 out of the 100 runs, while the others all had worse total likelihood.

5.4 Response to the Current STAR Panel Requests

Request No. 1:

880

Rationale: xxx

882

STAT Response: xxx

883 **Request No. 2:**

884

885 **Rationale:** xxx

886 **STAT Response:** xxx

887 **Request No. 3:**

888

889 **Rationale:** x.

890 **STAT Response:** xxx

891 **Request No. 4:**

892

893 **Rationale:** xxx

894 **STAT Response:** xxx

895 **Request No. 5:**

896

897 **Rationale:** xxx

898 **STAT Response:** xxx

899 **5.5 Base Case Model Results**

900 The base model parameter estimates and their approximate asymptotic standard errors are
901 shown in Table 7. Estimates of derived reference points and approximate 95% asymptotic
902 confidence intervals are shown in Table e. Time-series of estimated stock size over time are
903 shown in Table 6.

904 **5.5.1 Parameter Estimates**

905 Values of all estimated parameters are provided in Table 7. A few key parameters of note
906 include natural mortality estimated at 0.445, slightly above the 0.36 median of the prior and
907 with much narrower uncertainty than the prior (Figure 18), L-infinity at 175.67 for females
908 and 120.97 for males (based on an exponential offset of -0.373). The $\log(R_0)$ parameter was
909 estimated at 8.728, corresponding to an unfished equilibrium recruitment of 6.18 million.

910 Catchability from the WCGBT Survey was estimated at 0.81, close the median of the prior
911 applied to this parameter, with uncertainty estimated as very similar to the uncertainty in
912 the prior (Figure 18).

913 Selectivity was estimated to be asymptotic for the WCGBT Survey (the only fleet for which
914 it was allowed to be dome-shaped), with the peak selectivity occurring at 76 cm, below the
915 peak of the fishery selectivity at 94 cm (Figure 19). These two fleets had a similar estimate
916 for the lower maximum selectivity for females than males, at 0.696 for the survey and 0.744
917 for the fishery. Selectivity for the Triennial survey was substantially different from the other
918 two, with an additional parameter estimated for the initial selectivity of the smallest sizes
919 necessary to fit the very flat length compositions from the two years of data available, and
920 a peak occurring at 188 cm, far higher than the other two curves. When converted to age,
921 the selectivity peaked at about age-4 for the WCGBT Survey, age-5 for the fishery, and age
922 7 and 12 for males and females in the Triennial Survey, respectively (Figure 20).

923 5.5.2 Fits to the Data

924 *Indices.* The observed indices show much more variability than the model expectation, with
925 the fit to the WCGBT Survey essentially a flat line (Figure 23). The fit to the Triennial
926 Survey showsa noticeable change over time due to the separate catchability parameters
927 estimated for the early and late periods (Figure 24).

928 *Length Data.* The fits to the length data were reasonably good (Figures 25–26 and ??–56).
929 The observed length compositions for males in both the fishery and the WCGBT Survey
930 is bimodal, with modes in the 80 cm and 115 cm length bins for the fishery, and in the 60
931 cm and 115 cm bins for the survey. The model expectation has modes in similar locations
932 in both cases, where the first mode is close to the estimated peak selectivity value and the
933 second is close to the estimated male L-infinity parameter. However, the second mode in the
934 model expectation is less pronounced than in the observed data (Figure 25). The residual
935 patterns in the fit to the length compositions don't show strong patterns, with the WCGBT
936 Survey data especially well fit. There are a few large residuals over a range of lengths in the
937 early years as well as a few years where there were observations of small (under 50 cm) fish
938 in the retained fishery catch which the model expected would have been discarded (Figure
939 26). The fit to the length data in alternative models that lacked either the growth cessation
940 model or the sex-specific offsets to selectivity were less good (results not shown).

941 *Conditional Age-at-Length.* The conditional age-at-length data is likewise fit reasonably well,
942 with some patterns in residuals showing variability among years, but no clear pattern that
943 is consistent across years (Figures 27 and 28).

944 *Sex Ratios.* Sex ratio data is not included in the likelihood as such, but as a part of the
945 length composition likelihood. The proportions of females and males are compiled into a
946 single vector that is compared to the model expectations in the multinomial likelihood. The
947 patterns in sex ratio by length bin show fewer females than males for the middle range of
948 sizes (70–120 cm), with a shift to almost 100% females for the largest size bins (over 130 cm).
949 These patterns are shown in Figures 29 and 30. The approximate uncertainty associated
950 with the observed ratios is represented by a Jeffreys interval (Brown et al. 2001) based

on the combination of the proportion of the lengths with each length bin and the adjusted input sample size. The use of sex-specific growth curves was adequate to fit the ratios for the largest bins, but ratio skews toward males at lengths where the mean ages are similar for females and males. The fit to this part of the sex ratio pattern required an offset in selectivity.

Discards Rates and Mean Weight of the Discards. Fit to the discard fraction estimates (Figure 31) and the mean weight of the discards (Figure 32) show reasonably good fits. The model expectation is able to match the trend of decreasing discard fractions and decreasing mean weights over the years 2002–2010 by estimating an increasing trend in the asymptotic retention rate from 2004 to 2008 with a peak at close to 100%, followed by a decreasing trend from 2012 onward (Figures 21 and 22). The years 2008–2012 with the highest asymptotic retention rates have little retention of large fish leading to lower discard rates and smaller mean weight of the discarded fish. The period from 2011 onward had observer coverage increased to 100% for the catch-shares trawl fishery, leading to more precise data and consistent patterns in the two data types. The first few years (which form the basis for the estimates going back to 1995), are more uncertain and less well fit, with the discard rates over 30% inconsistent with the mean weight under 1.5 kg in 2003 and 2004.

5.5.3 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses

A number of sensitivity analyses were conducted, including:

- Allowing all selectivity curves to be dome-shaped
- Removing the sex-specific offset on the selectivity curves
- Removing the prior on catchability for the WCGBT Survey
- Estimating a single catchability for all years in the Triennial Survey
- Estimating separate natural mortality parameters for males and females
- Removing the prior on natural mortality
- Using the von Bertalanffy growth model
- Using the Richards growth model
- Tuning the sample sizes using the McAllister-Ianelli method
- Estimating historic discards based on 3yr average of discard rates and landings
- Changing discard mortality from 0.5 to 0.4
- Changing discard mortality from 0.5 to 0.6

- 982 • Estimating multipliers on historical discards over blocks of time

983 Results of these sensitivities are shown in Figures 38 to 43, and Tables 8 to 10.

984 **Selectivity and catchability**

985 Allowing the selectivity for all fleets to be dome-shaped resulted in domed selectivity for all
986 fleets, but only improved the total negative log-likelihood by 0.9 units, mostly through a
987 slightly improved fit to the length compositions, although the fit to the surveys was slightly
988 worse (Table 8). Removing the offset between female and male selectivity caused the negative
989 log-likelihood to be worse by 18.1 units, mostly through a worse fit to the length comps but
990 also a worse fit to the conditional age-at-length compositions. The conditional age data
991 was represented independently for each sex, so no sex-ratio information was present in the
992 data, but the growth curves were changed slightly to compensate for the change in fit to the
993 length data, resulting in a less good fit to the age data as well. The scale of the population
994 remained somewhat similar to the base model under both of these sensitivities (Figure 38).

995 Removing the prior on catchability for the WCGBT Survey had a large change in the es-
996 timated scale of the population, with the unfished equilibrium biomass increasing from the
997 2,224 mt estimated in the base model to 9,932 mt (“Q no prior on WCGBTS” in Figure
998 38 and Table 8). However, the change in likelihood was relatively small, with the total
999 improving by 0.4 units, of which 0.04 was associated with the prior itself.

1000 **Catch and discards**

1001 The sensitivity analyses related to discard mortality resulted in little change in the scale of
1002 the population for any scenario (Figure 39 and Table 9). Increasing or decreasing the discard
1003 mortality from 0.5 to 0.4 or 0.6 had the least impact, while the two alternative time series
1004 of discards caused the population to fall to a lower level around 1990 and increase faster in
1005 the recent period. The discards based on 3-yr average analysis simply used the alternative
1006 time series of historical discards described above and shown in Figure 4.

1007 The sensitivity analysis in which multipliers on historical discards were estimated made use
1008 of the relatively new “catch multiplier” option in Stock Synthesis. Multiplier parameters
1009 controlling the ratio of the discards removed from the model relative to the input values
1010 were estimated for blocks of time covering the periods 1916–1949, 1950–1959, 1960–1969,
1011 1970–1979, 1980–1989, and 1990–1994. These multiplier parameters were bounded to keep
1012 the input catch relative to the estimated total within the range 0.5–1.5 and a weak Beta prior
1013 distribution spawning this range was applied to the parameters to keep them from hitting
1014 the bounds and cause them to remain at 1.0 in the absence of information in the data.

1015 The resulting pattern of historical discards shows a steadily increasing catch, with higher
1016 catch relative to the input values in all the blocks up to a peak in the 1980s, followed by an es-
1017 timated decrease in the estimated catch for the 1990–1994 period (Figures 42 and 41). These

1018 changes provide a greater contrast in the catch history, causing the estimated time series of
1019 spawning biomass to fall to a lower level and then increase faster from the 1990s onward,
1020 thus fitting the WCGBT Survey slightly better (Figures 39 and {fig:Sensitivity_catch2}).
1021 However, the improvement in likelihood for the survey was only 0.3 units (Table 9).

1022 Biology and data weighting

1023 The sensitivity analyses related to biology and data weighting included assumptions about
1024 natural mortality (M), growth, and data weighting (Figure 43 and Table 10). Allowing
1025 separate estimates of female and male natural mortality led to estimates of 0.475 for females
1026 and 0.395 for males, which are nearly symmetric around the 0.445 estimate of the shared
1027 mortality parameter in the base model. This difference allows more males to be present in
1028 the population and therefore better match the skewed sex ratios in the length composition
1029 data. The scale of the unfished equilibrium spawning biomass dropped to 61% of the base
1030 model estimate due to the smaller fraction of females living to mature with the higher M ,
1031 but the estimate of total biomass in the unfished population remained at 91% of the base
1032 model (Table 10). The improvement in likelihood is 2.2 units, which is modest given the
1033 extra parameter estimated. Additional explorations (not shown) indicated that a model with
1034 differential M and no sex-specific offsets on the selectivity had much worse fit to the data
1035 than either the base model or this sensitivity analysis. Therefore, given that the differential
1036 selectivity provided a greater improvement in model fit than the sex-specific M , only the
1037 more influential factor was included in the base model.

1038 Removing the prior on M had little impact on the model with M increasing from 0.445 in
1039 the base model to 0.448 without the prior.

1040 The use of either von Bertalanffy (1938) or Richards (1959) growth models provided less good
1041 fits to both the conditional age-at-length and length data and higher estimated variability
1042 in length-at-age (Figure 44). The increase in variability in length-at-age suggests that the
1043 model is using this variability to compensate for lack of fit to the mean length-at-age. The
1044 Richards model is a generalization of the von Bertalanffy growth model with an additional
1045 parameter allowing a more sigmoidal shape. For females, this additional parameter was
1046 hitting the lower bound of 0.1 resulting in linear growth up to age 20. This parameter on
1047 the bound led to a bad gradient and a non-positive-definite Hessian matrix, indicated that
1048 the model had not converged to the maximum likelihood estimates. In theory the additional
1049 parameter in the Richards model should allow it to always provide a better likelihood relative
1050 to the von Bertallanfy, but further attempts to search for a converged model with Richards
1051 growth has not yet been undertaken.

1052 Tuning the sample sizes using the McAllister-Ianelli method had relatively small impact
1053 on the model results, with a lower weight given to the fishery lengths than the status quo
1054 Francis tuning method, and a higher weight given to the WCGBT Survey lengths. The
1055 lengths from the Triennial Survey were given similar weight. Ages from both the fishery and
1056 the WCGBT Survey were increased in weight by a factor of 4.8 and 7.5, respectively. The
1057 likelihoods could not be compared due to these changes in the adjusted sample sizes, but
1058 the estimated parameters were all relatively similar to those in the base model (Table 10).

1059 **5.5.4 Retrospective Analysis**

1060 Retrospective analyses, in which the final 5 years of data are successively removed from
1061 the model, showed relatively little change in the scale of the estimated population, but
1062 the uncertainty about the population size increased (Figure 45). The WCGBT Survey
1063 observations were underfit for the final 5 years, so removing these points, combined with
1064 a prior on catchability lowers the status of the stock, led to a slightly reduced estimated
1065 spawning biomass.

1066 **5.5.5 Likelihood Profiles**

1067 Likelihood profiles were conducted over $\log(R_0)$, stock-recruit steepness (h) and natural
1068 mortality (M). Results of these profiles are shown in Figures 46 to 51.

1069 The profile over $\log(R_0)$ shows that the change in likelihood over a broad range of values
1070 is relatively small compared to models with more contrast in the data, with a total change
1071 in likelihood of less than 4 units over a range of 8.2 to 9.6, corresponding to a range in
1072 equilibrium recruitment of 3.6 million to 14.8 million (the $\log(R_0)$ parameter is the log of R_0
1073 in thousands). Models with $\log(R_0) < 8.2$ did not converge. The age data and discard data
1074 are best fit at the highest R_0 considered while the index and mean body weight data are best
1075 fit at the lowest R_0 . Only the priors and the length data are best fit at intermediate values.
1076 The length data was best fit at $\log(R_0) = 8.6$, while the separate components of the prior
1077 likelihood were also best fit at $\log(R_0) = 8.6$ in the case of the prior on the catchability of
1078 the WCGBT Survey, and at $\log(R_0) = 8.2$ in the case of the prior on natural mortality. The
1079 base model estimate balancing all these components was $\log(R_0) = 8.728$. The spawning
1080 biomass estimates from the models in the profile were all relatively similar as a result of
1081 the models with higher R_0 also having a higher M estimate, leading to a similar number of
1082 fish surviving to maturity (the range was $M = 0.526$ at $\log(R_0) = 9.6$ to $M = 0.398$ at
1083 $\log(R_0) = 8.2$).

1084 The profile over steepness of the stock-recruit curve showed less than 0.8 units of likelihood
1085 over the range $h = 0.3$ to $h = 0.9$. The best fit occurred at $h = 0.5$, indicating that a model
1086 with steepness estimated would have been relatively similar to the base model where h was
1087 fixed at 0.4. However, earlier model explorations indicated that models with h estimated
1088 sometimes produced unstable results, where small changes in model configuration could cause
1089 the parameter to be estimated at either the upper or lower bound of the 0.2–1.0 range on
1090 which it's defined for the Beverton-Holt stock-recruit curve.

1091 The profile over natural mortality (M) showed that most of the information in the likelihood
1092 about M was from the length and age data, with additional information in the discard rates
1093 and the mean body weight data. The prior on M provided relatively little contribution to
1094 the total likelihood. The length data had the largest change in likelihood over the 0.25–0.55
1095 range of M considered, and was best fit at 0.45, close to the base model estimate of 0.445.

1096 **5.5.6 Reference Points**

1097 Reference points were calculated using the estimated selectivities and catch distribution
1098 among fleets in the most recent year of the model, (2018). Sustainable total yield (landings
1099 plus discards) were 507 mt when using an $SPR_{50\%}$ reference harvest rate and with a 95%
1100 confidence interval of 333 mt based on estimates of uncertainty. The spawning biomass
1101 equivalent to 40% of the unfished level ($SB_{40\%}$) was 890 mt.

1102 The 2019 spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass is above the
1103 target of 40% of unfished levels (Figure 34). The relative fishing intensity, $(1 - SPR)/(1 -$
1104 $SPR_{50\%})$, has been below the management target for the entire time series of the model
1105 (Table 6).

1106 Table e shows the full suite of estimated reference points for the base model and Figure 52
1107 shows the equilibrium curve based on a steepness value of 0.4.

₁₁₀₈ **6 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables**

₁₁₀₉ The forecasts of stock abundance and yield were developed using the final base model, with
₁₁₁₀ the forecasted projections of the OFL presented in Table 13.

₁₁₁₁ The forecasted projections of the OFL for each model are presented in Table h.

¹¹¹² 7 Regional Management Considerations

¹¹¹³ Big Skate is not managed to regional specifications.

₁₁₁₄ **8 Research Needs**

₁₁₁₅ There are a number of areas of research that could improve the stock assessment for Big
₁₁₁₆ Skate. Below are issues identified by the STAT team and the STAR panel:

₁₁₁₇ 1. Data!:

₁₁₁₈ 2. xxxx:

₁₁₁₉ 3. xxxx:

₁₁₂₀ 4. xxxx:

₁₁₂₁ 5. xxxx:

₁₁₂₂ **9 Acknowledgments**

₁₁₂₃ The authors gratefully acknowledge the time and effort reviewers John DeVore, Stacey Miller,
₁₁₂₄ Jim Hastie and Owen Hamel put into making this a polished document.

₁₁₂₅ We thank the STAR panel Chair, David Sampson, and reviewers Robin Cook and Cody
₁₁₂₆ Szulwalski.

₁₁₂₇ The Reconstructions of historical catch were critical to this assessment, and there are many
₁₁₂₈ people who contributed, among them

₁₁₂₉ our colleagues at WDFW: Theresa Tsou, Jessi Doerpinghaus and Greg Lippert

₁₁₃₀ our colleagues at ODFW: Ali Whitman and Ted Calavan

₁₁₃₁ our colleagues at the SWFSC: John Field and Rebecca Miller

₁₁₃₂ and others whose knowledge of the fishery provided context: Gerry Richter and Todd Phillips

₁₁₃₃ Our colleagues at NWFWC, including Chantel Wetzel, Kelli Johnson, and John Wallace all
₁₁₃₄ provided valuable contributions to the extraction and processing of the survey and fishery
₁₁₃₅ data.

₁₁₃₆ Finally, we are deeply grateful to Mellissa Monk of the SWFSC, for creating the RMarkdown
₁₁₃₇ template which was used to produce this assessment report.

¹¹³⁸ **10 Tables**

¹¹³⁹ **10.1 Data Tables**

Table 2: 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 2: 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 2: 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 3: 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 4: 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 5: Samples from the surveys.

Year	Triennial		WCGBTS		IPHC	
	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		

¹¹⁴¹ **10.2 Model Results Tables**

Table 6: 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)	%Unfished	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1916	25232	2224	1.000	6176	0	0.00	1.00
1917	25232	2224	1.000	6176	12	0.00	0.99
1918	25221	2223	0.999	6175	25	0.00	0.99
1919	25199	2220	0.998	6172	37	0.00	0.98
1920	25169	2217	0.997	6168	49	0.00	0.98
1921	25131	2212	0.995	6164	62	0.00	0.97
1922	25087	2206	0.992	6157	74	0.00	0.97
1923	25037	2200	0.989	6150	86	0.00	0.96
1924	24981	2192	0.985	6142	99	0.00	0.96
1925	24920	2183	0.981	6132	111	0.00	0.96
1926	24854	2173	0.977	6122	123	0.01	0.95
1927	24783	2163	0.973	6111	136	0.01	0.94
1928	24707	2153	0.968	6100	148	0.01	0.94
1929	24627	2142	0.963	6088	160	0.01	0.93
1930	24544	2130	0.958	6076	172	0.01	0.93
1931	24456	2118	0.953	6063	185	0.01	0.92
1932	24365	2106	0.947	6049	197	0.01	0.92
1933	24271	2094	0.941	6035	210	0.01	0.91
1934	24174	2081	0.936	6020	222	0.01	0.91
1935	24074	2067	0.929	6005	234	0.01	0.90
1936	23971	2053	0.923	5989	246	0.01	0.90
1937	23866	2039	0.917	5973	259	0.01	0.89
1938	23758	2025	0.910	5956	271	0.01	0.89
1939	23648	2010	0.904	5939	329	0.01	0.87
1940	23494	1991	0.895	5916	329	0.02	0.86
1941	23353	1972	0.887	5894	363	0.02	0.85
1942	23193	1952	0.878	5869	351	0.02	0.85
1943	23059	1933	0.869	5846	343	0.02	0.86
1944	22943	1917	0.862	5826	350	0.02	0.85
1945	22829	1900	0.854	5805	364	0.02	0.85
1946	22708	1884	0.847	5784	379	0.02	0.84
1947	22581	1868	0.840	5763	394	0.02	0.83
1948	22447	1851	0.832	5742	412	0.02	0.83
1949	22306	1834	0.825	5720	426	0.02	0.82
1950	22162	1818	0.817	5698	424	0.02	0.82

Continued on next page

Table 6: 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)	%Unfished	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1951	22032	1801	0.810	5677	418	0.02	0.82
1952	21917	1786	0.803	5656	434	0.02	0.81
1953	21794	1771	0.796	5635	515	0.03	0.78
1954	21603	1748	0.786	5604	430	0.02	0.81
1955	21507	1734	0.780	5584	470	0.02	0.80
1956	21377	1718	0.772	5561	434	0.02	0.81
1957	21290	1706	0.767	5544	439	0.02	0.81
1958	21201	1694	0.762	5527	426	0.02	0.81
1959	21126	1685	0.757	5514	435	0.02	0.81
1960	21045	1675	0.753	5500	427	0.02	0.81
1961	20974	1667	0.750	5489	487	0.03	0.78
1962	20849	1655	0.744	5471	465	0.02	0.79
1963	20754	1645	0.740	5456	473	0.02	0.79
1964	20658	1635	0.735	5440	468	0.02	0.79
1965	20575	1624	0.730	5425	438	0.02	0.80
1966	20525	1616	0.727	5413	444	0.02	0.80
1967	20470	1608	0.723	5401	463	0.02	0.79
1968	20399	1599	0.719	5387	497	0.03	0.78
1969	20299	1588	0.714	5369	460	0.02	0.79
1970	20238	1581	0.711	5358	416	0.02	0.81
1971	20223	1578	0.710	5354	409	0.02	0.81
1972	20211	1577	0.709	5352	423	0.02	0.80
1973	20184	1574	0.708	5348	429	0.02	0.80
1974	20150	1571	0.706	5343	415	0.02	0.81
1975	20130	1570	0.706	5341	429	0.02	0.80
1976	20097	1567	0.705	5337	440	0.02	0.80
1977	20057	1564	0.703	5331	452	0.02	0.79
1978	20010	1559	0.701	5324	536	0.03	0.76
1979	19887	1546	0.695	5304	584	0.03	0.74
1980	19732	1529	0.688	5277	444	0.02	0.79
1981	19724	1524	0.685	5268	547	0.03	0.75
1982	19618	1510	0.679	5246	486	0.03	0.77
1983	19576	1502	0.676	5233	466	0.03	0.78
1984	19551	1497	0.673	5224	420	0.02	0.80
1985	19565	1497	0.673	5224	453	0.03	0.79
1986	19541	1495	0.672	5221	425	0.02	0.80
1987	19539	1497	0.673	5224	431	0.02	0.79

Continued on next page

Table 6: 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)	%Unfished	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative exploitation rate	SPR
1988	19529	1499	0.674	5228	415	0.02	0.80
1989	19534	1502	0.676	5233	413	0.02	0.80
1990	19541	1506	0.677	5238	422	0.02	0.80
1991	19540	1507	0.678	5240	432	0.02	0.79
1992	19531	1506	0.677	5239	424	0.02	0.80
1993	19534	1505	0.677	5238	438	0.02	0.79
1994	19524	1503	0.676	5234	438	0.02	0.79
1995	19515	1500	0.675	5230	120	0.01	0.94
1996	19808	1525	0.686	5269	348	0.02	0.83
1997	19858	1529	0.688	5277	596	0.03	0.73
1998	19673	1512	0.680	5250	220	0.01	0.89
1999	19862	1529	0.688	5277	319	0.02	0.85
2000	19941	1538	0.692	5291	408	0.02	0.81
2001	19931	1539	0.692	5292	245	0.01	0.88
2002	20076	1554	0.699	5316	240	0.01	0.88
2003	20212	1569	0.706	5340	386	0.02	0.82
2004	20197	1571	0.707	5344	286	0.02	0.86
2005	20281	1582	0.711	5361	347	0.02	0.84
2006	20304	1588	0.714	5369	429	0.02	0.80
2007	20254	1585	0.713	5365	292	0.02	0.86
2008	20344	1593	0.716	5377	387	0.02	0.82
2009	20342	1591	0.715	5374	217	0.01	0.90
2010	20501	1604	0.721	5394	207	0.01	0.90
2011	20652	1618	0.727	5415	282	0.01	0.87
2012	20714	1626	0.731	5427	282	0.01	0.87
2013	20769	1635	0.735	5441	144	0.01	0.93
2014	20947	1657	0.745	5474	397	0.02	0.82
2015	20874	1657	0.745	5474	351	0.02	0.84
2016	20859	1660	0.746	5478	441	0.02	0.80
2017	20770	1652	0.743	5466	297	0.02	0.86
2018	20833	1655	0.744	5471	185	0.01	0.91
2019	0	1667	0.750	5488			

Table 7: 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	0.445	3	(0.1, 0.6)	OK	0.030	Log_Norm (-1.02165, 0.438)
2	L_at_Amin_Fem_GP_1	20.094	2	(10, 40)	OK	1.033	None
3	Linf_Fem_GP_1	175.671	2	(100, 300)	OK	4.012	None
4	VonBert_K_Fem_GP_1	12.137	1	(0.005, 30)	OK	0.359	None
5	Cessation_Fem_GP_1	5.652	3	(0.1, 10)	OK	12.041	None
6	SD_young_Fem_GP_1	5.706	5	(1, 20)	OK	0.903	None
7	SD_old_Fem_GP_1	7.085	5	(1, 20)	OK	0.921	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	1.000	-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	-0.373	2	(-1, 1)	OK	0.025	None
17	VonBert_K_Mal_GP_1	0.101	3	(-10, 20)	OK	0.034	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)	8.728	3	(5, 15)	OK	0.282	None
26	SR_BH_stEEP	0.400	-3	(0.2, 1)			None

Continued on next page

Table 7: 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)	-0.209	1	(-2, 2)	OK	0.184	Normal (-0.188, 0.187)
79	Q_extraSD_WCGBT5(5)	0.162	1	(0, 2)	OK	0.057	None
80	LnQ_base_Triennial(6)	-1.046	1	(-10, 2)	OK	0.694	None
81	Q_extraSD_Triennial(6)	0.365	1	(0, 2)	OK	0.146	None
82	LnQ_base_Triennial(6)_1995	-0.731	1	(-7, 0)	OK	0.693	None
83	Size_DblN_peak_(1)	94.092	4	(80, 150)	OK	4.912	None
84	Size_DblN_top_logit_(1)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None
85	Size_DblN_ascend_se_(1)	7.156	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.118	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)	66.219	2	(15, 150)	OK	0.671	None
90	Retain_L_width_(1)	4.876	2	(0.1, 10)	OK	0.354	None
91	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_(1)	2.048	3	(-10, 20)	OK	0.359	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)	-5.537	4	(-50, 50)	OK	2.174	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)	0.744	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.095	None

Continued on next page

Table 7: 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)	76.187	4	(50, 150)	OK	6.668	None	
103	Size_DblN_top_logit_WCGBT5(5)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None	
104	Size_DblN_ascend_se_WCGBT5(5)	6.503	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.371	None	
105	Size_DblN_descend_se_WCGBT5(5)	16.488	5	(-1, 20)	OK	56.568	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)	-8.052	4	(-50, 50)	OK	4.166	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)	0.696	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.125	None	
113	Size_DblN_peak_Triennial(6)	187.722	4	(50, 200)	OK	34.761	None	
114	Size_DblN_top_logit_Triennial(6)	-15.000	-5	(-15, 4)			None	
115	Size_DblN_ascend_se_Triennial(6)	8.474	4	(-1, 9)	OK	0.422	None	
116	Size_DblN_descend_se_Triennial(6)	20.000	-5	(-1, 20)			None	
117	Size_DblN_start_logit_Triennial(6)	-4.789	4	(-15, 9)	OK	0.786	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)	0.604	4	(0.5, 1.5)	OK	0.130	None	
124	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2005	2.299	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.566	None	
125	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2006	3.304	4	(-10, 20)	OK	1.305	None	
126	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2007	3.962	4	(-10, 20)	OK	1.982	None	
127	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2008	11.091	4	(-10, 20)	OK	111.895	None	

Continued on next page

Table 7: 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	4.917	4	(-10, 20)	OK	3.735	None	
129	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2010	13.242	4	(-10, 20)	OK	88.124	None	
130	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2011	14.640	4	(-10, 20)	OK	74.025	None	
131	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2012	13.890	4	(-10, 20)	OK	81.550	None	
132	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2013	3.454	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.333	None	
133	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2014	3.619	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.276	None	
134	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2015	3.404	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.261	None	
135	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2016	2.885	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.192	None	
136	Retain_L_asymptote_logit_2017	2.819	4	(-10, 20)	OK	0.193	None	

Table 8: Sensitivity of the base model to assumptions about selectivity and catchability.

Label	Base model	Sel all domed	Sel no sex offset	Q no prior on WCGBTS	Q no offset on triennial
TOTAL likelihood	402.12	401.21	420.24	401.67	402.95
Survey likelihood	-9.72	-9.72	-9.84	-9.31	-9.38
Length comp likelihood	341.44	340.27	356.65	340.46	342.01
Age comp likelihood	97.14	97.44	100.57	97.08	96.99
Discard likelihood	-22.45	-22.80	-22.80	-22.14	-22.64
Mean body wt likelihood	-4.42	-4.05	-4.44	-4.60	-4.27
Parm priors likelihood	0.12	0.06	0.10	0.17	0.23
Recr Virgin millions	6.18	5.05	5.43	34.78	5.94
log(R0)	8.73	8.53	8.60	10.46	8.69
NatM Female	0.45	0.41	0.43	0.46	0.45
NatM Male	0.45	0.41	0.43	0.46	0.45
Linf Female	175.67	176.82	177.04	175.61	175.40
Linf Male	120.97	120.85	120.73	120.95	121.01
Q WCGBTS	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.14	0.90
SSB Virgin thousand mt	2.22	2.81	1.94	9.93	1.91
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.67	2.17	1.27	9.50	1.37
Bratio 2019	0.75	0.77	0.65	0.96	0.72
SPRratio 2018	0.18	0.16	0.24	0.03	0.20
Retained Catch MSY	558.67	595.13	446.62	2793.89	510.57
Dead Catch MSY	603.92	643.94	481.77	3030.18	551.56
Totbio unfished	25232.30	25321.30	23340.10	126562.00	23048.20
OFLCatch 2021	1390.54	1529.09	995.99	8154.10	1231.59

Table 9: 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	Multiplier on historical discards
TOTAL likelihood	402.12	401.58	401.85	402.36	401.86
Survey likelihood	-9.72	-9.92	-9.98	-9.49	-10.05
Length comp likelihood	341.44	341.12	341.61	341.28	341.25
Age comp likelihood	97.14	97.24	97.14	97.13	97.22
Discard likelihood	-22.45	-22.51	-22.66	-22.26	-22.65
Mean body wt likelihood	-4.42	-4.46	-4.39	-4.45	-4.44
Parm priors likelihood	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.51
Recr Virgin millions	6.18	6.02	6.19	6.19	6.06
log(R0)	8.73	8.70	8.73	8.73	8.71
NatM Female	0.45	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.44
NatM Male	0.45	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.44
Linf Female	175.67	175.76	175.68	175.66	175.72
Linf Male	120.97	120.95	120.96	120.98	120.96
Q WCGBTS	0.81	0.83	0.82	0.80	0.83
SSB Virgin thousand mt	2.22	2.23	2.29	2.17	2.27
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.67	1.62	1.67	1.66	1.63
Bratio 2019	0.75	0.73	0.73	0.77	0.72
SPRratio 2018	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
Retained Catch MSY	558.67	551.42	567.17	552.69	558.71
Dead Catch MSY	603.92	595.86	612.92	597.60	603.65
Totbio unfished	25232.30	25021.50	25620.40	24953.00	25329.90
OFLCatch 2021	1390.54	1346.42	1389.18	1394.56	1352.17

Table 10: Sensitivity of the base model to assumptions about biology and data weighting

Label	Base model	Bio separate M by sex	Bio no M prior	Bio von Bertalanffy growth	Bio Richards growth	Misc McAllister Ianelli tuning
TOTAL likelihood	402.12	399.94	402.00	445.19	456.54	1116.89
Survey likelihood	-9.72	-9.88	-9.72	-9.54	-9.73	-9.66
Length comp likelihood	341.44	338.79	341.48	387.56	362.67	564.52
Age comp likelihood	97.14	97.53	97.09	94.06	129.88	591.26
Discard likelihood	-22.45	-22.79	-22.47	-22.39	-21.98	-22.34
Mean body wt likelihood	-4.42	-3.92	-4.41	-5.05	-4.33	-7.13
Parm priors likelihood	0.12	0.21	0.01	0.53	0.01	0.24
Recr Virgin millions	6.18	5.19	6.29	17.80	0.00	7.26
log(R0)	8.73	8.55	8.75	9.79	8.03	8.89
NatM Female	0.45	0.47	0.45	0.57	0.36	0.46
NatM Male	0.45	0.40	0.45	0.57	0.36	0.46
Linf Female	175.67	175.53	175.65	587.20	2595.92	176.97
Linf Male	120.97	120.15	120.99	236.34	136.91	120.50
Q WCGBTS	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.84	0.85	0.77
SSB Virgin thousand mt	2.22	1.37	2.20	1.25	0.00	2.37
SSB 2019 thousand mt	1.67	0.87	1.65	1.02	0.00	1.83
Bratio 2019	0.75	0.63	0.75	0.82	0.00	0.77
SPRratio 2018	0.18	0.26	0.18	0.13	0.89	0.16
Retained Catch MSY	558.67	432.06	561.23	751.54	0.00	601.43
Dead Catch MSY	603.92	465.72	606.68	812.55	0.00	650.09
Totbio unfished	25232.30	23008.60	25327.00	39650.20	0.00	26861.90
OFLCatch 2021	1390.54	942.16	1397.99	1957.73	0.00	1523.66

Table 11: Results from 100 jitters from the base case model.

Description	Value
Returned to base case	51
Found local minimum	49
Found better solution	0
Error in likelihood	0
Total	100

Table 12: 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	1389.940	313.160	0.000	1667.190	0.750
2020	1390.490	313.160	0.000	1664.770	0.749
2021	1390.540	1136.647	0.000	1662.950	0.748
2022	1327.210	1072.121	0.000	1581.990	0.711
2023	1278.000	1021.539	0.000	1507.590	0.678
2024	1241.120	982.221	0.000	1438.770	0.647
2025	1212.850	950.914	0.000	1374.480	0.618
2026	1189.120	923.817	0.000	1314.410	0.591
2027	1167.280	899.641	0.000	1259.890	0.566
2028	1145.980	875.107	0.000	1213.480	0.546
2029	1124.960	851.041	0.000	1177.730	0.530
2030	1104.190	828.385	0.000	1152.760	0.518

Table 13: Projections of landings, total mortality, OFL, and ACL values.

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

¹¹⁴² 11 Figures

¹¹⁴³ 11.1 Data Figures




Figure 1: Summary of data sources used in the model.




Figure 2: 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.




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




Figure 4: Estimated total catch using different assumptions for discards. The discard rates shown in green lines are relative to the right-hand axis while all other values are relative to the left-hand axis.




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.
72




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.

1144 11.2 Biology Figures




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 current fishery.




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




Figure 13: Comparison of reads from each of two age readers for Big Skate. Sample sizes associated with each combination of ages are shown by the size circles and the numbers within them. The blue histograms show the distribution of ages estimated by each reader.




Figure 14: Estimated ageing imprecision.




Figure 15: 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 16: 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).

₁₁₄₅ 11.3 Model Results Figures

₁₁₄₆ 11.3.1 Growth and Selectivity




Figure 17: Estimated length-at-age for female and male Big Skate (top left panel). Shaded areas indicate 95% intervals for distribution of lengths at each age. Values represent beginning-of-year growth. Weight (thick line) and maturity (thin line) are shown in the top-right and lower-left panels as a function of length and age, respectively, where the values-at-age are calculated by mapping the length-based relationships through the estimated distribution of length at each age.




Figure 18: Estimates of natural morality and catchability of the WCGBT Survey with normal approximations to their uncertainty compared to their prior distributions.

Length-based selectivity by fleet in 2018




Figure 19: Selectivity at length for all of the fleets in the base model. Female selectivity is shown in the solid lines and males in the dashed lines.

Derived age-based from length-based selectivity by fleet in 2018




Figure 20: Selectivity at age derived from the combination of selectivity-at-length (shown above) and the estimated distribution of length at each age for all of the fleets in the base model. Female selectivity is shown in the solid lines and males in the dashed lines.




Figure 21: Female fishery selectivity and retention in 2018 with associated derived quantities.




Figure 22: Time-varying retention for the fishery (left) with the time-series of asymptotic retention rates (right).

1148 11.3.2 Fits to the Data




Figure 23: 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 24: 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 25: Fits to length comp data, aggregated across time by fleet.




Figure 26: Pearson residuals for length composition data for all years and fleets, with females in red and males in blue. Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed > expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed < expected).




Figure 27: Pearson residuals for the fit to conditional age-at-length data from the fishery. Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed > expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed < expected).




Figure 28: Pearson residuals for the fit to conditional age-at-length data from the WCGBT Survey. Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed $>$ expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed $<$ expected).




Figure 29: 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 30: 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 31: Fit to the discard fraction estimates. Points are model estimates with 95% uncertainty intervals. The model estimate is shown in the blue lines.




Figure 32: 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.

1150 11.3.3 Time Series Figures




Figure 33: Estimated spawning biomass (mt) with approximate 95% asymptotic intervals.




Figure 34: Estimated %unfished with approximate 95% asymptotic intervals.




Figure 35: Estimated time-series of recruitment for Big Skate.




Figure 36: Estimated recruitment and the assumed stock-recruit relationship.




Figure 37: 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.

1151 11.3.4 Sensitivity Analyses and Retrospectives




Figure 38: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated in sensitivity analyses related to selectivity and catchability.




Figure 39: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated in sensitivity analyses related to historic catch and discards.




Figure 40: Fit to the WCGBT Survey estimated in the sensitivity analyses related to historic catch and discards.




Figure 41: Catch by category for the sensitivity analysis where multipliers on historical discards were estimated. The estimated time series including the multipliers is shown in the solid green line and the input values in the base model are shown in the dashed green line.




Figure 42: Estimated total catch for the sensitivity analysis where multipliers on historical discards were estimated. 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 43: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated in sensitivity analyses related to biology and other assumptions.




Figure 44: Comparison of the estimated growth curves from the sensitivities analyses. The increase at age 20 in the von Bertalanffy and Richards growth models is an adjustment to account for average size in the plus group based on an assumed exponential decay of the numbers at age beyond age 20.




Figure 45: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) with approximate 95% asymptotic intervals estimated in retrospective analyses in which the final 5 years of data are successively removed from the model.

1153 11.3.5 Likelihood Profiles

1154




Figure 46: Likelihood profile over the log of equilibrium recruitment (R_0).




Figure 47: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated for the models included in the profile over the log of equilibrium recruitment (R_0).




Figure 48: Likelihood profile over stock-recruit steepness (h).




Figure 49: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated for the models included in the profile over stock-recruit steepness (h).




Figure 50: Likelihood profile over natural mortality (M).




Figure 51: Time series of spawning biomass (mt) estimated for the models included in the profile over natural mortality (M).

1155 11.3.6 Reference Points and Forecasts




Figure 52: Equilibrium yield curve for the base case model. Values are based on the fishery selectivity and with steepness fixed at 0.4.

1156 Appendix A. Detailed fits to length composition data




Figure 53: 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 McAllister Iannelli tuning method.




Figure 54: 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 55: 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 56: 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.

1157 **References**

- 1158 Alaska Fisheries Science Center. 2018. Assessment of the skate stock complex in the Gulf of
1159 Alaska. Available from {<https://www.afsc.noaa.gov/REFM/Docs/2018/GOA/GOAskate.pdf>}.
- 1160 Batdorf, C. 1990. Northwest Native Harvest. Hancock House Publishers Ltd.; Surrey, B.C.,
1161 Canada.
- 1162 Bizzarro, J. 2015. Comparative resource utilization of eastern north pacific skates (raji-
1163 formes: Rajidae) with applications for ecosystem-based fisheries management. WA: Univer-
1164 sity of Washington.
- 1165 Bizzarro, J. 2019. Manuscript in preparation.
- 1166 Bizzarro, JJ and Broms, KM and Logsdon, MG and Ebert, DA and Yoklavich, MM and
1167 Kuhnz, LA and Summers, AP. 2014. Spatial segregation in eastern north Pacific skate
1168 assemblages. PloS one **9**(10).
- 1169 Bizzarro, J., Robinson, H., Rinewalt, C., and Ebert, D. 2007. Comparative feeding ecology
1170 of four sympatric skate species off central California, USA. In *Biology of skates*. Springer.
1171 pp. 91–114.
- 1172 Bowers, G. M. 1909. Report of The Commissioner For the Year Ending June 30, 1909. Part
1173 XXVIII. Washington Printing Office.
- 1174 Bradburn, M.J. and Keller, A.A and Horness, B.H. 2011. The 2003 to 2008 US West
1175 Coast bottom trawl surveys of groundfish resources off Washington, Oregon, and Califor-
1176 nia: estimates of distribution, abundance, length, and age composition. NOAA Technical
1177 Memorandum NMFS NOAA-TM-NMFS-NWFSC-114: 323 pp.
- 1178 Brown, L.D., Cai, T.T., and DasGupta, A. 2001. Interval estimation for a binomial propor-
1179 tion. *Statistical science*: 101–117. JSTOR.
- 1180 Calavan, T. 2019. Oregon Department of Fisheries; Wildlife; Personal Communication,
1181 Newport, OR, USA.
- 1182 Castro-Aguirre, J.L., and Pérez, H.E. 1996. Catálogo sistemático de las rayas y especies
1183 afines de méxico: Chondrichthyes: Elasmobranchii: Rajiformes: Batoideiomorpha. Unam.
- 1184 Castro-Aguirre, J., Schmitter, J., Balart, E., and Torres-Orozco, R. 1993. Sobre la dis-
1185 tribución geográfica de algunos peces bentónicos de la costa oeste de baja california sur,
1186 méxico, con consideraciones ecológicas y evolutivas. In *Anales de la escuela nacional de*
1187 *ciencias biológicas*, méxico. pp. 75–102.

- 1188 Chapman, W.M. 1944. The Latent Fisheries of Washington and Alaska. Washington State
1189 Department of Fisheries.
- 1190 Chiquillo, Kelcie L and Ebert, David A and Slager, Christina J and Crow, Karen D. 2014.
1191 The secret of the mermaid's purse: Phylogenetic affinities within the Rajidae and the evolution
1192 of a novel reproductive strategy in skates. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution **75**:
1193 245–251. Elsevier.
- 1194 DeLacy, A.C., and Chapman, W.M. 1935. Notes on some elasmobranchs of puget sound,
1195 with descriptions of their egg cases. Copeia **1935**(2): 63–67. JSTOR.
- 1196 Dorn, M and Cordue, P and Haist, V. 2007. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland,
1197 OR. Available from [{https://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/STARreport_Skate.pdf}](https://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/STARreport_Skate.pdf).
- 1198 Downs, D.E., and Cheng, Y.W. 2013. Length-length and width-length conversion of long-
1199 nose skate and big skate off the pacific coast: Implications for the choice of alternative
1200 measurement units in fisheries stock assessment. North American journal of fisheries man-
1201 agement **33**(5): 887–893. Taylor & Francis.
- 1202 Ebert, D. 2003. Sharks, rays, and chimaeras of california. Univ of California Press.
- 1203 Ebert, D.A., and Compagno, L.J. 2007. Biodiversity and systematics of skates (chon-
1204 drichthyes: Rajiformes: Rajoidei). In Biology of skates. Springer. pp. 5–18.
- 1205 Ebert, D.A., Smith, W.D., and Cailliet, G.M. 2008. Reproductive biology of two commer-
1206 cially exploited skates, raja binoculata and r. Rhina, in the western gulf of alaska. Fisheries
1207 Research **94**(1): 48–57. Elsevier.
- 1208 Eschmeyer, W.N., and Herald, E.S. 1983. A field guide to pacific coast fishes: North america.
1209 Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- 1210 Farrugia, T.J., Goldman, K.J., Tribuzio, C., and Seitz, A.C. 2016. First use of satellite
1211 tags to examine movement and habitat use of big skates beringraja binoculata in the gulf of
1212 alaska. Marine Ecology Progress Series **556**: 209–221.
- 1213 Ford, P. 1971. Differential growth rate in the tail of the pacific big skate, (*Raja binoculata*).
1214 Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada **28**(1): 95–98. NRC Research Press.
- 1215 Francis, R.I.C.C. 2011. Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. Cana-
1216 dian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciencies **68**: 1124–1138.
- 1217 Gburski, C.M. and Gaichas, S.K. and Kimura, D.K. 2007. Age and growth of big skate
1218 (*Raja binoculata*) and longnose skate (*Raja rhina*) in the Gulf of Alaska. In Biology of
1219 Skates. Springer, Dordrecht.
- 1220 Gertseva, V. 2019. Manuscript in preparation.

- 1221 Gertseva, V and Schirippa, MJ. 2007. Status of the Longnose Skate (*Raja rhina*) off the
1222 continental US Pacific Coast in 2007. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, OR.
1223 Available from [\{http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/\}](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/).
- 1224 Gertseva, V., and Taylor, I. 2011. Status of spiny dogfish shark resource off the continental
1225 us pacific coast in 2011. PFMC. 2011. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, OR.
1226 Available from [\{http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/\}](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/).
- 1227 Gunderson, Donald Raymond and Sample, Terrance M. 1980. Distribution and
1228 abundance of rockfish off Washington, Oregon and California during 1977. Northwest
1229 and Alaska Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. Available from
1230 [\\{http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/mfr423-4/mfr423-42.pdf}](http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/mfr423-4/mfr423-42.pdf).
- 1231 Hamel, Owen S. 2015. A method for calculating a meta-analytical prior for the natural
1232 mortality rate using multiple life history correlates. ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal
1233 du Conseil **72**(1): 62–69. doi: [\\{10.1093/icesjms/fsu131}](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu131).
- 1234 Hitz, C.R. 1964. Observations on egg cases of the big skate (*raja binoculata girard*) found
1235 in oregon coastal waters. Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada **21**(4): 851–854. NRC
1236 Research Press.
- 1237 Hoff, GR. 2009. Skate *Bathyraja* spp. egg predation in the eastern Bering Sea. J. Fish.
1238 Biol. **74**: 250–269.
- 1239 Ishihara, H., Treloar, M., Bor, P., Senou, H., and Jeong, C. 2012. The comparative mor-
1240 phology of skate egg capsules (Chondrichthyes: Elasmobranchii: Rajiformes). Bulletin of
1241 the Kanagawa Prefectural Museum (Natural Science) **41**: 9–25.
- 1242 Keller, A.A. and Wallace, J.R. and Methot, R.D. 2017. The Northwest Fisheries Science
1243 Center's West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey: History, Design, and Description.
1244 NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS NOAA-TM-NMFS-NWFSC-136: 38 pp.
- 1245 King, J., and McFarlane, G. 2009. Biological results of the strait of georgia spiny dogfish
1246 (*squalus acanthias*) longline survey, october 10-22, 2008. Fisheries; Oceans Canada, Science
1247 Branch, Pacific Region.
- 1248 King, J.R., Surry, A.M., Garcia, S., and P.J. Starr. 2015. Big skate (*Raja binoculata*)
1249 and longnose skate (*R. rhina*) stock assessments for British Columbia. Ottawa : Canadian
1250 Science Advisory Secretariat.
- 1251 King, JR and McFarlane, GA. 2010. Movement patterns and growth estimates of big skate
1252 (*Raja binoculata*) based on tag-recapture data. Fish. Res. **101**: 50–59.
- 1253 Lippert, G. 2019. Washington Department of Fisheries; Wildlife; Personal Communication,
1254 Olympia, Washington, USA.

- 1255 Love, Milton S. 2011. Certainly more than you want to know about the fishes of the Pacific
1256 Coast: a postmodern experience. Really Big Press.
- 1257 Maunder, M.N., Deriso, R.B., Schaefer, K.M., Fuller, D.W., Aires-da-Silva, A.M., Minte-
1258 Vera, C.V., and Campana, S.E. 2018. The growth cessation model: A growth model for
1259 species showing a near cessation in growth with application to bigeye tuna (*thunnus obesus*).
1260 Marine biology **165**(4): 76. Springer.
- 1261 McEachran, J., and Miyake, T. 1990. 1990. Zoogeography and bathymetry of skates (chon-
1262 drichthyes, rajidae). Elasmobranchs as living resources. Advances in biology, Ecology, Sys-
1263 tematics and the status of the fisheries: 305–326.
- 1264 McFarlane GA and King JR. 2006. Age and growth of big skate (*Raja binoculata*) and
1265 longnose skate (*Raja rhina*) in British Columbia waters. Fisheries Research **May 1 (2-3)**:
1266 169–78.
- 1267 Mecklenburg, CW and Mecklenburg, TA and Thorsteinson, LK. 2002. Fishes of Alaska.
1268 American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.
- 1269 Methot, RD Jr. and Wetzel, CR and Taylor, IG. 2019. Stock Synthesis User Manual Version
1270 3.30.13. NOAA Fisheries. Seattle, WA. Available from {<https://vlab.ncep.noaa.gov/web/stock-synthesis>}.
- 1272 Methot, Richard D. and Wetzel, Chantell R. 2013. Stock synthesis: A biological and statis-
1273 tical framework for fish stock assessment and fishery management. Fisheries Research **142**:
1274 86–99.
- 1275 Miller, B.S., Cross, J.N., Steinfort, S.N., Fresh, K.L., and Simenstad, C.A. 1980. Nearshore
1276 fish and macroinvertebrate assemblages along the strait of juan de fuca including food habits
1277 of the common nearshore fish.
- 1278 Pacific Fishery Management Council. 2018. Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery.
1279 Available from {http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/SAFE_Dec2016_02_2.pdf}.
- 1280 Punt AE and Smith DC and KrusicGolub K and Robertson S. 2008. Quantifying age-reading
1281 error for use in fisheries stock assessments, with application to species in Australia's southern
1282 and eastern scalefish and shark fishery. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences.
- 1283 Richards, F. 1959. A flexible growth function for empirical use. Journal of experimental
1284 Botany **10**(2): 290–301. Oxford University Press.
- 1285 Stevenson, DE and Orr, JW and Hoff, GR and McEachran, JD. 2008. Emerging patterns
1286 of species richness, diversity, population density, and distribution in the skates (Rajidae) of
1287 Alaska. Fish Bull **106**: 24–39.

- 1288 Stewart, I.J., Wallace, J.R., and McGilliard, C. 2009. Status of the us yelloweye rockfish
1289 resource in 2009. In Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, OR. Available from
1290 [\{http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/\}](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/).
- 1291 Taylor, I.G., Stewart, I.J., Hicks, A.C., Garrison, T.M., Punt, A.E., Wallace, J.R., Wetzel,
1292 C.R., Thorson, J.T., Takeuchi, Y., Ono, K., Monnahan, C.C., Stawitz, C.C., A'mar, Z.T.,
1293 Whitten, A.R., Johnson, K.F., Emmet, R.L., Anderson, S.C., Lambert, G.I., Stachura,
1294 M.M., Cooper, A.B., Stephens, A., Klaer, N.L., McGilliard, C.R., Iwasaki, W.M., Doering,
1295 K., and Havron, A.M. 2019. R4ss: R code for stock synthesis. Available from <https://github.com/r4ss>.
- 1297 Taylor IG and Cope, J and Hamel O and Thorson, J. 2013. Deriving estimates of OFL for
1298 species in the “Other Fish” complex or potential alternative complexes. Pacific Fishery Man-
1299 agement Council, Portland, OR. Available from <http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock->
1300 [assessments/\}](http://www.pcouncil.org/groundfish/stock-assessments/).
- 1301 Thorson, James T. and Barnett, Lewis A. K. 2017. Comparing estimates of abun-
1302 dance trends and distribution shifts using single- and multispecies models of fishes and
1303 biogenic habitat. ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil: fsw193. doi:
1304 [10.1093/icesjms/fsw193](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw193).
- 1305 Thorson, J. T. and Shelton, A. O. and Ward, E. J. and Skaug, H. J. 2015. Geostatistical
1306 delta-generalized linear mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices
1307 for West Coast groundfishes. ICES Journal of Marine Science **72**(5): 1297–1310. doi:
1308 [10.1093/icesjms/fsu243](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu243).
- 1309 von Bertalanffy, L. 1938. A quantitative theory of organic growth. Human Biology **10**:
1310 181–213.
- 1311 Zeiner, S.J. and P. Wolf. 1993. Growth characteristics and estimates of age at maturity of
1312 two species of skates (*Raja binoculata*) and (*Raja rhina*) from Monterey Bay, California.