

# Status of the Yellowtail rockfish stock off the U.S. West Coast north of 40°10' in 2025

Kiva L. Oken<sup>1</sup>, Ian G. Taylor<sup>1</sup>, Megan L. Feddern<sup>1</sup>, Alison D. Whitman<sup>2</sup> and Fabio P. Caltabellotta<sup>3</sup>

1. NOAA Fisheries Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East
2. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2040 Southeast Marine Science Drive
3. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 600 Capital Way North



U.S. Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Northwest Fisheries Science Center

## Table of contents

0.1	Executive Summary . . . . .	5
0.1.1	Assessment Model . . . . .	5
0.1.2	Reference Points, Stock Status, and Projections . . . . .	5
1	Introduction . . . . .	6
1.1	Life History . . . . .	6
1.2	Ecosystem considerations . . . . .	6
1.3	Fishery description . . . . .	6
1.4	Management History . . . . .	6
1.5	Management performance . . . . .	6
1.6	Fisheries off Canada and Alaska . . . . .	6
2	Data . . . . .	7
2.1	Fishery-dependent data . . . . .	7
2.1.1	Landings . . . . .	7
2.1.2	Discards . . . . .	7
2.1.3	Biological data . . . . .	7
2.1.4	Abundance indices . . . . .	7
2.2	Fishery-independent data . . . . .	7
2.3	Biological Parameters . . . . .	7
2.3.1	Natural Mortality . . . . .	7
2.3.2	Weight-at-length . . . . .	7
2.3.3	Maturity . . . . .	7
2.3.4	Fecundity . . . . .	8
2.4	Environmental and ecosystem data . . . . .	8
3	Assessment model . . . . .	9
3.1	History of modeling approaches . . . . .	9
3.2	Response to most recent STAR panel and SSC recommendations . . . . .	9
3.3	Model Structure and Assumptions . . . . .	9
3.3.1	Model Changes from the Last Assessment . . . . .	9
3.3.2	Modeling Platform and Structure . . . . .	9
3.3.3	Model Parameters . . . . .	9
3.3.4	Key Assumptions and Structural Choices . . . . .	9
3.4	Base Model Results . . . . .	10
3.4.1	Parameter Estimates . . . . .	10
3.4.2	Fits to the Data . . . . .	10
3.4.3	Population Trajectory . . . . .	10
3.5	Model Diagnostics . . . . .	11
3.5.1	Convergence . . . . .	11
3.5.2	Sensitivity Analyses . . . . .	11
3.5.3	Retrospective Analysis . . . . .	11
3.5.4	Likelihood Profiles . . . . .	11
3.6	Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties . . . . .	11

4	Management	12
4.1	Reference Points . . . . .	12
4.2	Harvest Projections and Decision Tables . . . . .	12
4.3	Evaluation of Scientific Uncertainty . . . . .	12
4.4	Regional management considerations . . . . .	12
4.5	Research and Data Needs . . . . .	12
4.6	Acknowledgements . . . . .	13
4.7	References . . . . .	14
4.8	Tables . . . . .	15
4.9	Figures . . . . .	16
4.10	Notes . . . . .	17
4.11	Appendices . . . . .	18

## List of Figures

## List of Tables

Please cite this publication as:

Oken, K.L., I.G. Taylor, M.L. Feddern, A.D. Whitman, F.P. Caltabellotta. Status of the Yellowtail rockfish stock off the U.S. West Coast north of 40°10') in 2025. Prepared by [COMMITTEE]. [XX] p.

0.1 Executive Summary

0.1.1 Assessment Model

0.1.2 Reference Points, Stock Status, and Projections

## 1 Introduction

Testing adding in an introduction for Yellowtail rockfish. There is currently no read of parameters for child documents.

### 1.1 Life History

### 1.2 Ecosystem considerations

### 1.3 Fishery description

### 1.4 Management History

### 1.5 Management performance

### 1.6 Fisheries off Canada and Alaska

## 2 Data

### 2.1 Fishery-dependent data

#### 2.1.1 Landings

#### 2.1.2 Discards

#### 2.1.3 Biological data

#### 2.1.4 Abundance indices

### 2.2 Fishery-independent data

### 2.3 Biological Parameters

#### 2.3.1 Natural Mortality

#### 2.3.2 Weight-at-length

#### 2.3.3 Maturity

We used a total of 292 individual histological samples of aged female yellowtail rockfish to estimate maturity for the assessment. These samples were all collected north of 40.167; this latitude filter excluded 5 additional samples collected in the south, but the inclusion or exclusion of these samples did not change our results. The 292 samples were collected over the period 2016–2023, though more samples were collected earlier in these years ( $n = 111$  in 2016, 52 in 2017, 31 in 2018, 17 in 2021, 9 in 2022, 13 in 2023). Previous assessments of yellowtail estimated length-based maturity ( $L_{50} = 42.49\text{cm}$  in 2017 assessment); however, we switched to an age based model for the current assessment. For many species, energy is reallocated toward maturation from growth, and as a result growth rates slow during the juvenile to adult transition period. Thus, length at 50% maturity will represent a range of ages, providing a less accurate understanding of the spawning population. We treated maturity as a binomial response, and considered a variety of models with temporal and spatial covariates, using a logit link and generalized linear mixed model framework, implemented the R package *sdmTMB* (Anderson et al. 2024). Briefly, we considered models that included (1) temporal year effects (either estimated as a random walk intercept, or smooth term), (2) spatial random fields (using a mesh cutoff distance of 50km), and (3) spatially varying coefficients of age, following the model adopted by Grandin et al. (2024). Models that converged were compared by examining QQ plots, AUC metrics, and AIC scores. Likely because of the uneven temporal distribution of sampling, and general sparsity, we did not find support for including temporal or spatial effects, and decided on the simpler null model (equivalent

to a logistic regression). For the age-based model, we estimated an intercept of -6.70 ( $SE = 0.99$ ) and slope of 0.67 ( $SE = 0.10$ ), equivalent to an  $A_{50}$  of 13.31 years. For a more direct comparison to the previous assessment, we used these same 292 samples to fit an equivalent length – based model, which resulted in an estimated  $L_{50} = 43.35$  cm.

#### 2.3.4 Fecundity

### 2.4 Environmental and ecosystem data



### 3 Assessment model

#### 3.1 History of modeling approaches

#### 3.2 Response to most recent STAR panel and SSC recommendations

#### 3.3 Model Structure and Assumptions

##### 3.3.1 Model Changes from the Last Assessment

##### 3.3.2 Modeling Platform and Structure

##### 3.3.3 Model Parameters

##### 3.3.4 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices

### 3.4 Base Model Results

#### 3.4.1 Parameter Estimates

#### 3.4.2 Fits to the Data

#### 3.4.3 Population Trajectory

### 3.5 Model Diagnostics

#### 3.5.1 Convergence

#### 3.5.2 Sensitivity Analyses

#### 3.5.3 Retrospective Analysis

#### 3.5.4 Likelihood Profiles

### 3.6 Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties

## 4 Management

### 4.1 Reference Points

### 4.2 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables

### 4.3 Evaluation of Scientific Uncertainty

### 4.4 Regional management considerations

### 4.5 Research and Data Needs

#### 4.6 Acknowledgements

#### 4.7 References

- Anderson, Sean C., Eric J. Ward, Philina A. English, Lewis A. K. Barnett, and James T. Thorson. 2024. “sdmTMB: An r Package for Fast, Flexible, and User-Friendly Generalized Linear Mixed Effects Models with Spatial and Spatiotemporal Random Fields.” *bioRxiv* 2022.03.24.485545. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.24.485545>.
- Grandin, C. J., Johnson K. F., Edwards A. M., and Berger A. M. 2024. “Status of the Pacific Hake (Whiting) Stock in U.S. And Canadian Waters in 2024.” Joint Technical Committee of the U.S.; Canada Pacific Hake/Whiting Agreement, National Marine Fisheries Service; Fisheries; Oceans Canada.

#### 4.8 Tables

#### 4.9 Figures



#### 4.10 Notes

#### 4.11 Appendices