## Lake Erie Yellow Perch Task Group - Executive Summary Report

## March 17, 2008

This is a condensed version of the YPTG annual report, for the full report please visit http://www.glfc.org/lakecom/lec/YPTG.htm

## 2007 Fisheries Review

The lakewide total allowable catch (TAC) in 2007 was 11.389 million pounds. This allocation represented a $31 \%$ decrease from the 2006 TAC of 16.480 million pounds. For yellow perch assessment and allocation, Lake Erie is partitioned into four Management Units (Units, or MUs; Figure 1). The 2007 allocation by management unit was 1.679 , 4.206, 5.229 and 0.275 million pounds for Units 1 through 4, respectively. The lakewide harvest of yellow perch in 2007 was 9.684 million pounds; this was a $12.8 \%$ decrease from the 2006 harvest of 11.104 million pounds. Harvest by management unit was $1.8,4.1,3.6$ and 0.2 million pounds for Units 1 through 4, respectively (Table 1, Figure 2). The portion of TAC harvested was $106 \%, 97 \%, 69 \%$ and $87 \%$ in MUs 1 through 4, respectively. In 2007, Ontario harvested 5.8 million pounds, followed by Ohio ( 3.6 million Ibs.), Pennsylvania (219 thousand lbs.), Michigan ( 63 thousand lbs.) and New York ( 26 thousand lbs.).

Targeted gill net effort decreased 57\% in MU1, $75 \%$ in MU2, $45 \%$ in MU3 and $45 \%$ in MU4 from 2006. Gill net effort remained lower in 2007 compared to the 1990's and earlier decades. U.S. angling effort increased in 2007 from 2006 in MU1 ( $25 \%$ ) and MU3 ( $77 \%$ ), and decreased in MU4 (34\%). Effort remained approximately the same in MU2 in 2007. U.S. trap net effort (lifts) in 2007 decreased in MU1 (16\%), MU3 (20\%), and MU4 (30\%), but increased $22 \%$ in MU2 compared to 2006. Fishing effort by jurisdiction and gear type is presented in Table 2.

Targeted gill net harvest rates increased in 2007 compared to 2006 in all Management Units. Targeted gill net harvest rates increased $24 \%, 106 \%, 61 \%$ and $44 \%$ in MU1-4 respectively. Sport harvest rates decreased in MU1, MU2, and MU4 from 2006 in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ by $24 \%, 16 \%$, and $33 \%$ respectively. The sport harvest rate remained approximately the same in MU3 from 2006 to 2007. Trap net harvest rates increased in MU2 (88\%) and MU4 (46\%), but remained approximately the same in MU1 and MU3 from 2006. Harvest rates for 2007 are presented in Table 3.

Table 1. Lake Erie yellow perch harvest by jurisdiction and gear type for 2007

| MU | Harvest by jurisdiction (lbs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total (lbs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Michigan | Ontario | Ohio |  | Pennsylvania |  | New York |  |  |
|  | sport | commercial* | sport | commercial trap net | sport | commercial trap net | sport | commercial trap net |  |
| 1 | 62,815 | 727,678 | 781,859 | 200,818 |  |  |  |  | 1,773,170 |
| 2 |  | 1,847,139 | 543,104 | 1,701,552 |  |  |  |  | 4,091,795 |
| 3 |  | 2,997,101 | 342,999 | 48,286 | 169,594 | 23,471 |  |  | 3,581,451 |
| 4 |  | 185,954 |  |  | 25,859 | 0 | 16,424 | 9,511 | 237,748 |
| Total | 62,815 | 5,757,872 | 1,667,962 | 1,950,656 | 195,453 | 23,471 | 16,424 | 9,511 | 9,684,164 |

*small mesh gill net, large mesh gill net and incidental trawl harvest combined
Table 2. Lake Erie yellow perch fishing effort by jurisdiction and gear type for 2007

| MU | Effort by jurisdiction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Michigan | Ontario | Ohio |  | Pennsylvania |  | New York |  |
|  |  | commercial (km gill net)* |  | commercial (trap net lifts) |  | commercial (trap net lifts) |  | commercial (trap net lifts) |
| 1 | 181,698 | 2,230 | 823,624 | 2,951 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | 2,966 | 498,843 | 9,158 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 6,115 | 218,683 | 713 | 135,611 | 88 |  |  |
| 4 |  | 550 |  |  | 31,545 | 0 | 29,999 | 144 |
| Total | 181,698 | 11,861 | 1,541,150 | 12,822 | 167,156 | 88 | 29,999 | 144 |

Table 3. Lake Erie yellow perch harvest per unit effort by gear type and jurisdiction in 2007

| MU | Harvest per unit effort by jurisdiction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Michigan | Ontario | Ohio |  | Pennsylvania |  | New York |  |
|  | sport (fish/hr) | commercial (kg/km)* | sport (fish/hr) | commercial <br> (kg/lift) | sport (fish/hr) | commercial <br> (kg/lift) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { sport } \\ \text { (fish/hr) } \end{gathered}$ | commercial <br> (kg/lift) |
| 1 | 1.0 | 136.6 | 3.4 | 30.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | 238.7 | 2.8 | 84.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 218.2 | 3.4 | 30.7 | 3.8 | 121.0 |  |  |
| 4 |  | 148.1 |  |  | 1.5 | -- | 1.0 | 30.0 |

*small mesh gill net harvest per unit effort only

## ADMB Catch-at-Age Analysis and Recruitment Estimate for 2008

Population size for each management unit was estimated by catch-at-age analysis using the Auto Differentiation Model Builder computer program (ADMB; Figure 3). Age-2 yellow perch recruitment in 2008 was predicted by linear regression of juvenile yellow perch trawl indices against catch-at-age analysis estimates of two-year-old abundance in each management unit. Age-2 yellow perch recruitment in 2008 was calculated using the mean of values predicted from the indices that correlate well ( $p<0.01, \mathrm{r}^{2}>0.50$ ) with age- 2 abundance estimates. Estimates of age- 2 yellow perch recruitment for 2008 (the 2006 year class) were below average in Management Units 1, 2, slightly above average in MU3, and near average in MU4. The 2006 year class is expected to contribute minimally to fisheries in 2008.

Stock size estimates for 2008 (ages 3 and older) were projected from catch-at-age analysis estimates of 2007 population size and age-specific survival rates in 2007. Projected age-2 yellow perch recruitment from the 2006 year class (method described above) was added to the 2008 population estimate for older fish in each unit, producing the total standing stock in 2008 (Table 4). Stock size estimates projected for 2008 were lower due primarily to mortality exerted on the 2003 year class. Due to the weaker 2006 year class, which was preceded by weak 2004 and 2005 year classes, estimated abundances of ages $2+$ yellow perch in 2008 are $19 \%, 37 \%$, and $10 \%$ lower than the 2007 abundances across management units 1-3, respectively. Estimated abundance of ages 2+ yellow perch in MU4 increased 5\% in 2008 from 2007 due to a moderate age-2 year class. Abundance projections for 2008 were 25, 51, 55 and 11 million age 2 and older yellow perch in Management Units 1 through 4, respectively (Table 4).

Total biomass estimates of age-2 and older yellow perch for 2008 have declined for the third consecutive year in MU1, MU2 and MU3, biomass has declined slightly from 2007 in MU4. Total biomass in 2008 is estimated to decrease from 2007 values in MU1 (26\%), MU2 (32\%), MU3 (15\%) and MU4 (13\%). The biomass estimates for 2008 are below the historic (1975-2007) mean in MU1 (58\% of the mean value), and above historic means in MU2 (11\%), MU3 (69\%), and MU4 (103\%). The strong 2003 year class (at age 5) is expected to represent the largest fraction of total biomass in 2008 in MU2 (55\%), MU3 (38\%), and MU4 (34\%); however, the 2005 year class (at age 3) is expected to represent the largest fractions of total biomass in MU1 (35\%) with the 2003 year class representing $32 \%$ of the MU1 biomass.

Estimates of yellow perch survival for ages 3 and older in 2006 were $39 \%, 54 \%, 51 \%$ and $58 \%$ in MU1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively. In 2007, estimated survival rates (ages 3+) were $45 \%, 47 \%, 52 \%$ and $64 \%$ in Units 1 through 4 . As expected, survival rates were higher for fish ages 2 and older than ages 3 and older, since new recruits are less vulnerable to fishing mortality. Estimated exploitation rates in 2006 were $35 \%, 16 \%, 20 \%$ and $11 \%$ in Management Units $1-4$, respectively, for ages 3 and older. Exploitation rates for 2007 were estimated at $28 \%, 25 \%, 18 \%$ and $4 \%$ for yellow perch ages 3 and older across the MUs.

## Recommended Allowable Harvest (RAH) for 2008

Target fishing rates used for TACs in $2007\left(F_{2007}\right)$ are proposed for 2008 TACs, and are presented for Management Units 1 through 4 in Table 5. In 2005, an exercise was completed to update the allocation area shares using geographical information systems (GIS) mapping. In 2008, updated area percentages will be implemented as allocation shares among jurisdictions. Allocation shares by management unit and jurisdiction are:

Allocation by Management Unit and Jurisdiction, 2008:

| MU 1: | MI | $9.10 \%$ | OH | $50.31 \%$ | ONT | $40.58 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MU 2: | OH | $54.42 \%$ | ONT | $45.58 \%$ |  |  |
| MU 3: | OH | $32.85 \%$ | PA | $15.46 \%$ | ONT | $51.69 \%$ |
| MU 4: | NY | $30.27 \%$ | PA | $10.76 \%$ | ONT | $58.97 \%$ |

Table 4. Projection of the 2008 Lake Erie yellow perch population. Stock size estimates are derived from ADMB and age-2 estimates for 2008 are derived from ADMB age-2 abundance against YOY and yearling trawl indices.

|  | Age | $2007$ <br> Parameters | Rate Fu | nctions | $2008$ <br> Parameters |  | Stock | mass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stock Size (numbers millions) | Fishing Mortality Rate | Survival Rate | Stock Size (numbers millions) | Mean Weight in Pop. $(\mathrm{kg})$ | milli | kg | millions lbs. |
|  |  | Mean | (F) | (S) | Mean |  | 2007 | 2008 | 2008 |
| Unit 1 | 2 | 15.411 | 0.088 | 0.614 | 8.927 | 0.065 | 1.356 | 0.580 | 1.279 |
|  | 3 | 1.623 | 0.168 | 0.567 | 9.460 | 0.099 | 0.183 | 0.937 | 2.065 |
|  | 4 | 12.153 | 0.437 | 0.433 | 0.920 | 0.122 | 1.665 | 0.112 | 0.247 |
|  | 5 | 0.416 | 0.445 | 0.430 | 5.262 | 0.161 | 0.074 | 0.847 | 1.868 |
|  | 6+ | 1.633 | 0.482 | 0.414 | 0.855 | 0.217 | 0.328 | 0.185 | 0.409 |
|  | Total | 31.235 | 0.238 | 0.528 | 25.423 | 0.105 | 3.607 | 2.662 | 5.869 |
|  | (3+) | 15.825 | 0.410 | 0.445 | 16.496 | 0.126 | 2.251 | 2.081 | 4.589 |
| Unit 2 | 2 | 22.905 | 0.033 | 0.649 | 8.584 | 0.070 | 1.993 | 0.601 | 1.325 |
|  | 3 | 2.918 | 0.129 | 0.589 | 14.855 | 0.106 | 0.350 | 1.575 | 3.472 |
|  | 4 | 47.556 | 0.361 | 0.467 | 1.719 | 0.141 | 7.276 | 0.242 | 0.534 |
|  | 5 | 1.157 | 0.365 | 0.465 | 22.218 | 0.193 | 0.146 | 4.288 | 9.455 |
|  | 6+ | 6.117 | 0.375 | 0.461 | 3.357 | 0.316 | 1.682 | 1.061 | 2.339 |
|  | Total | 80.652 | 0.249 | 0.523 | 50.733 | 0.153 | 11.447 | 7.767 | 17.126 |
|  | (3+) | 57.748 | 0.349 | 0.473 | 42.149 | 0.170 | 9.454 | 7.166 | 15.801 |
| Unit 3 | 2 | 20.039 | 0.103 | 0.605 | 21.310 | 0.056 | 1.603 | 1.193 | 2.631 |
|  | 3 | 3.297 | 0.141 | 0.582 | 12.118 | 0.099 | 0.326 | 1.200 | 2.645 |
|  | 4 | 30.979 | 0.253 | 0.520 | 1.919 | 0.139 | 4.647 | 0.267 | 0.588 |
|  | 5 | 0.720 | 0.285 | 0.504 | 16.124 | 0.207 | 0.131 | 3.338 | 7.360 |
|  | 6+ | 5.265 | 0.272 | 0.511 | 3.052 | 0.327 | 1.537 | 0.998 | 2.200 |
|  | Total | 60.300 | 0.196 | 0.551 | 54.523 | 0.128 | 8.245 | 6.995 | 15.425 |
|  | (3+) | 40.261 | 0.246 | 0.524 | 33.213 | 0.175 | 6.642 | 5.802 | 12.793 |
| Unit 4 | 2 | 3.489 | 0.013 | 0.662 | 4.174 | 0.077 | 0.412 | 0.321 | 0.709 |
|  | 3 | 0.759 | 0.036 | 0.647 | 2.308 | 0.169 | 0.143 | 0.390 | 0.860 |
|  | 4 | 3.736 | 0.054 | 0.635 | 0.491 | 0.247 | 0.975 | 0.121 | 0.267 |
|  | 5 | 0.322 | 0.065 | 0.628 | 2.373 | 0.286 | 0.099 | 0.679 | 1.496 |
|  | 6+ | 1.979 | 0.059 | 0.632 | 1.453 | 0.336 | 0.679 | 0.488 | 1.076 |
|  | Total | 10.285 | 0.040 | 0.644 | 10.798 | 0.185 | 2.308 | 1.999 | 4.409 |
|  | (3+) | 6.796 | 0.054 | 0.635 | 6.625 | 0.253 | 1.897 | 1.678 | 3.700 |

Table 5. Lake Erie yellow perch fishing rates and the Recommended Allowable Harvest (RAH; in millions of pounds) for 2008 by management unit.

| MU | Fishing Rate | Recommended Allowable <br> Harvest (millions Ibs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.720 | 1.408 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 0.661 | 4.227 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 0.703 | 3.710 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.230 | 0.325 |
| Total |  | 9.670 |



Figure 2. Lake Erie yellow perch harvest by management unit and gear type.


Figure 3. Lake Erie yellow perch population estimates by management unit for age 2 (dark bars) and ages 3+ (light bars). Estimates for 2007 are from ADMB and regressions for age 2 from survey gears.

