

Update on age and growth of bigeye tuna in the WCPO

Jessica Farley, Paige Eveson, Kyne Krusic-Golub, Naomi Clear, Caroline Sanchez, Francois Roupsard, Keisuke Satoh, Neville Smith, John Hampton

Project 81 WCPFC SC Busan, August 2018

OCEANS & ATMOSPHERE www.csiro.au





Outline

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Objectives
- 3. Background
 - Ageing methods annual & daily
 - Age validation annual & daily
 - Biological (decimal) age calculation
- 4. Methods
- 5. Results
 - New age estimates
 - Growth modelling
 - GAM to investigate spatial effects
 - Summary



Introduction

- 2007 SC4 recommended a bigeye growth project
- 2011 Pilot project completed preliminary growth curve
- 2017 Final project completed presented at SC13 (Project 35)
 - 1,039 <u>annual</u> age estimates (included 68 BET from EPO)
 - Estimate growth parameters
 - L_{∞} = 158 cm
 - Ln (L2) = 152 cm; smaller than 184 cm used in previous assessments
 - Contributed to more optimistic view of stock status (not in an overfished state, not experiencing overfishing)
 - But concern at SC13 that large fish may be underrepresented in data
 - Additional otoliths identified by NRIFSF and SPC
 - SC13 requested further work = Project 81



Introduction





Introduction



Daily-integrated-VB (daily age & tag data)



Objectives

- Prepare and read an additional 125 otoliths from bigeye tuna >130 cm FL using the annual increment method identified in Farley et al. (2017).
- Revise and update the Farley et al. (2017) age and growth estimates based on the additional new data.

Background:

1) Ageing methods - annual & daily



Otolith sectioning plane





Annual ageing

- Fish Ageing Services (FAS)
- Transverse plane
- 4 serial sections
- Alternate opaque/translucent zones
- Count opaque zones
- Readability score
- Edge type
 - Narrow T, wide T or opaque
 - Used to estimate decimal age



Daily ageing

- Fish Ageing Services (FAS)
- Transverse or longitudinal plane
- Count microincrements
- Readability score
- Confident up to age 300 days only









From Williams et al. (2013).

Daily vs annual age





Background:

2) Age validation – annual & daily



Mark-recapture experiment

- 1990s SPC / CSIRO tagging program
- Coral Sea
- BET caught injected with SrCl₂ released
- 34 recaptured
- 11 analysed
- At liberty 207 days to >6 years
- SrCl₂ mark examined under SEM

Annual age validation

Fish number	Release Date	Release fork length (cm)	Recapture Date	Recapture fork length (cm)	Growth (cm)	Days Libert	at ty
591	9/10/1995	80	2/11/1998	139	59	1120	
37	13/11/1992	72	31/07/1993	85	13	260	
57	6/10/1995	75	14/08/1997	128	53	678	
59	12/11/1992	96	15/07/1998	159	63	2071	5.7 y
62	9/10/1995	109	3/05/1996	123	14	207	
63	6/10/1995	83	10/06/1996	94	11	248	
64	6/10/1995	79	unknown	unknown			
65	9/10/1995	78	26/01/1998	128	50	840	
66	9/10/1995	84	18/12/1997	129	45	801	
67	9/10/1995	78	4/11/1997			757	
2820	9/10/1995	125	25/5/2002	157	32	2420	6.6 y



Annual age validation

Fish number		37	57	59	62	63	64	65	66	67	591	2820
FL at tagging	(cm)	72	75	96	109	83	79	78	84	78	80	125
FL at recaptu	re (cm)	85	128	159	123	94	-	128	129	-	139	157
Time at libert tagging (days	ty after ;)	260 (8.5 mths)	678 (1 yr 10 mths)	2071 (5 yrs 8 mths)	207 (7 mths)	248 (8 mths)	recap. details not known	840 (2 yrs 3 mths)	801 (2 yrs 2 mths)	757 (2 yrs 1 mth)	1120 (3 yrs 1 mth)	2420 (6 yrs 7 mths)
Number of increments	expected	0 or 1	1 or 2	5 or 6	0 or 1	0 or 1		2	2	2	3	6 or 7
after Sr mark	observed	1	1	5	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	6
Age estimate study) *	(this	2	3	8	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	9
Age at taggin	g **	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.5	3.18
Age at recapt	ture **	1.7	3.8	8.6	3.5	2.0	-	3.8	3.9	-	4.8	7.87
Month of rec	apture	July	Aug	July	May	June		Jan	Dec	Nov	Feb	May
distance from Sr	Sr (O) -O	0.36	0.74	1.06	0.25	0.27	0.30	0.72	0.77	0.81	0.67	0.49
mark to margin (cm)	Sr (I) -I	0.26	0.56	0.80	0.15	0.16	0.25	0.54	0.63	0.77	0.50	0.43

* Estimated by counting annual increments on sectioned sagittal otoliths.

** Estimated using results from a study of otolith microincrements and tagging data (Hampton et al. 1998).



Examples – validated annual age



BET 59 - at liberty 5 years, 8 months 5 opaque zones

incs

BET 2820 - at liberty 6 years, 7 months 6 opaque zones

16 | Jessica Farley

Daily age validation

Fish no.	Release FL (cm)	Recapture FL (cm)	Days at Liberty	Otolith analysed in the SEM					Sist	ter Otolith	
				Count 1	Count 2	Reading Score	% mean difference from days at liberty	Count 1	Count 2	Reading Score	% mean difference from days at liberty
37	72	85	260	218	216	A	-16.5				
57	75	128	678	587	570	В	-14.7	530	560	С	-19.6
62	109	123	207	155	137	С	-29.4	144	146	А	-30.0
63	83	94	248	230	228	В	-7.7	184	200	С	-22.6
65	78	128	840	597	666	B-	-24.7				
66	84	129	801			broken		567	582	С	-28.3
67	78	unknown	757					570	532	В	-27.2

A= count with high confidence, all areas have visible microincrements

B= count with medium confidence, most areas have visible microincrements but a few areas are unreadable

C= count with low confidence, many areas along the section are unreadable

Conclusions – WCPO BET

- Annual periodicity of increments directly validated for age range 2 to 9 years.
- Age estimates in days for BET 72 129 cm FL are not reliable



Background:

3) Biological (decimal) age



Biological age from annual counts

- The number of opaque zones counted in otoliths is not necessarily the fish's biological age
- Convert counts to decimal age using an algorithm that accounts for:
 - Birth date
 - Timing of year that opaque zones form
 - Otolith edge type
 - Catch date

Age algorithm a = (n + b) + r/365

- *a* = decimal age
- *n* = count opaque zones
- b = "adjustment" (criteria in table below)
- *r* = capture date (days since last birthday; **July 1**)

Opaque zones completed Apr-Sep (July 1 as midpoint)

- need to adjust depending if zone has been deposited & counted, or not
- Use edge type to decide

	OCTOBER TO MARCH	APRIL TO JUNE	JULY TO SEPTEMBER
Wide or Intermediate	0	0	+1
Narrow	0	-1	0

Birth date & increment formation period





Regressing

Spawning capable: actively spawning

Spawning capable: non-spawning





July 1

Examples of age calculation

Fish	1	2	3	4
Nominal birth date	1 July 2010	1 July 2010	1 July 2010	1 July 2010
Last birthday	1 July 2011	1 July 2011	1 July 2012	1 July 2012
Date caught	1 June 2012	1 June 2012	1 Aug 2012	1 Aug 2012
Day of capture after last birthday (r)	336	336	31	31
Zone count (<i>n</i>)	1	2	1	2
Edge type	Wide	Narrow	Wide	Narrow
Count adjustment (b)	0	-1	+1	0
Decimal age (a)	1.92	1.92	2.08	2.08



Nominal birth date



24 | Jessica Farley

Project 81 Update on age and growth of bigeye tuna in the WCPO

Methods

- n = 136 >130 cm
- n = 49 90-129 cm
- n = 52 >130 cm from pilot study
- n = 12 daily ageing 31-39 cm
- Removed EPO ages
- Included all daily ages <300 days (no doubles)
- Included SPC daily ages (n = 28 <1 yr)
- Total = 1244 age estimates



Lon

Length/age frequency of BET aged



Length-at-age & VB curves



MODEL	Data	n	L∞	k	to	σ
VB1	Project 81	1244	156.9 (1.7)	0.307 (0.010)	-0.69 (0.04)	9.3 (0.22)
VB2	Project 81 low readability	318	152.9 (1.6)	0.361 (0.015)	-0.47 (0.05)	8.0 (0.32)
VB3	Project 81 high readability	984	156.9 (1.7)	0.301 (0.010)	-0.71 (0.04)	9.4 (0.21)
VB4	Project 35	1039	158.1 (1.8)	0.292 (0.011)	-0.75 (0.05)	9.7 (0.21)

Comparing growth curves



Daily-integrated-VB (daily age & tag)

New 'high readability' curve & MFCL 2014



Comparing growth curves





Fitting GAM to investigate spatial effects

Predict length at age 3.3 years



Fitting GAM to investigate spatial effects

Predict length at otolith weight 0.6 g



Summary & recommendations

- Annual ageing = counts of opaque zones
 - Use algorithm to account for birth date, catch date, edge type etc
- Daily ageing = confident up to 300 day
- Annual periodicity of increments validated for age range 2-9 years
- Age estimates in days for fish 72 129 cm FL are not reliable
- New growth curve using high confident age data
 - $L_{\infty} = 156.9 \text{ cm FL}$
 - Consistent with daily-integrated-VB growth curve
- PAW recommendations
 - Inter-lab ageing workshop in Pacific (daily/annual ageing methods)
 - Further improve tagging data for integrated growth curve

Acknowledgements

- Project 35 and Project 81 has been a **PICT** collaboration
- Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority, Marshall Islands (Berry Muller) Ministry of Fisheries, Fiji Islands (Netani Tavaga); Department of Resources and Development, Federated States of Micronesia (Brad Phillips); National Fisheries Authority, Papua New Guinea (Thomas Usu, Brian Kumasi); Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources, Solomon Islands (Charlene Golu); Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Kiribati; and, Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism, Palau (Kathy Sisior).
- We are also very grateful to the support received from Luen Thai in Majuro, Kiribati Fish Limited (KFL) in Tarawa and Soltuna in Noro for access to fish and providing support to observer biological sampling.
- All the observers, port-samplers, observer co-ordinators, fisheries officers, skippers and fish processors across the Pacific involved in collecting, storing and transporting the otoliths and gonads for this project.
- The Fisheries Agency of Chinese Taipei and I-Hsuan Tseng
- This work was funded by the WCPFC, CSIRO & SPC.