Do walleye pollock exhibit flexibility in where or when they spawn based on variability in water temperature?
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**ABSTRACT**

Environmental variability is increasingly recognized as a primary determinant of year-class strength of marine fishes by directly or indirectly influencing egg and larval development, growth, and survival. Here we examined the role of annual water temperature variability in determining when and where walleye pollock (Theragra chalcogramma) spawn in the eastern Bering Sea. Walleye pollock spawning was examined using both long-term ichthyoplankton data (N=19 years), as well as with historical spatially explicit, foreign-reported, commercial catch data occurring during the primary walleye pollock spawning season (February–May) each year (N=22 years in total). We constructed variable-coefficient generalized additive models (GAMs) to relate the spatially explicit egg or adult catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) to predictor variables including spawning stock biomass, season, position, and water temperature. The adjusted R² value was 63.1% for the egg CPUE model and 35.5% for the adult CPUE model.

Both egg and adult GAMs suggest that spawning progresses seasonally from Bogoslof Island in February to Outer Domain waters between the Pribilof and Unimak Islands by May. Most importantly, walleye pollock egg and adult CPUE was predicted to generally increase throughout the study area as mean annual water temperature increased. These results suggest low interannual variability in the spatial and temporal dynamics of walleye pollock spawning regardless of changes in environmental conditions, at least at the spatial scale examined in this study and within the time frame of decades.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. Introduction

There is increasing appreciation for the importance of spatial effects on the temporal dynamics of marine fish populations (Cadrin and Secor, 2009; Ciannelli et al., 2007). In particular, it is recognized that where and when marine fish spawn sets the stage for egg and larval development, growth, and survival (Bailey et al., 1997). Environmental variability is increasingly recognized as a primary determinant of year-class strength of marine fishes by directly or indirectly influencing egg and larval development, growth, and survival. Here we examined the role of annual water temperature variability in determining when and where walleye pollock (Theragra chalcogramma) spawn in the eastern Bering Sea. Walleye pollock spawning was examined using both long-term ichthyoplankton data (N=19 years), as well as with historical spatially explicit, foreign-reported, commercial catch data occurring during the primary walleye pollock spawning season (February–May) each year (N=22 years in total). We constructed variable-coefficient generalized additive models (GAMs) to relate the spatially explicit egg or adult catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) to predictor variables including spawning stock biomass, season, position, and water temperature. The adjusted R² value was 63.1% for the egg CPUE model and 35.5% for the adult CPUE model.

Both egg and adult GAMs suggest that spawning progresses seasonally from Bogoslof Island in February to Outer Domain waters between the Pribilof and Unimak Islands by May. Most importantly, walleye pollock egg and adult CPUE was predicted to generally increase throughout the study area as mean annual water temperature increased. These results suggest low interannual variability in the spatial and temporal dynamics of walleye pollock spawning regardless of changes in environmental conditions, at least at the spatial scale examined in this study and within the time frame of decades.
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Further refine our understanding of the spatial and temporal dynamics of spawning in eastern Bering Sea. The next logical step is to quantify how environmental variability, specifically water temperature, affects where and when spawning occurs given the scenario of a changing climate in the eastern Bering Sea (Grebmeier et al., 2006; Overpeck et al., 1997).

Bacheler et al. (2009) examined the effects of climate and landscape on the spatial and temporal distribution of pollock eggs in the Shelikof Strait region of the Gulf of Alaska. They found a relatively minor effect of temperature on the spatial extent of spawning, suggesting that the location of spawning in the Gulf of Alaska is very consistent from year to year and may have a geographical orientation rather than a high degree of environmental variability. Alternatively, Smart et al. (2012) suggests that pollock spawning, as measured by egg and larval catches, can be influenced by water temperature. Some fish species may have populations where spawning is geographically fixed, and other populations where spawning location changes with environmental conditions (e.g. Pacific hake, Merluccius productus; Bailey et al., 2004). It is likely that population-level variability in spawning strategy is an important and highly selective trait. In the case of walleye pollock in the eastern Bering Sea, it is unknown if variability in the timing and location of spawning exists, and if so, whether such variability is related to environmental conditions.

In this study we analyzed two independent data sources using regression models to elucidate the spatial and temporal patterns of walleye pollock spawning in the eastern Bering Sea. Spawning distributions are described using both egg distributions from ichthyoplankton surveys and commercial fisheries data. We compare these two independent methods to make broad inferences about how water temperature influences the spawning dynamics of pollock in the eastern Bering Sea.

2. Material and methods

We employed two independent data sources to determine if pollock spawning is influenced by water temperature in the eastern Bering Sea. First, we used the locations and timing of pollock egg collections over space and time to define spawning aggregations. We considered the presence of pollock eggs to be the most direct, practical, and powerful approach to understand pollock spawning dynamics. Eggs serve as a record of the history of spawning over approximately the past month. However, the spatial and temporal coverage of ichthyoplankton surveys varied among years. Therefore, we developed an independent test of pollock spawning dynamics from ichthyoplankton data using long-term, foreign-reported commercial catch data of adult pollock. Adult catch data is advantageous because it is spatially and temporally extensive, but the disadvantage is that adult catches may not always reflect actual spawning locations because fishers historically targeted pre-spawning fish (Low and Ikeda, 1980). We consider the inclusion of commercial catch data as an independent validation of ichthyoplankton data; both data sources are described in detail below.

2.1. Ichthyoplankton data

The Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC, Seattle, WA) has conducted ichthyoplankton surveys in the eastern Bering Sea for many years (see Fig. 1 for map of study area), and we used data on pollock egg abundance and distribution to make inferences about the spawning dynamics of the species. We initially examined 22 years of ichthyoplankton survey data (hereafter “ichthyoplankton data”), but sufficient sample sizes within the region of interest (N > 10 tows) for this paper only occurred in 19 of these years: 1986, 1988, 1991–2000, 2002–2003, and 2005–2009. Sampling occurred in all months between February and September, but the temporal coverage of sampling was somewhat variable over time due to inconsistent availability of ship time and weather (Table 1).

Two sampling gears were used to sample pollock eggs in this study: bongo (93%) and Tucker (7%) nets. Each net type consisted of 0.333-mm or 0.505-mm mesh, and was towed obliquely from 10 m off the bottom to the surface in shelf areas or from a depth of 300 m to the surface in slope and basin areas. Pollock eggs have been captured in very similar numbers between these two net types (Shima and Bailey, 1993) and mesh sizes, suggesting that...
differences in catchability between these two gears or mesh sizes are minimal. An added benefit of analyzing data from two gear types is that the spatial and temporal coverage of ichthyoplankton data was as broad as possible. Both nets were towed at a speed to maintain a 45° wire angle at a retrieval rate of 20 m min−1. Eggs were preserved in 5% formalin and later sorted and identified to species at the Plankton Sorting and Identification Center in Szczecin, Poland. AFSC scientists later verified a sub-sample for taxonomic identification accuracy.

Ichthyoplankton data analyzed in this study consisted of the number of eggs caught per standardized area sample (numbers · 10 m−2, hereafter referred to as “egg CPUE”). We used number of eggs per unit area instead of number per unit volume as the response variable because pollock egg density may decrease as the depth of the tow increases even when the true number of eggs in the water column is the same between shallow and deep sites. Therefore, we determined that number per unit area is more reflective of true abundance when comparing across depth zones. We ran models using both volumetric and area-based response variables; results were very similar between these two approaches, so only area-based results are provided. Tows with zero catch of pollock eggs (26% of tows) were excluded from the analysis. Since we were primarily interested in testing hypotheses about competing models rather than making predictions about spawning distribution, the removal of zero egg tows should not affect the results.

2.2. Foreign-reported commercial catch data collection

We used long-term foreign-reported, commercial catches of adult pollock (hereafter “commercial data”) to independently validate observed patterns of pollock spawning dynamics from ichthyoplankton data. Foreign commercial fisheries began targeting adult pollock in the eastern Bering Sea in 1964 (Low and Ikeda, 1980). Foreign catches peaked in the early 1970s, but decreased after that time following bilateral agreements between the United States, Japan, and the former Soviet Union. By 1987, U. S. fishing vessels were able to take 99% of the quota (Janeli et al., 2009), so foreign catches declined to nearly zero shortly after this time. We did not include any domestic observer data since 1987 in our analyses because of various spatial and temporal closures that have been enacted over time designed to protect spawning pollock, minimize bycatch, and enforce other restrictions; these closures would complicate our interpretations of the spawning dynamics of pollock when using commercial data.

Foreign commercial data in the eastern Bering Sea have been reported to the AFSC (1963–1991) and are used here as an independent validation of pollock spawning patterns observed from ichthyoplankton. The spatial and temporal resolution of the commercial data is not as high as the ichthyoplankton; total catch of pollock is provided for a number of 0.5° latitude by 1.0° longitude cells for each month and year of the time series. Total catch is low before 1965 and after 1987, so only 1965–1987 data are used here. Pollock were captured in a variety of fishing gears, but we limited our analysis to towing in order to standardize catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) to the greatest extent possible. The response variable was CPUE of pollock from commercial data (hereafter referred to as “adult CPUE”), computed as the total metric tons of pollock captured by towing gear per hour trawled.

The spatial coverage of commercial data was much greater than that of ichthyoplankton data (Fig. 2). To standardize the spatial extent of the two data sources for comparative purposes, we analyzed ichthyoplankton and commercial data within a box extending from 53° to 58° latitude and 158° to 173° longitude (Fig. 2) that covered nearly all of the ichthyoplankton sampling over time. Furthermore, this box is consistent with previous analyses of ichthyoplankton data in the eastern Bering Sea (e.g., Bacheler et al., 2010).

2.3. Data analysis

We chose to construct relatively simple models to describe walleye pollock spawning dynamics because we were primarily interested in elucidating general patterns that were comparable among the different sources of data. We used generalized additive models (GAMs) to elucidate the spatial and temporal patterns of pollock spawning in relation to water temperature using egg and adult CPUE. A GAM is a nonparametric and nonlinear regression technique that does not require a priori specifications of the functional relationship between the response and predictor variables (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990; Wood, 2006). GAMs replace the traditional least-squares estimate of multiple linear regression with a local smoother; here, we used the cubic spline smoother. We used a new formulation of a variable-coefficient GAM (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1993), which has the additional benefit of being able to identify specific locations where, in our case, pollock eggs or adult CPUE is expected to increase or decrease with changes in any of the predictor variables of the model (see Bacheler et al., 2009; Bartolino et al., 2011, for ecological examples of variable-coefficient GAM models). In our case, these spatially explicit models were used to determine the ways in which water temperature influenced the spatial and temporal dynamics of pollock spawning.

We constructed variable-coefficient GAMs with four predictor variables (hereafter referred to as “covariates”): (1) spawning stock biomass, to account for yearly changes in pollock egg abundance; (2) position (latitude and longitude), to account for changes in pollock spawning over space; (3) day of the year or month, to account for seasonal variability in pollock spawning; and (4) water temperature, to account for changes in pollock spawning dynamics at different water temperatures. Spawning stock biomass (SSB) was included in each model as a factor variable. Position was the latitude (φ) and longitude (λ) of either the individual ichthyoplankton sample or the center of the grid cell of the commercial adult CPUE. Day of the year was used in the ichthyoplankton dataset and month was used for the adult CPUE dataset because daily data were not available (both are referred to as time t below). Only data between 1 February and 31 May were analyzed in both datasets because this time interval encompasses most of the pollock spawning in the eastern Bering Sea (Bacheler et al., 2010; Hinckley, 1987; Jang et al., 2006) (Fig. 2).

We used average sea surface temperature (°C) between February and May as an annual index of water temperature in the eastern Bering Sea. Monthly temperatures for the eastern Bering Sea (55°N, 166°W) were acquired from NOAA’s National Centers for Environmental Prediction (Earth System Research Laboratory, 2011). Although pollock spawn at depth, monthly sea surface temperature (temp) was used as a proxy for the water temperature experienced by spawning pollock because bottom temperatures were not available for most years of our study. This is a reasonable assumption because sea surface temperature is highly correlated with bottom temperature during spring months when most pollock spawning occurs (Bacheler et al., 2010; Hinckley, 1987). Generally, surface and bottom temperatures across the shelf are similar until late spring when the water column begins to stratify (Luchin et al., 1999), and interannual patterns in SST are coherent across the shelf (Niebauer, 1981). Even in summer, the mean annual surface temperature across the eastern Bering Sea shelf is correlated with bottom temperature (R2=0.61 from 1982–2006; data from Buckley et al., 2009).

In our spatially explicit variable-coefficient GAM, we related the natural logarithm of pollock egg or adult CPUE, ln(CPUE) to
temporal, spatial, and temperature variables using the following model structure:

$$x_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda} = a_{ssb} + g_1(\theta, \lambda) + g_2(\theta, \lambda) \cdot \text{temp} + g_3(\theta, \lambda) \cdot t + e_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where $$x_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda}$$ is pollock egg or adult CPUE at time $$t$$, spawning stock biomass $$ssb$$, latitude $$\phi$$, and longitude $$\lambda$$, $$a_{ssb}$$ is the spawning stock biomass-specific intercept, $$\text{temp}$$ is spring water temperature, $$t$$ is day of the year for the egg CPUE model or month for the adult CPUE model, $$g_1$$, $$g_2$$ are nonparametric smoothing functions, and $$e_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda}$$ is the random error assumed to be normally distributed (on a log scale) with a mean of zero and finite variance. The strength of the variable-coefficient GAM approach used here is the ability to predict specific areas where pollock egg or adult CPUE is expected to increase or decrease given changes in either water temperature or time.

We included an additional quadratic term for the time variable in the egg CPUE model to relax the assumption of a linear relationship between the time of the year and egg CPUE. This model was formulated as

$$x_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda} = a_{ssb} + g_1(\theta, \lambda) + g_2(\theta, \lambda) \cdot \text{temp} + g_3(\theta, \lambda) \cdot t + g_4(\theta, \lambda) \cdot t^2 + e_{t,ssb,\theta, \lambda}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

A quadratic term for month could not be included in the adult CPUE model because of the low number of monthly periods (four: February, March, April, and May) over which smoothing was not appropriate. Eq. (1) was considered the “base” model for adult CPUE and Eq. (2) was considered the “base” model for egg CPUE.

Traditional approaches to plotting the spatially explicit effects from variable-coefficient GAMs (e.g., Bacheler et al., 2009; Bartolino et al., 2011) were unavailable here because of the inclusion of the quadratic term for time in the egg CPUE model. Instead, we developed an alternative approach to visualizing the effects from the egg and adult CPUE models. Egg CPUE data were predicted for two seasonal periods (i.e., 15 March and 15 May) in a common year within each 0.5° by 0.5° degree cell over a grid encompassing our study area. We then plotted the difference in egg CPUE predictions for each grid cell as

$$x_{\text{difference}} = x_{15\text{May}} - x_{15\text{March}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

Grid cells with a high positive effect occur where the predicted egg CPUE on 15 May far exceeds the predicted egg CPUE on 15 March, and high negative effects occur where predicted egg CPUE for 15 March far exceeds predicted egg CPUE on 15 May. The foreign-reported adult CPUE data were already provided in a

---

**Fig. 2.** Left column: mean walleye pollock Theragra chalcogramma egg catch-per-unit-effort (number of eggs \(\cdot 10^3\) m\(^{-2}\)) in (A) February–March, (B) April–May, and (C) June–September from surveys occurring in 1986, 1988, 1991–2000, 2002–2003, and 2005–2009. Right column: foreign-reported adult catch-per-unit-effort of walleye pollock (t per hour trawled) in the eastern Bering Sea in (D) February–March, (E) April–May, and (F) June–September in 1965–1987. Shown are mean egg or adult catch-per-unit-effort within each spatial cell averaged across all years of the study.
regular grid, so we predicted adult CPUE over the existing grid at a common year for both March and May, and the difference between the two was plotted for each grid cell in the same way as described above for the egg CPUE model.

The visualization of the effect of water temperature on egg and adult CPUE was developed the same way as the effect of time. Egg and adult CPUE were predicted over a grid at low (3 °C) and high springtime water temperatures (4 °C; see 3. Results below), and the difference between these two predictions was plotted for each grid cell and each model.

We also noted that sample sizes within our study region for both ichthyoplankton and commercial data sources varied among grid cells. Therefore, we plotted the number of samples for each grid cell for both data sources; this figure assisted interpretations of the temporal and water temperature figures.

Egg and adult CPUE base models were compared to reduced models using generalized cross validation (GCV; a measure of the out-of-sample predicted mean squared error), Akaike information criterion (AIC: Burnham and Anderson, 2002), and standard model diagnostics. A variety of reduced models that had one covariate removed at a time were compared to each of the base models. Models with the lowest GCV and AIC scores were selected over models with higher scores, and the two measures selected the same overall best model for both ichthyoplankton and commercial data. Models were coded and analyzed using the mgcv library (version 1.6–2; Wood, 2004) in R version 2.11 (R Development Core Team, 2010) using the Gaussian family model and identity link function.

### 3. Results

Highest pollock egg CPUE occurred between February and May in the eastern Bering Sea; egg CPUE after May was much lower (Fig. 2), justifying our selection of February to May data to be analyzed in our study. Egg CPUE in February–March was highest in the Aleutian Basin around Bogoslof Island, but increased eastward in the Outer Domain in April–May. Adult CPUE from commercial data showed a similar pattern of being highest in the Aleutian Basin in February–March and highest in the Outer Domain in April–May (Fig. 2). The annual mean February–May water temperature ranged from a low of 2.0 °C in 2007 to 4.7 °C in 2003 (overall mean from 1965–2009 = 3.5 °C) (Fig. 3).

Within our study area (i.e., box shown in Fig. 2), ichthyoplankton data were collected in 1–5 cruises taken each year from 12 to 263 bongo or Tucker tow samples (Table 1). The fewest eggs were collected in 1992 (N=52) and the most were collected in 1988 (N=336,341); the total collected over all 19 years of the study was over 1.5 million (Table 1).

In Table 2, the number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is listed. The total number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058, and the number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058. The total number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058, and the number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058. The total number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058, and the number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058. The total number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058, and the number of grid cells reporting positive pollock catch each year is 1,058.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pollock caught (t)</th>
<th>Hours trawled</th>
<th>CPUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36399</td>
<td>5025</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>62536</td>
<td>20962</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>74761</td>
<td>17791</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>148224</td>
<td>22365</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>219582</td>
<td>32952</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>162388</td>
<td>30499</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>114783</td>
<td>21198</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>61021</td>
<td>20182</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>54274</td>
<td>22170</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>82159</td>
<td>31416</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6219</td>
<td>10787</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>13525</td>
<td>31441</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>24826</td>
<td>27865</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>45170</td>
<td>39016</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>68921</td>
<td>39539</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>39215</td>
<td>25609</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>51824</td>
<td>27520</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>33281</td>
<td>12421</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14732</td>
<td>6975</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15313</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5519</td>
<td>1330453</td>
<td>450078</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The base models for egg and adult CPUE substantially outperformed any of the reduced models based on GCV and AIC scores (Table 3). The adjusted R^2 value was 63.1% for the egg CPUE model and 35.5% for the adult CPUE model (Table 3). Standard model diagnostics (using the gam.check function in R) suggested that both models fit the data very well. Therefore, all subsequent analyses are based upon the respective egg and adult CPUE base models only.

Spatially explicit sample sizes varied for the ichthyoplankton and commercial data sources (Fig. 4). Ichthyoplankton sample sizes were highest closest to the Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands, particularly near Bogoslof Island and north of Unimak Island (Fig. 4A). In contrast, commercial data sample sizes were highest in the Outer Domain south of the Pribilof Islands (Fig. 4B). It is in these regions where our subsequent analyses of pollock spawning dynamics are likely to be most reliable.
Egg and adult CPUE showed similar spatially explicit patterns based on the effect of time (Fig. 5). Egg CPUE increased between 15 March and 15 May most substantially in the Outer Domain between Unimak and the Pribilof Islands, and also west of the Pribilof Islands; it declined the most around Bogoslof Island and Bristol Bay (Fig. 5A). Similarly, adult CPUE increased the most in the Outer Domain between Unimak and the Pribilof Islands, and decreased the most around Bogoslof Island (Fig. 5B). In contrast, however, adult CPUE increased in Bristol Bay, but note that

### Table 3

Model selection for the spatially explicit variable-coefficient generalized additive models for walleye pollock *Theragra chalcogramma* egg and adult CPUE models. Estimated degrees of freedom are provided for each term; na: covariate not applicable to that particular model; GCV: generalized cross validation score; AIC: Akaike information criterion; Adjusted $R^2$: adjusted coefficient of determination. Base is: $a_{ssb}(\phi, l) = a_{ssb} + g_1(\phi, l) + g_2(\phi, l) \cdot \text{temp} + g_3(\phi, l) \cdot t + g_4(\phi, l) \cdot t^2 + \epsilon_{\text{ext}(\phi, l)}$, where $a_{\text{ext}(\phi, l)}$ is pollock egg or adult CPUE at time $t$, spawning stock biomass $ssb$, latitude $\phi$, and longitude $l$, $a_{ssb}$ is the spawning stock biomass-specific intercept, temp is water temperature, $t$ is day of the year for the egg CPUE model or month for the adult CPUE model, $g_1$–$g_4$ are nonparametric smoothing functions, and $\epsilon_{\text{ext}(\phi, l)}$ is the random error assumed to be normally distributed (on a log scale) with a mean of zero and finite variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$a_{ssb}$</th>
<th>$g_1(\phi, l) \cdot \text{temp}$</th>
<th>$g_2(\phi, l) \cdot t$</th>
<th>$g_3(\phi, l) \cdot t^2$</th>
<th>GCV</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egg CPUE model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>6716 0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_2(\phi, l) \cdot \text{temp}$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>6765 0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_4(\phi, l) \cdot t^2$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>6845 0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_3(\phi, l) \cdot t$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>6856 0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $a_{ssb}$</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td>7083 0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult CPUE model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>14226 0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_2(\phi, l) \cdot \text{temp}$</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>14241 0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_1(\phi, l)$</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>14296 0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $a_{ssb}$</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>14436 0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base - $g_3(\phi, l) \cdot t^2$</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>14444 0.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Sample sizes of (A) ichthyoplankton surveys and (B) foreign-reported adult walleye pollock *Theragra chalcogramma* catch data in the eastern Bering Sea. The number of samples occurring within each grid cell was summed across all years of each survey (ichthyoplankton: 1986, 1988, 1991–2000, 2002–2003, and 2005–2009; foreign-reported data: 1965–1987).

Fig. 5. Spatially explicit variable-coefficient generalized additive model plots for the effects of time on walleye pollock *Theragra chalcogramma* egg (A) or foreign-reported adult catch-per-unit-effort (B) in the eastern Bering Sea. Light gray grid cells denote highest overall predicted egg or adult CPUE and dark gray cells indicate the lowest. Overlaid on grid cells are red or blue bubbles, which indicate an expected increase or decrease, respectively, in log-transformed egg or adult pollock CPUE as time progressed from March to May, the core walleye pollock spawning season in the eastern Bering Sea.
commercial data sample sizes in this region were extremely low (Fig. 4B).

As water temperature increased from 3 to 4 °C, both pollock egg and adult CPUE increased throughout the study region (Fig. 6). Egg CPUE increased most substantially east of the Pribilof Islands in the Middle Domain, and least in Bristol Bay and basin waters north of Bogoslof Island (Fig. 6A). Adult CPUE increased the most near Unimak Island, the southern section of the Alaska Peninsula, and northwest of the Pribilof Islands (Fig. 6B).

4. Discussion

Understanding the degree to which the spawning spatial structure of marine populations is affected by environmental variability would enable us to infer the likelihood that species will shift their range or colonize new habitats. This is particularly relevant for subpolar regions where the effect of climate warming is more likely to cause shifts in population distributions (Mueter and Litzow, 2008). Over a long time period, it is reasonable to expect that marine populations may change their spawning distribution due to colonization of new and favorable habitats, especially during the early life stages (Iles and Sinclair, 1982). Spawning distribution can also change as a consequence of selective fishing removals (Opdal, 2010). However, on relatively shorter time scales of years to decades, the processes that affect spawning distribution are less clear. Do individuals conserve a memory of their previous or parental spawning locations (e.g., Corten, 2002; Cury, 1994) or do they exhibit flexibility in choosing their spawning sites (e.g., Bailey et al., 2004)? Can these two different strategies coexist, as is observed in Pacific hake, apparently with both geographically fixed and environmentally driven subpopulations (e.g., Bailey et al., 2004)?

Detection and monitoring of the spatial distribution of fish spawning requires high resolution data that are rarely available due to the short duration of spawning events, as well as harsh weather conditions during the spawning season (typically winter or late spring in temperate and subpolar stocks). Analytically, we face the challenge of detecting spatial patterns from limited time series and testing whether such patterns change over contrasting environmental regimes (Ciannelli et al., 2008).

Using egg and adult CPUE in a regression framework explicitly developed for testing variability of spatial patterns (e.g., Bacheler et al., 2009), we have documented that there are consistent seasonal patterns of pollock spawning locations in the eastern Bering Sea. Seasonally, we show that peak spawning occurs early in the year (March) in the Bogoslof and Islands of Four Mountains regions and progresses toward the slope area and around the Pribilof Islands by May. We interpret these seasonal patterns as a manifestation of spawning activities from multiple subpopulations (Bacheler et al., 2010; Bailey et al., 2000; Hinckley, 1987). Water temperature also caused changes in both egg and adult CPUE, but the effect of water temperature was less spatially heterogeneous compared to that of seasons. Locally, the magnitude of the effect caused by a 1 °C variation in water temperature is similar to that caused by a seasonal progression (March to May), albeit a much more spatially homogeneous effect. Thus, temperature does not appear to drastically change the spatial patterns of spawning locations, but primarily the magnitude. Within the time frame examined here (1965–2009), we have observed temperature variations of up to 3 °C, indicating that locally the effect of interannual changes of temperature over the time series may exceed that of seasons, within each sampled year.

Despite the socioeconomic and ecological importance of pollock in the Bering Sea, there have been relatively few studies that characterize their spawning geography and phenology, and none to date that have addressed spawning variability over time. Our study is in agreement with previous studies that have examined pollock spawning geography (Hinckley, 1987) and phenology (Bacheler et al., 2010) in the Bering Sea. We build upon these studies by examining the ways in which interannual variability in spawning is linked to environmental variability. We estimate that the effect of water temperature warming on pollock spawning activity is locally strong, but more spatially homogeneous than the effect of season. Thus we contend that there is persistence in pollock spawning locations with respect to changes in thermal conditions (Cury, 1994), at least at the spatial scale examined in this study (hundreds of km) and within the time frame of decades. A similar analysis conducted on pollock eggs in the Shelikof Strait region of the Gulf of Alaska also found a limited effect of water temperature on egg spatial patterns (Bacheler et al., 2009).

Our results indicate that pollock spawning locations in the Bering Sea may have undergone interannual changes, as evidenced by the combined patterns of the egg and catch data. However, these changes appear more linked to variability of
recruitment events between stocks or substocks; the role of fishing on the spatial variability in spawning over time undoubtedly played a significant role for the Aleutian basin spawning aggregations, particularly as large recruitment events ceased in this region (Janelli et al., 2009). Specifically, adult CPUE data between March and May show the largest change of spatial patterns as a decline of CPUE in the Bogoslof and Islands of Four Mountains regions. The egg data show a similar spatial decline in the Island of Four Mountains, albeit the magnitude is much reduced. The foreign-reported adult CPUE data used in our analyses ended in 1987, while the egg CPUE data analyzed here started in 1986. Thus, the two data sets cover different time periods. It is then reasonable to assume that the seasonal decline of spawning activity in the Islands of Four Mountains region has been accompanied by an overall progressive decline of spawning activity over time in that region. This observation is consistent with what we know about the collapse of the pollock stock from the Aleutian Basin, where the Islands of Four Mountains region was a prominent spawning area. After the early 1990s, pollock catches from that region had declined by 80% compared to the peak catches of the mid and late 1980s (Janelli et al., 2009). This does not imply that similar effects are occurring now, rather that future analyses of spawning distribution patterns may want to consider including fishery removals.

We consider the egg abundance data as the most reliable source of information for pollock spawning activity. We did not score eggs based on their maturity stage, thus egg distribution patterns may reflect some drift activity (Wespestad et al., 2000). However, given that pollock tend to spawn in relatively deep regions of the water column (≥200 m) where currents are typically sluggish, and that previous analyses on yolk-sac larval distribution compared to egg distribution showed a modest amount of drift between these two stages (Bacheler et al., 2010), we expect that the effect of drift on eggs is minimal compared to the spatial resolution of the sampling. The main problem that we see in the egg CPUE data is its spatial and temporal coverage. Hence, we also included adult CPUE data in our analyses, but acknowledge that commercial CPUE data can be problematic because of differences in their abilities (e.g., skipper skills or technologies) to catch fish (Hilborn and Walters, 1992). Overall we found strong agreement in the ways in which pollock spawning varied in relation to season or water temperature observed from these two very different datasets. The main differences were found with respect to seasonal patterns, particularly in the Bristol Bay region where the sample sizes were small and uncertainty was large.

Declining fish stocks are often reflected in a contraction of their spawning distribution (Atkinson et al., 1997; McFarlane et al., 2002; Watanabe et al., 1997). It follows that documenting changes in spawning location and extent is of particular relevance to fisheries management as an indicator of changes in population abundance. During their spawning migrations, fish are typically subject to a high degree of site-specific associations (Cury, 1994), and many marine fish species exhibit philopatry (e.g., Brophy et al., 2006; Rooker et al., 2008). If there are multiple subunits within a population, the spawning geography is very heterogeneous (e.g., Iles and Sinclair, 1982). Thus, the spatial structure during the spawning phase also reflects the population genetic and ecological structure, and its monitoring over time has important implications for conservation and management (Schindler et al., 2010).
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