Spatial effort allocation: separation of catches in highly mixed fisheries

Paul J. Dolder, James Thorson, Cóilín Minto,

Jean-Marc Guarini, Dorleta Garcia and Jan Jaap Poos

paul.dolder@gmit.ie





Doctoral Programme MARES



Motivation

- Mixed fisheries have highly complex spatiotemporal dynamics
- Fishers make decisions about location choice in face of uncertainty
- In EU, 'landing obligation' makes spatial targeting (and avoidance) key to meeting management goals



Motivation

- Spatial targeting is a mechanism to decouple exploitation among species
- Challenge: how far can it practically contribute to **dealing with LO**
- Unknown and anecdotal: need for a **quantifiable framework**



Objectives

- Goal: Develop a framework for understanding and simplifying complexities of spatiotemporal targeting
- Approach:
 - Implement geostatistical model to draw inference on fishery-fish community dynamics
 - Identify species assemblages which **co-occur** and are exploited together
 - Tease out potential for (and limitations to) **spatial targeting** in mixed fishery
- Applied to **Celtic Sea** case study

Brief methods

- Spatial Dynamic Factor Analysis (SDFA) able to take account of latent (unobserved) drivers which affect species distribution and density for one or more species
- Gaussian Markov Random Fields (GMRFs) to model the variation in probability of occurrence and density (and account for autocorrelation)
- Separate contribution of gear effects, encounter probability and density (**GLMM**).











Data: Surveys







2010

2015

0

-12

-8

Survey code	Name	Gear	Temporal ex-
			tent
CEXP / IE-IGFS	Celtic Explorer (IE)	Otter trawl	2003 - 2015
CARLHELMAR	Carlhelmar (UK)	Commercial beam trawl	1989 - 2013
NWGFS	North West groundfish survey (UK)	Beam trawl	1988 - 2015
Q1SWBEAM	Quarter 1 south-west beam trawl survey (UK)	2006 - 2015	
Q4SWIBTS	Quarter 4 south-west interna- tional bottom trawl survey (UK)	Otter trawl	2003 - 2010
THA2 / EVHOE	EVHOE survey on Thalasa (FR)	Otter trawl	1997 - 2015
WCGFS	Wstern channel groundfish survey (UK)	Otter trawl (Por- tuguese high head- line)	1982 - 2004

Data: Species















Species code	Common name	Species	MCRS (cm)
juv	Juvenile		
adu	Adult		
bud	Black bellied angler- fish	Lophius budgessa	32*
cod	Atlantic cod	Gadus morhua	35
had	Atlatic haddock	Melanogrammus aeglefinus	30
hke	Atlantic hake	Merluccius merluccius	27
meg	Megrim	Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis	20
pisc	White bellied angler- fish	Lophius piscatorius	32*
ple	European Plaice	Pleuronectes platessa	27
sol	Common sole	Solea solea	24
whg	Atlantic whiting	Merlangius merlangus	27

*Monkfish species estimated based on a 500g minimum marketing weight





Spatial drivers of species assemblages





First factor shows strong correlation with depth for encounter probability (-0.85, -0.88 to -0.81) and density (-0.71, -0.77 to -0.65). 80 % of variance explained by depth and habitat: 9/10 of that by depth.

Spatiotemporal changes in assemblages distributions



Correlation between species

	ple_adu	ple_juv	sol_adu	sol_juv	pisc_adu	pisc_juv	hke_adu	hke_juv	meg_juv	meg_adu	bud_adu	bud_juv	whg_adu	whg_juv	cod_adu	cod_juv	had_adu	had_juv		sol_adu	sol_juv	ple_adu	ple_juv	had_juv	pisc_juv	whg_juv	hke_juv	meg_adu	meg_juv	vu[_bud	hke_adu	cod_juv	pisc_adu	bud_adu	cod_adu	had_adu	whg_adu
	1	0.88	0.75	0.51	-0.31		-0.33				-0.27		0.48	0.55		0.26		0.35		1	0.62	0.31				0.41			-0.61	-0.61	-0.47						<mark>0.23</mark>
	0.88	1	0.69	0.64	-0.35		-0.4			-0.39	-0.33	-0.38	<mark>0.25</mark>	0.5	-0.29		-0.28			0.62	1		0.43					0.35									
	0.75	0.69	1	0.86	-0.28		-0.37	0.28		-0.28	- <mark>0.26</mark>		0.45	0.63				0.33		0.31		1	0.64	0.43		0.5		-0.33	-0.36		-0.35		-0.38				
	0.51	0.64	0.86	1	-0.4		-0.57		-0.31	-0.57	-0.45	-0.53		0.51			-0.36				0.43	0.64	1		0.47	0.6					-0.34		-0.48		-0.63		
	-0.31	-0.35	-0.28	-0.4	1	0.74	0.52	0.25	0.28	0.59	0.72	0.65		-0.35	0.34		0.32	<mark>0.23</mark>		,		0.43		1	0.43	0.4										0.56	0.44
					0.74	1	0.73	0.68	0.49	0.56	0.7	0.81	0.34		0.31	0.26	0.41	0.58					0.47	0.43	1	0.5						0.5	<mark>0.29</mark>			0.46	0.67
	-0.33	-0.4	-0.37	-0.57	0.52	0.73	1	0.54	0.61	0.7	0.68	0.81			0.44	<mark>0.27</mark>	0.54	0.53		0.41		0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	1	0.21	-0.37	-0.48		-0.45		-0.35				0.47
			<mark>0.28</mark>		<mark>0.25</mark>	0.68	0.54	1	0.75	0.66	0.64	0.72	0.48	0.45	0.36	0.34	0.53	0.75								0.21	1	<mark>0.26</mark>		0.46			-0.35				
ON				-0.31	0.28	0.49	0.61	0.75	1	0.85	0.82	0.83					0.44	0.63	Chr.	•	0.35	-0.33				-0.37	0.26	1	0.67	0.47						<mark>0.24</mark>	-0.25
Con the		-0.39	-0.28	-0.57	0.59	0.56	0.7	0.66	0.85	1	0.88	0.88			0.41		0.69	0.63	Str.	-0.61		-0.36				-0.48		0.67	1	0.79					-0.42		-0.31
	-0.27	-0.33	-0.26	-0.45	0.72	0.7	0.68	0.64	0.82	0.88	1	0.93		-0.29			0.32	0.39		-0.61							0.46	0.47	0.79	1	0.31				-0.41		-0.28
		-0.38		-0.53	0.65	0.81	0.81	0.72	0.83	0.88	0.93	1		-0.21			0.48	0.59	Contraction of the second seco	-0.47		-0.35	-0.34			-0.45				0.31	1	0.74	0.71		0.3		
	0.48	<mark>0.25</mark>	0.45			0.34		0.48					1	0.81	0.49	0.72	0.63	0.73		(0.5						0.74	1	0.74		0.63	0.47	0.48
	0.55	0.5	0.63	0.51	-0.35			0.45			-0.29	-0.21	0.81	1		0.53	<mark>0.24</mark>	0.45				-0.38	-0.48		0.29	-0.35	-0.35				0.71	0.74	1	0.4	0.67	0.55	0.41
		-0.29	_		0.34	0.31	0.44	0.36		0.41			0.49		1	0.87	0.72	0.42															0.4	1		0.47	0.49
	0.26					0.26	0.27	0.34					0.72	0.53	0.87	1	0.57	0.42					-0.63						-0.42	-0.41	0.3	0.63	0.67		1	0.58	0.47
		-0.28		-0.36	0.32	0.41	0.54	0.53	0.44	0.69	0.32	0.48	0.63	0.24	0.72	0.57	1	0.85						0.56	0.46			<mark>0.24</mark>				0.47	0.55	0.47	0.58	1	0.72
	0.35		<mark>0.33</mark>		<mark>0.23</mark>	0.58	0.53	0.75	0.63	0.63	0.39	0.59	0.73	0.45	0.42	0.42	0.85	1		0.23				0.44	0.67	0.47		-0.25	-0.31	-0.28		0.48	0.41	0.49	0.47	0.72	1

(A) Spatial Encounter probability

(B) Spatial Density

Potential for spatial targeting



Conclusions

- Provides a dimension-reduction framework to understand how spatial community and fishery dynamics interact to determine species and size composition
- Applied to the highly mixed fisheries of the Celtic Sea: clear common spatial patterns emerge for **three distinct assemblages**
- Importance to focus management on axes of maximal separation and identify how spatial targeting can help support catch balancing (modelling priority)

- Wasn't what I came here initially to talk about....
- Developing comparison of spatial effort allocation methods: RUMs, Markov, Dynamic state. Welcome a chat about your experiences
- Also talk this afternoon on spatial simulation model: Spatial management and MPAs 3.30 PM – 5.00 PM

Thank you for listening!

Questions?

Contact: paul.dolder@gmit.ie

Spatial separation of catches in highly mixed fisheries. Scientific Reports (*in review*)

Acknowledgements:



Doctoral Programme MARES









