## Longfin AP Informational Document - APRIL 2015 Jason Didden

**Note - Data Sources for the following are generally from unpublished NMFS Survey, Dealer, VTR, Permit, and MRFSS databases unless noted...everything should be considered preliminary.

## Basic Biology

Longfin inshore squid (formerly named Loligo) are distributed primarily in continental shelf waters located between Newfoundland and the Gulf of Venezuela (Cohen 1976; Dawe et al. 1990). In the northwest Atlantic Ocean, longfin squid are most abundant in the waters between Georges Bank and Cape Hatteras, NC where the species is commercially exploited. The stock area extends from the Gulf of Maine to southern Florida. However, the southern limit of the species' distribution in US waters is unknown due to an overlap in geographic distribution with the congener, Loligo pleii, which cannot be visually distinguished from longfin squid using gross morphology (Cohen 1976). A recent genetics study indicates that the population inhabiting the waters between Cape Cod Bay, MA and Cape Hatteras, NC is a single stock (Shaw et al. 2010). Distribution varies seasonally. North of Cape Hatteras, longfin squid migrate offshore during late autumn to overwinter in warmer waters along the shelf edge and slope, and then return inshore during the spring where they remain until late autumn (Jacobson 2005).

The species migrates long distances during its short lifespan; inshore during spring and offshore during late fall. Recruitment occurs throughout the year with seasonal peaks in overlapping "microcohorts" which have rapid and different growth rates (Brodziak and Macy 1996; Macy and Brodziak 2001). As a result, seasonally stable biomass estimates may mask substantial population turnover (Guerra et al. 2010). Recruitment is largely driven by environmental factors (Dawe et al. 2007). For most squid species, temperature plays a large role in migrations and distribution, growth, and spawning (Boyle and Rodhouse 2005). Individuals hatched in warmer waters during the summer grow more rapidly than those hatched in winter and males grow faster and attain larger sizes than females (Brodziak and Macy 1996).

Longfin serves as a key prey species for a variety of marine mammals, diving birds, and finfish species (Clarke 1996; Overholtz et al. 2000; Jacobson 2005). Natural mortality is very high; especially for spawners. Estimates of non-spawning mortality, 0.11 per week and spawning mortality, 0.19-0.48 per week, are very high. Minimum estimates of longfin squid consumption by finfish showed high inter-annual variability, but were 0.8 to 11 times the annual catches during 1977-2009. During 1987-2008, minimum consumption was much higher during the fall $($ median $=34,089 \mathrm{mt})$ than during the spring $($ median $=14,643 \mathrm{mt})$.

## Status of the Stock

The life history characteristics of short-lived squid present unique challenges to stock assessment and most of the traditional approaches that have been used for finfish species have not been successfully applied to squid stocks (Boyle and Rodhouse 2005).

Based on a new biomass reference point from the 2010 assessment (SAW SARC 51), the longfin squid stock was not overfished in 2009, but overfishing status cannot be determined because no overfishing threshold was recommended. A new BMSY target of $50 \%$ of K ( $0.50 *(76,329 / 0.90)$ $=42,405 \mathrm{mt})$ was recommended. The biomass (B) threshold is $50 \%$ of BMSY $(=21,203 \mathrm{mt})$. The biomass estimate, which is based on the two-year average of catchability-adjusted spring and fall survey biomass during 2008-2009, was $54,442 \mathrm{mt}$ ( $80 \% \mathrm{CI}=38,452-71,783 \mathrm{mt}$ ). This is greater than the biomass (B) threshold and the biomass target. The stock exhibits very large fluctuations in abundance (from variation in reproductive success and recruitment) which is expressed as regular large inter-annual changes (2-3 fold) in survey biomass.

A new threshold reference point for fishing mortality was not recommended in the 2010 assessment because there was no clear statistical relationship between longfin catch and annual biomass estimates during 1975-2009. Furthermore, annual catches were low relative to annual estimates of minimum consumption by a subset of fish predators. The assessment and reviewers concluded that the stock appears to be relatively lightly exploited. The 2009 exploitation index of 0.176 (catch in 2009 divided by the average of the spring and fall survey biomass during 2008$2009 ; 80 \% \mathrm{CI}=0.124-0.232$ ) was slightly below the 1987-2008 median of 0.237 .


Figure 1. 2010 Assessment Figure B6-Annual biomass in relation to the proposed biomass threshold (which is $1 / 2$ of the target) - shown here as a relative value

The NMFS Northeast Science Center has provided updates regarding indices and recent biological data (http://www.mafmc.org/council-events/2015-msb-ap). This document should be read in conjunction with the Center's update and much of the information from that document is not repeated in detail here.

## Landings size composition



Figure 2. Longfin length composition 1996-2009 from SAW/SARC 51.

## Fishery Performance

The U.S. squid fishery began in the late 1800s as a source of bait, and from 1928 to 1967, annual squid landings (including Illex illecebrosus landings) from Maine to North Carolina ranged from 500 to $2,000 \mathrm{mt}$ (Lange 1980). During 1964 through the mid-1980s, landings of Longfin by distant water fleets occurred in offshore waters and landings by the U.S. fishery occurred when Longfin were available inshore during spring and summer (Lange et al. 1984). Total landings increased rapidly during 1967-1973 with the development of a directed fishery by distant water fleets in offshore waters, from 1,677 mt in 1967 to a peak of $37,613 \mathrm{mt}$ in 1973, but then declined to $10,646 \mathrm{mt}$ in 1978. Total landings were dominated by landings from the foreign fleets during 1967-1984, ranging between $76 \%$ and $98 \%$ of the total landings during most years and averaging 20,130 mt.

During 1978-1982, bottom trawlers engaged in directed fisheries for Illex and Longfin in U.S. waters were required to fish with a minimum codend mesh size of 60 mm (with specific chafing gear requirements) and were restricted to fishing seaward of the 183 m isobath and during late fall through winter (ICNAF 1978). Fishing by distant water fleets was phased out by 1987 due to the development of an offshore U.S. fishery for Longfin. There is substantial uncertainty in the landings data prior to 1987, due to the lack of observer coverage of distant water fleets prior to 1978 and low coverage thereafter, and because unspecified squid landings were as high as $20 \%$ during some years (Cadrin and Hatfield 1999).

The domestic fishery currently occurs primarily in Southern New England and Mid-Atlantic
waters, but some fishing also occurs along the southern edge of Georges Bank. Spatial patterns in fishing effort reflect seasonal Longfin migration patterns whereby effort is generally directed offshore during October-March and inshore during April-September. The fishery is dominated by small-mesh otter trawlers, but seasonal near-shore pound net and weir fisheries also exist. During 1963-1982, the domestic fishery occurred primarily in inshore waters during spring and summer. Offshore fishing by U.S. vessels began in 1983.

Quotas were trimester-based in 2000, quarterly-based during 2001-2006, and trimester based since 2007. These sub-annual seasons have led to one or more fishery closures in most years.


Figure 3. Longfin landings within 200 miles of U.S. Coast (2014 Preliminary).
Source: Saw/SARC 51; unpublished NEFSC dealer reports

After reaching a relative low point in 2010, landings rebounded in 2011 and 2012, primarily driven by strong Trimester 2 (summer) landings. Trimester 2 closed in 2011, 2012, and 2014 so overall landings would have been higher in recent years if not for the relatively small Trimester 2 quota. Landings in the early half of 2013 were very low but better fall landings resulted in total landings that were lower than 2012 but higher than 2011. 2014 total landings were similar to 2013 but were more evenly spread throughout the year (and Trimester 2 was closed early). 2015 appears to be starting similarly to 2014.


Figure 4. U.S. Longfin landings. Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports


Figure 5. U.S. Longfin ex-vessel revenues (nominal). Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports


Figure 6. U.S. Longfin ex-vessel prices (Nominal)
Source: Unpublished NMFS dealer reports


Figure 7. U.S. Longfin ex-vessel prices (Producer Price Index adjusted, 2014 dollars)
Source: Unpublished NMFS dealer reports

## Longfin Squid Quota Monitoring Report



Figure 8. 2015 Landings to Date (blue $=2015$, orange $=2014$ ) (as of April 15, 2015)

## Longfin Squid Quota Monitoring Report



Figure 9. 2014 (blue) and 2013 longfin landings (orange)
source: http://www.nero.noaa.gov/ro/fso/reports/reports_frame.htm

## Specification Performance

The principle measure used to manage longfin within a year is monitoring via dealer weighout data that is submitted weekly. The annual quota is divided into three, 4 -month trimesters and the first two trimesters close when $90 \%$ of the trimester quota is projected to be reached. The Trimester ratios are $43 \%, 17 \%, 40 \%$. The third trimester closes when $95 \%$ of the annual quota is projected to be reached. Overages from the first two trimesters roll over to the third. Half of a Trimester 1 underage can also be transferred to Trimester 2, but Trimester 2 can only increase by $50 \%$, so it can increase from approximately 8 million pounds to approximately 12 million pounds. Table 1 lists the performance of the Longfin fishery (commercial) compared to its annual quota. Research Set Asides (RSA) have been subtracted from the recent quotas in Table 1, but the RSA program has been suspended so the 2015-2016 quotas (and 2017 if the RSA remains suspended) are $22,445 \mathrm{mt}$. Both squids are in constant, multi-year quotas through 2017 subject to annual review by the SSC and Council.

Table 1. Longfin DAH Performance. (mt)

| Year | Commercial <br> Landings | Quota | Percent of <br> Quota <br> Landed |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2004 | 13,678 | 17,000 | $80 \%$ |
| 2005 | 16,720 | 17,000 | $98 \%$ |
| 2006 | 15,916 | 17,000 | $94 \%$ |
| 2007 | 12,179 | 17,000 | $72 \%$ |
| 2008 | 11,396 | 17,000 | $67 \%$ |
| 2009 | 9,307 | 19,000 | $49 \%$ |
| 2010 | 6,912 | 18,667 | $37 \%$ |
| 2011 | 9,554 | 19,906 | $48 \%$ |
| 2012 | 12,817 | 22,220 | $58 \%$ |
| 2013 | 11,097 | 22,049 | $50 \%$ |
| 2014 | 11,858 | 21,810 | $54 \%$ |

## Source: Unpublished NMFS dealer reports

## Quarter and/or Trimester Closures

Year<br>2000<br>2001<br>2002<br>2003<br>2004<br>2005<br>2006<br>2007<br>2008<br>2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012<br>2013<br>2014<br>Closures<br>March 25-Apr 30; Jul 1-Aug 31; Sep 7-Dec 31;<br>May 29-Jun 30;<br>May 28-Jun30; Aug 16-Sep 30; Nov 2 -Dec 11; Dec 24-Dec31;<br>Mar 25-Mar 31;<br>Mar 5- Mar 31;<br>Feb 20-Mar 31; April 25-Jun 30; Dec 18-Dec 31;<br>Feb 13-Mar 31; April 21-April 26; May 23-June 30; Sept 2-Sept 30;<br>April 13-April 30;<br>July 17 - Aug 31.<br>Aug 6 - Aug 31.<br>Aug 23-Aug 31<br>April 17-April 30 (butterfish cap); July 10 - Aug 31<br>Aug 11-Aug 31

Table 2. 2014 Longfin landings (mt) by states with more than 100 mt .

| State | Records | Metric <br> Tons | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RI | 8,208 | 6,655 | $56 \%$ |
| NY | 6,103 | 2,167 | $18 \%$ |
| NJ | 1,478 | 1,254 | $11 \%$ |
| MA | 1,052 | 1,093 | $9 \%$ |
| CT | 1,266 | 589 | $5 \%$ |

*May not add to $100 \%$ since states with minor landings not included.

Table 3. 2014 Longfin landings (mt) by month.

| MONTH | Metric Tons | Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1,009 | $9 \%$ |
| 2 | 593 | $5 \%$ |
| 3 | 1,002 | $8 \%$ |
| 4 | 700 | $6 \%$ |
| 5 | 972 | $8 \%$ |
| 6 | 1,700 | $14 \%$ |
| 7 | 1,934 | $16 \%$ |
| 8 | 1,015 | $9 \%$ |
| 9 | 1,013 | $9 \%$ |
| 10 | 932 | $8 \%$ |
| 11 | 613 | $5 \%$ |
| 12 | 375 | $3 \%$ |

Table 4. Vessels active in various annual landing ranges (pounds per vessel)

| YEAR | Vessels 500,000 $+$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Vessels } \\ 100,000 \\ 500,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vessels } \\ & 50,000- \\ & 100,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vessels } \\ 10,000- \\ 50,000 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 88 |
| 1983 | 1 | 64 | 36 | 108 |
| 1984 | 1 | 41 | 48 | 111 |
| 1985 | 2 | 44 | 34 | 89 |
| 1986 | 1 | 56 | 44 | 98 |
| 1987 | 3 | 39 | 44 | 103 |
| 1988 | 11 | 65 | 35 | 95 |
| 1989 | 15 | 68 | 51 | 83 |
| 1990 | 11 | 52 | 47 | 108 |
| 1991 | 17 | 54 | 34 | 107 |
| 1992 | 17 | 48 | 31 | 67 |
| 1993 | 21 | 73 | 32 | 92 |
| 1994 | 24 | 74 | 26 | 77 |
| 1995 | 15 | 79 | 40 | 96 |
| 1996 | 8 | 68 | 37 | 93 |
| 1997 | 13 | 87 | 55 | 65 |
| 1998 | 18 | 86 | 46 | 91 |
| 1999 | 18 | 85 | 36 | 120 |
| 2000 | 13 | 96 | 47 | 96 |
| 2001 | 12 | 66 | 44 | 84 |
| 2002 | 13 | 90 | 32 | 69 |
| 2003 | 8 | 65 | 24 | 59 |
| 2004 | 12 | 65 | 26 | 52 |
| 2005 | 19 | 61 | 17 | 43 |
| 2006 | 16 | 76 | 26 | 50 |
| 2007 | 16 | 42 | 32 | 68 |
| 2008 | 10 | 58 | 18 | 78 |
| 2009 | 8 | 52 | 26 | 65 |
| 2010 | 3 | 45 | 23 | 69 |
| 2011 | 7 | 55 | 32 | 46 |
| 2012 | 8 | 75 | 38 | 41 |
| 2013 | 10 | 56 | 20 | 37 |
| 2014 | 12 | 58 | 30 | 54 |

Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports

Table 5. Numbers of Vessels to reach $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ and $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ of federal landings.

| Year | Percent of Catch <br> Harvested by Federally- <br> Permitted Vessels | Number of vessels that harvested approx. 75\% of federal landings | Number of vessels that accounted for about the next 20\% | Number of vessels that accounted for about 95\% of federal landings (sum of previous 2 columns) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1997 | 96\% | 84 | 88 | 172 |
| 1998 | 98\% | 75 | 92 | 167 |
| 1999 | 97\% | 72 | 103 | 175 |
| 2000 | 97\% | 87 | 99 | 186 |
| 2001 | 97\% | 64 | 88 | 152 |
| 2002 | 100\% | 70 | 69 | 139 |
| 2003 | 100\% | 52 | 59 | 111 |
| 2004 | 97\% | 54 | 57 | 111 |
| 2005 | 96\% | 46 | 45 | 91 |
| 2006 | 97\% | 60 | 59 | 119 |
| 2007 | 95\% | 42 | 63 | 105 |
| 2008 | 99\% | 49 | 63 | 112 |
| 2009 | 98\% | 49 | 61 | 110 |
| 2010 | 96\% | 49 | 58 | 107 |
| 2011 | 100\% | 49 | 54 | 103 |
| 2012 | 99\% | 59 | 60 | 119 |
| 2013 | 99\% | 44 | 42 | 86 |
| 2014 | 98\% | 50 | 59 | 109 |

[^0]Table 6. Species Composition (by value) by the 60 high-liner vessels that accounted for $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ of total Longfin harvest by weight 2008-2012. Only species that accounted for at least $\mathbf{2 \%}$ of revenues are included.

| Species | For Primary Loligo <br> Vessels, percent of <br> total revenue that <br> came from various <br> species. |
| :--- | ---: |
| Loligo | $31 \%$ |
| Illex | $19 \%$ |
| Silver Hake | $11 \%$ |
| Summer Flounder | $7 \%$ |
| Scallops | $6 \%$ |
| Scup | $5 \%$ |
| Mackerel | $4 \%$ |
| Monkfish | $3 \%$ |
| Haddock | $2 \%$ |
| Yellowtail Flounder | $2 \%$ |
| Atl Herring | $2 \%$ |
| Cod | $2 \%$ |
| Total | $93 \%$ |

Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports.
Since longfin squid is in multi-year quotas this table was not updated for 2014
Table 7. Species Composition (by value) by the 61 vessels that accounted for $75 \%$ of total Longfin harvest by weight 2001-2005.

| Species | For Primary Loligo <br> Vessels, percent of <br> total revenue that came <br> from various species. |
| :--- | ---: |
| Loligo | $35 \%$ |
| Silver Hake | $11 \%$ |
| Illex | $10 \%$ |
| Scallops | $6 \%$ |
| Mackerel | $5 \%$ |
| Yellowtail Flounder | $5 \%$ |
| Haddock | $5 \%$ |
| Summer Flounder | $4 \%$ |
| Monkfish | $3 \%$ |
| Cod | $3 \%$ |
| Scup | $2 \%$ |
| Winter Flounder | $2 \%$ |
| Menhaden | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $92 \%$ |
| Sorre: |  |

Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports.
Since longfin squid is in multi-year quotas this table was not updated for 2014

## DEALER INFORMATION

Table 8. Dealer Dependence on Longfin 2011-2013 by dealers purchasing at least $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0}$ Longfin over 2011-2013.

| Number of <br> Dealers | Relative <br> Dependence on <br> Loligo |
| ---: | :--- |
| 24 | $<5 \%$ |
| 6 | $5 \%-10 \%$ |
| 20 | $10 \%-25 \%$ |
| 14 | $25 \%-50 \%$ |
| 6 | $50 \%+$ |

Source: unpublished NEFSC dealer reports.
Since longfin squid is in multi-year quotas this table was not updated for 2014

## Nominal LPUE

In summary from work done in the last assessment, the July-December fishery shows an increasing trend in nominal LPUE during 1996-2004, followed by a decrease through 2009. The nominal LPUE trend is similar for the January-June fishery, but the trend is delayed by one year. LPUE trends for the two fisheries are correlated ( $\mathrm{r}=0.48$ ). However, these trends are difficult to interpret because of one or more fishery closures during each year since 2000 and the lack of a clear understanding of what the LPUE values actually represent given the complex population dynamics of the species and the fact that effort has not been standardized.


Figure 10. Figure B18 from SAW/SARC 51 - Longfin CPUE (Nominal).

## Recreational Fishery

There is some recreational fishing for longfin squid fishing but it is not currently quantifiable MRIP (http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/recreational-fisheries/index) does not collect information on invertebrates. Fishermen jig fish at night with lights in NY-NH (mostly from shore but some private boats also) and some charters jig during the day. Subject to resource constraints, staff would like to further examine recreational longfin squid catches in the coming years. Qualitative information may be obtained from a forum specializing in East Coast squid fishing:
http://www.squidfish.net/forums/index.php?/forum/18-east-coast/.


[^0]:    Source: Unpublished NMFS Dealer/Permit Data

