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#### Abstract

Correlations among port clusters and groups of port clusters were used to determine associations among the lobster fisheries in Lobster Fishing Area (LFA) 33. Correlations among fall and spring landings indicate an association among port clusters 2-5 and 8-13. Port cluster 1 does not have strong associations with any other port cluster. Port clusters 6 and 7 appear to be an intermediate group.

Port clusters were grouped for catch rate analysis into port clusters 1-4, 5-9, and 10-13. Fall catch rates significantly increased from 1994 to 1999 in all groups of port clusters. Spring catch rates exhibited significant annual differences only for the analysis that combined port clusters 5-9. Correlations among fall catch rates indicate that catch rates were positively and significantly correlated only between port clusters 5-9 and 10-13 and port clusters 5-9 and 1-4. Only port clusters 5-9 and 10-13 were significantly correlated for spring catch rates.

Length frequencies examined from port sampling indicated that in general males and females caught in the spring were larger than those caught in the fall. However, there were in general no significant correlations among port clusters with respect to changes in length.

These results are consistent with the findings of previous analyses that have shown that there are fishery differences between the western and eastern portions of LFA 33. It would seem appropriate to undertake an analysis of the consequences of splitting LFA 33 into two groups that would lead to more homogenous areas for fisheries management.


## Résumé

Des corrélations entre des regroupements de ports et des groupes de regroupements de ports ont servi à déterminer des associations entre les pêches du homard dans la zone de pêche du homard (ZPH) 33. Des corrélations entre les débarquements à l'automne et au printemps révèlent une association entre les regroupements de ports 2-5 et 8-13. Il n'y a pas de forte association entre le regroupement de ports 1 et aucun autre des regroupements. Les regroupements de ports 6 et 7 semblent constituer un groupe intermédiaire.

Aux fins de l'analyse des taux de capture, on a constitué des groupes formés respectivement des regroupements de ports 1-4, 5-9 et 10-13. Les taux de capture en automne ont augmenté de façon notable de 1994 à 1999 dans tous les groupes. Ils étaient corrélés de façon positive et significative uniquement entre les regroupements de ports 5-9 et 10-13 et les regroupements de ports 5-9 et 1-4. Les taux de capture au printemps ont présenté des différences annuelles significatives uniquement dans le groupe combinant aux fins de l'analyse les regroupements de ports 5-9. Ils étaient corrélés de façon significative uniquement entre les regroupements de ports 5-9 et 10-13.

L'étude de la distribution des longueurs à partir des échantillons prélevés dans les ports a révélé qu'en général, les mâles et les femelles capturés au printemps étaient plus gros que ceux pris à l'automne. Cependant, il n'y avait généralement pas de corrélation significative entre les regroupements de ports en regard des changements dans la longueur.

Ces résultats concordent avec les conclusions d'analyses antérieures qui ont révélé des différences dans la pêche entre les parties occidentale et orientale de la ZPH 33. II semblerait justifié d'entreprendre une analyse des conséquences de la division de la ZPH 33 en deux groupes afin d'obtenir des zones de pêche plus homogènes pour la gestion de la pêche.

## Introduction

LFA 33 extends from Halifax to Port La Tour (Fig. 1). The fishing season extends from the last Monday in November to May 31. LFA 33 is divided into 13 port clusters (Figs. 1, 2, 3, Appendix 1) and a uniform management plan currently applies to the LFA. The purpose of this paper is to investigate associations among the port clusters with respect to catch rate, annual landings, and length frequencies to determine if fishery differences occur in this LFA that should be examined with respect to their effects on fisheries management. Differences in these characteristics among port clusters, particularly if they coincide with other life history differences, would support an investigation into the consequences that non-uniform management regimes might have in meeting conservation targets in these fisheries. In the broader context of managing and defining lobster production areas (LPAs), knowledge on variation in the population and fishery characteristics by groups of ports will be necessary.

## Fishery Description

## Regulations

The season for LFA 33 is the last Monday in November (November 27 in 2000) to May 31. The minimum carapace length for the fishery in 2000 was 82.5 mm . Unless otherwise indicated the fall portion of the season refers to the last Monday in November to the last day in February. The spring portion of the season refers to March 1 to May 31.

Regulations since the beginning of the four year plan in 1998.

| Season | Trap Limit | Minimum <br> Size | Season |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1998-1999 | 250 | 81 mm | November 29- |
|  |  |  | May 31 |
| Fall 1999 | 250 | 81 mm | November 28 - |
| Spring 1999 | 250 | 82.5 mm | May 31 |
| 1999-2000 | 250 | 82.5 mm | November 27 - |
|  |  |  | May 31 |

## Industry reviews

Meetings to review the data presented in this report with industry were held in October 2000 and February 2001. The October meetings were to review the history of the fishery and to get general comments on the data to be used in this assessment. The February meetings were to present analyses completed to date and to receive suggestions that could improve these analyses.

General comments from industry that apply to all areas in LFA 33 were that the fishing grounds have expanded in all areas to deeper water. This expansion has been less pronounced in the most eastern portion of LFA 33 compared to the western portion because there is more deep-water habitat in the west as compared to the east. Comments by fishers working in these deeper waters were that in the first years of fishing, catches consisted primarily of large lobsters. In subsequent years, smaller lobsters have predominated in the catches. The explanation given by the fishers for this effect is that more room is created for smaller lobsters as the larger ones are removed. In general industry comments were that landings have been stable and that lobster are more abundant now than in the past. Some comments were made that it is necessary to fish a bit harder and cover more ground to maintain recent catch levels. The specifics of major points from these meetings are in Appendix 2.

## Methods

## Annual landings

Trends in annual landings have been used to define hypotheses regarding lobster production areas (Campbell and Mohn 1983; Hudon 1994). A correlations analysis among the port clusters investigated whether recent landings (1989 to 2000) provide similar area associations to those determined using historical landings (1892 to 1981) investigated by Campbell and Mohn (1983) and landings from 1947 to 1991 investigated by Hudon (1994). Correlations, r-squared values from paired combinations of port clusters, for fall and spring landings were examined using the corrcoef Matlab function to answer this question.

Data for this examination came from DFO landings statistics in the ZIF (Zonal Interchange Format) data base from the 1989-1990 season to the 19992000 season. From 1989 to 1995 landings data were obtained from sales slips. A survey of fishers in 1993 to1994 (Nolan 1995, unpublished DFO report) indicated that this method underestimated landings by $29 \%$ in LFA 33 , with the highest incidence of underestimation from port clusters 1 and 2. Beginning in the 1995-1996 season (DFO 1996) landings data were obtained from mandatory monthly logs submitted by lobster fishers. Landings by port were combined to obtain landings by port cluster. The underestimation of landings was recognized by the industry during workshops but it was agreed upon that these would still be useful for identifying relative trends in annual landings.

## Catch rates (CPUE)

Differences in CPUE are often used to provide an index of annual changes in population abundance or production (Hilborn and Walters 1992). CPUE in these analyses were defined as numbers caught per trap haul, kilograms caught per trap haul, or tonnes per boat. Consistent annual differences in the CPUE among port cluster would indicate there might be potential
production or abundance differences within the LFA that would require different management measures to achieve conservation objectives. Similarly, differing annual trends in CPUE among the port clusters would indicate that uniform management measures are not having the same affect in all areas.

Annual differences in CPUE were examined by comparing landings per boat among the port clusters. Data for this examination came from DFO landings statistics in the ZIF (Zonal Interchange Format) data base as described above. Unique CFV (Commercial Fishing Vessel) numbers were used to obtain the number of boats fishing in each port cluster. Landings by boat were obtained for the spring and fall portions of each fishing season. Annual trends were not examined using these data because there was no information on weekly or daily landings using the sales slip system. Sales slips may represent lobsters caught over unknown time periods. Similarly, with respect to the mandatory logbooks, fishers will often hold lobsters while waiting for desirable market conditions and so the time period associated with each entry is uncertain (Appendix 2). Timing information is necessary to separate within season effects from annual effects in evaluating annual trends in CPUE.

A data set that permits annual changes in CPUE to be examined comes from logbooks maintained by volunteer lobster fishers in LFA 33 since 1984. The information in the logbooks consists of number of traps fished and either pounds or numbers of lobsters caught each fishing day. The program began in port clusters 5-9. Overall the number of participants has increased, however, fishers participating have also changed over the years. Because there were only a few participants from each port cluster, port clusters were grouped for analysis. The groupings were port clusters 1-4,5-9, and 10-13. Industry felt these logbooks were a better representation of CPUE in the various fisheries than those resulting from sales slips or the mandatory logbooks (Appendix 2).

To identify changes in CPUE resulting from individual fisher, within season (week), and annual effects a multiplicative analysis (Hilborn and Walters 1992) was performed separately on each of the three sets of port clusters (1-4,5-9, and 10-13) for spring and fall portions of the season. The analysis was used to derive annual indices of CPUE for each of the groups of port clusters. Tests of significance of the model are base on log transformed data. Results are reported on the natural log scale.

## Length frequencies

Trends in size among port clusters would also define hypotheses about the population and fishery interactions of LFA 33. For example, declining mean length may result from increased recruitment or high exploitation. If all port clusters had similar trends for mean length then this would imply that either recruitment or exploitation trends were similar among all port clusters.

Carapace length frequencies have been collected from port samples since 1984, but some samples from port cluster 9 were collected in 1946 and 1949 (Appendix 3). Weighted mean carapace lengths by the fall and spring portions of the season were calculated using the numbers sampled at each length as:

Mean Carapace Length $=\frac{\sum \mathrm{n} x \text { length }}{\text { Total Number }}$
where n is the number at length.
Correlation coefficients between pairs of port clusters were examined using the corrcoef Matlab function.

## Results

## Annual landings

On average, approximately 725 boats fished in LFA 33 from 1996-1999 (Table 1). Port Clusters 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11 accounted for most of the fall effort (Table 1). The number of boats participating in the spring fishery is less than the fall and has typically been about 600. As they did in the fall. port Clusters 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11 accounted for most of the spring effort (Table 2). An anomaly in effort is apparent for the 1998-1999 spring portion of the season (Table 2). Recorded effort was much lower than other years. There is no explanation for this anomaly and landing analyses include this anomalous year with the assumption that the anomaly was equal among all port clusters (Table 3). If this assumption were true then it would not affect the relative relationships among the port clusters.

Average landings per boat for seasons beginning in 1989 to 1999 were higher in the fall than the spring (Table 4). In addition, landings per boat in the fall from port clusters 1-6 were appreciably smaller than those from port clusters 7-13 (Table 4). A similar split was observed during the spring but it was not quite as dramatic (Table 4). Most of the landings are from port clusters 7 to 13 (Table 5).

Significant correlations among port clusters 2-5 were found for fall landings (Table 6, Fig. 5). Port cluster 8 was significantly correlated with landings from port clusters 9-13 (Table 6, Fig. 5). Port cluster 1 was not significantly correlated with any other port cluster (Table 6, Fig. 5).

For spring landings, there were more significant correlations among the block of port clusters from 7-13 than from 1-6. For port clusters 1-6, the significant correlations tended to be between neighboring port clusters rather than in blocks (Table 7, Fig. 6).

Correlations between fall and the following spring catches were significant only between port clusters 6 and 7 (Fig. 7).

These results indicate an association among port clusters 2-5 and 8-13. Port cluster 1 seems to be different than most other port clusters and port clusters 6 and 7 are intermediate.

## Catch rates (CPUE)

CPUE differed significantly among fisher, week, and year for each set of port clusters for the fall season analysis ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) (Table 8). These analyses
indicate that fall CPUE has increased significantly between 1994 and 1999 for each set of port clusters (Figs. 8). Port clusters 5-9 CPUE was significantly correlated with port clusters 1-4 and 10-13 (p<0.05). However, port clusters 1013 and 1-4 were not significantly correlated (Fig. 9).

For spring CPUE, fisher and week effects were significant ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) but annual effects were only significant for port clusters 5-9 (Table 9). For port clusters 5-9, CPUE was significantly greater from 1997 to 1999 than from 1993 to 1996 (Fig. 10). CPUE for port clusters 5-9 and port clusters 10-13 were significantly correlated ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) but other port cluster combinations were not significantly correlated (Fig. 11).

## Length frequencies

Fall and spring port length frequency samples are summarized in Appendix 3 in both metric and English units. In general, males and females caught in the spring were larger than those caught in the fall (Figs. 12-15). The longest time series was from port clusters 9 and 13. In port clusters 9 and 13 there has been little change in average length of males and females caught in the fall (Figs. 14, 15). Mean length of males and females caught in the spring are somewhat larger in recent years compared with the late 1980s (Figs. 14, 15). However, mean length correlations among the port clusters were not significant.

## Discussion

Previous analyses of the relationship among LFA 33 fisheries (Campbell and Mohn 1983; Campbell 1989; Hudon, 1994; and Miller 1997) also found differences between the western and eastern portions of LFA 33. In the case of Campbell and Mohn these were based on a principle components and cluster analysis of landings from 1892 to1981. Hudon (1994) found a split between statistical districts corresponding to port clusters 1-7 versus 8-13 using historical landings between 1947 and 1991. Campbell (1989) examined the recapture sites of lobsters tagged off McNutt Island near Shelburne (port cluster 11). All recapture sites were in the western portion of LFA 33 or the Gulf of Maine including offshore Georges and Browns Bank. None were recaptured in the eastern portion of LFA 33. Miller (1997) found that post larval abundance was greater in the western compared to the eastern portion of LFA 33, while ovigerous females had higher catch rates in the east compared to the west.

These analyses and others indicate fishery and biological differences between the eastern and western portions of LFA 33. The exact position of the east - west split depends on the characteristic examined. It would seem appropriate to undertake an analysis of the consequences of splitting the LFA into two groups that would lead to more homogenous areas for fisheries management. There appears to be a clear split between port clusters 1-5 and 813. Port clusters 6 and 7 appear to be intermediate. Catch per boat seems to divide quite distinctly between port clusters 6 and 7 . Initial investigations should examine the biological and management consequences of a split in LFA 33 into
two portions consisting of port clusters 1-5 and 6-13, 1-6 and 7-13, or 1-7 and 813.
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Table 1. Number and percentage of boats in the fall as determined by unique inshore CFV numbers in each port cluster from 1996-1999. The fall portion of the season occurs in both calendar years during the season years indicated in the table. For example, 9697 means that the season started on the last Monday in November 1996 and ended May 31, 1997. The fall portion extends only from the starting November date 1996 to the end of February 1997.

Number of boats

|  | Season years |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Port Cluster | 9697 | 9798 | 9899 | 9900 | Mean |
| 1 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | 45 | 39 | 40 | 37 | 40 |
| 3 | 77 | 73 | 71 | 73 | 74 |
| 4 | 92 | 81 | 86 | 81 | 85 |
| 5 | 30 | 33 | 34 | 32 | 32 |
| 6 | 44 | 48 | 49 | 47 | 47 |
| 7 | 64 | 62 | 65 | 58 | 62 |
| 8 | 47 | 43 | 48 | 47 | 46 |
|  | 67 | 62 | 58 | 58 | 61 |
|  | 67 | 104 | 98 | 105 | 94 |
| 10 | 74 | 74 | 79 | 79 | 77 |
|  | 37 | 37 | 35 | 39 | 37 |
| Sum | 31 | 55 | 54 | 55 | 50 |

Percentage of boats

|  | Season years |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Port Cluster | 9697 | 9798 | 9899 | 9900 | Mean |
| 1 | 1.47 | 1.54 | 1.63 | 1.42 | 1.52 |
|  | 6.02 | 5.45 | 5.43 | 5.25 | 5.54 |
|  | 10.31 | 10.21 | 9.63 | 10.35 | 10.12 |
|  | 12.32 | 11.33 | 11.67 | 11.49 | 11.71 |
|  | 4 | 4.02 | 4.62 | 4.61 | 4.54 |
| 4.44 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | 5.89 | 6.71 | 6.65 | 6.67 |
| 6 | 8.57 | 8.67 | 8.82 | 8.23 | 8.47 |
|  | 7 | 6.29 | 6.01 | 6.51 | 6.67 |
|  | 8.97 | 8.67 | 7.87 | 8.23 | 6.37 |
|  | 13.92 | 13.71 | 14.25 | 13.33 | 13.81 |
|  | 9.91 | 10.35 | 10.72 | 11.21 | 10.54 |
|  | 10 | 4.95 | 5.17 | 4.75 | 5.53 |
| Total | 11 | 7.36 | 7.55 | 7.46 | 7.09 |

Table 2. Number and percentage of boats in the spring as determined by unique inshore CFV numbers in each port cluster from 1996-1999. The spring portion of the season occurs in only one calendar year during the season years indicated in the table. For example, 9697 means that the season started on the last Monday in November 1996 and ended May 31, 1997. The spring portion extends only March 1, 1996 to May 31, 1997.

Number of boats

|  | Spring portion of the season |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Port Cluster | 9697 | 9798 | 9899 | 9900 | Mean |
| 1 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| 2 | 32 | 32 | 14 | 28 | 27 |
| 3 | 57 | 66 | 25 | 69 | 54 |
| 4 | 63 | 66 | 25 | 72 | 57 |
| 5 | 26 | 29 | 5 | 25 | 21 |
| 6 | 35 | 39 | 12 | 44 | 33 |
| 7 | 50 | 56 | 35 | 56 | 49 |
| 8 | 38 | 38 | 18 | 35 | 32 |
| 9 | 62 | 56 | 66 | 60 | 61 |
|  | 98 | 97 | 86 | 85 | 92 |
| 10 | 98 | 56 | 47 | 66 | 56 |
| 11 | 56 | 34 | 46 | 32 | 36 |
| Total | 31 | 53 | 26 | 53 | 46 |
|  | 12 | 50 | 531 | 409 | 630 |

Percentage of boats

| Port Cluster | Spring portion of the season |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9697 | 9798 | 9899 | 9900 | Mean |
| 1 | 1.48 | 1.43 | 0.98 | 0.79 | 1.19 |
| 2 | 5.27 | 5.07 | 3.42 | 4.44 | 4.66 |
| 3 | 9.39 | 10.46 | 6.11 | 10.95 | 9.53 |
| 4 | 10.38 | 10.46 | 6.11 | 11.43 | 9.93 |
| 5 | 4.28 | 4.60 | 1.22 | 3.97 | 3.73 |
| 6 | 5.77 | 6.18 | 2.93 | 6.98 | 5.71 |
| 7 | 8.24 | 8.87 | 8.56 | 8.89 | 8.65 |
| 8 | 6.26 | 6.02 | 4.40 | 5.56 | 5.67 |
| 9 | 10.21 | 8.87 | 16.14 | 9.52 | 10.72 |
| 10 | 16.14 | 15.37 | 21.03 | 13.49 | 16.07 |
| 11 | 9.23 | 8.87 | 11.49 | 10.48 | 9.88 |
| 12 | 5.11 | 5.39 | 11.25 | 5.08 | 6.28 |
| 13 | 8.24 | 8.40 | 6.36 | 8.41 | 7.99 |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Table 3. Landings (tonnes) for Port Clusters in LFA 33.
Port Cluster 1

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 13.3 | 2.0 | 15.3 | 86.9 |
| 9091 | 17.7 | 4.0 | 21.7 | 81.6 |
| 9192 | 20.5 | 3.0 | 23.5 | 87.2 |
| 9293 | 10.7 | 4.1 | 14.8 | 72.3 |
| 9394 | 6.1 | 15.1 | 21.2 | 28.8 |
| 9495 | 18.3 | 17.7 | 36.0 | 50.8 |
| 9596 | 7.4 | 3.1 | 10.5 | 70.5 |
| 9697 | 12.9 | 4.1 | 17.0 | 75.9 |
| 9798 | 13.4 | 7.3 | 20.7 | 64.7 |
| 9899 | 19.6 | 8.2 | 27.8 | 70.5 |
| 9900 | 23.4 | 6.4 | 29.8 | 78.5 |
| Means | 14.8 | 6.8 | 21.7 | 69.8 |

Port Cluster 2

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total Percent Fall |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 29.8 | 9.2 | 39.0 | 76.4 |
| 9091 | 45.2 | 14.9 | 60.1 | 75.2 |
| 9192 | 40.8 | 10.5 | 51.3 | 79.5 |
| 9293 | 21.2 | 9.5 | 30.7 | 69.1 |
| 9394 | 28.7 | 36.9 | 65.6 | 43.8 |
| 9495 | 26.6 | 21.5 | 48.1 | 55.3 |
| 9596 | 40.0 | 10.2 | 50.2 | 79.7 |
| 9697 | 43.3 | 8.4 | 51.7 | 83.8 |
| 9798 | 44.2 | 18.6 | 62.8 | 70.4 |
| 9899 | 53.0 | 24.0 | 77.0 | 68.8 |
| 9900 | 55.1 | 23.7 | 78.8 | 69.9 |
| Means | 38.9 | 17.0 | 55.9 | 70.2 |

Port Cluster 3

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 69.6 | 30.8 | 100.4 | 69.3 |
| 9091 | 83.1 | 53.5 | 136.6 | 60.8 |
| 9192 | 70.4 | 34.5 | 104.9 | 67.1 |
| 9293 | 59.0 | 41.9 | 100.9 | 58.5 |
| 9394 | 84.6 | 48.4 | 133.0 | 63.6 |
| 9495 | 88.8 | 30.2 | 119.0 | 74.6 |
| 9596 | 92.9 | 23.7 | 116.6 | 79.7 |
| 9697 | 93.3 | 15.0 | 108.3 | 86.1 |
| 9798 | 107.0 | 43.5 | 150.5 | 71.1 |
| 9899 | 112.7 | 62.8 | 175.5 | 64.2 |
| 9900 | 144.3 | 56.4 | 200.7 | 71.9 |
| Means | 91.4 | 40.1 | 131.5 | 69.7 |

Table 3. (cont).
Port Cluster 4

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 75.6 | 41.5 | 117.1 | 64.6 |
| 9091 | 68.4 | 51.2 | 119.6 | 57.2 |
| 9192 | 74.8 | 31.8 | 106.6 | 70.2 |
| 9293 | 57.3 | 31.3 | 88.6 | 64.7 |
| 9394 | 66.7 | 36.8 | 103.5 | 64.4 |
| 9495 | 76.8 | 7.8 | 84.6 | 90.8 |
| 9596 | 104.1 | 38.0 | 142.1 | 73.3 |
| 9697 | 148.7 | 34.0 | 182.7 | 81.4 |
| 9798 | 151.5 | 74.2 | 225.7 | 67.1 |
| 9899 | 161.1 | 73.9 | 235.0 | 68.6 |
| 9900 | 168.4 | 56.6 | 225.0 | 74.8 |
| Means | 104.9 | 43.4 | 148.2 | 70.6 |

Port Cluster 5

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | Percent Fall

Port Cluster 6

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 41.6 | 15.7 | 57.3 | 72.6 |
| 9091 | 54.5 | 20.8 | 75.3 | 72.4 |
| 9192 | 31.9 | 7.0 | 38.9 | 82.0 |
| 9293 | 23.9 | 10.5 | 34.4 | 69.5 |
| 9394 | 27.6 | 12.2 | 39.8 | 69.3 |
| 9495 | 30.0 | 13.0 | 43.0 | 69.8 |
| 9596 | 45.0 | 13.0 | 58.0 | 77.6 |
| 9697 | 59.5 | 11.3 | 70.8 | 84.0 |
| 9798 | 71.2 | 30.6 | 101.8 | 69.9 |
| 9899 | 76.3 | 29.6 | 105.9 | 72.0 |
| 9900 | 74.2 | 24.7 | 98.9 | 75.0 |
| Means | 48.7 | 17.1 | 65.8 | 74.0 |

Table 3 (cont).
Port Cluster 7

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 169.2 | 100.8 | 270.0 | 62.7 |
| 9091 | 192.7 | 89.0 | 281.7 | 68.4 |
| 9192 | 159.7 | 39.7 | 199.4 | 80.1 |
| 9293 | 170.3 | 47.5 | 217.8 | 78.2 |
| 9394 | 130.1 | 46.0 | 176.1 | 73.9 |
| 9495 | 105.2 | 44.0 | 149.2 | 70.5 |
| 9596 | 143.0 | 21.6 | 164.6 | 86.9 |
| 9697 | 125.5 | 16.6 | 142.1 | 88.3 |
| 9798 | 145.8 | 57.3 | 203.1 | 71.8 |
| 9899 | 147.2 | 56.3 | 203.5 | 72.3 |
| 9900 | 177.2 | 55.9 | 233.1 | 76.0 |
| Means | 151.4 | 52.2 | 203.7 | 75.4 |

Port Cluster 8

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 84.7 | 30.6 | 115.3 | 73.5 |
| 9091 | 111.9 | 40.1 | 152.0 | 73.6 |
| 9192 | 118.7 | 24.5 | 143.2 | 82.9 |
| 9293 | 96.3 | 41.8 | 138.1 | 69.7 |
| 9394 | 115.0 | 37.3 | 152.3 | 75.5 |
| 9495 | 54.2 | 20.1 | 74.3 | 72.9 |
| 9596 | 110.5 | 14.9 | 125.4 | 88.1 |
| 9697 | 108.8 | 13.1 | 121.9 | 89.3 |
| 9798 | 108.7 | 28.2 | 136.9 | 79.4 |
| 9899 | 79.9 | 42.0 | 121.9 | 65.5 |
| 9900 | 122.8 | 33.4 | 156.2 | 78.6 |
| Means | 101.0 | 29.6 | 130.7 | 77.2 |

Port Cluster 9

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 131.7 | 125.5 | 257.2 | 51.2 |
| 9091 | 239.0 | 104.6 | 343.6 | 69.6 |
| 9192 | 217.7 | 62.6 | 280.3 | 77.7 |
| 9293 | 207.7 | 103.5 | 311.2 | 66.7 |
| 9394 | 209.5 | 131.3 | 340.8 | 61.5 |
| 9495 | 146.2 | 69.3 | 215.5 | 67.8 |
| 9596 | 236.6 | 49.8 | 286.4 | 82.6 |
| 9697 | 208.3 | 34.3 | 242.6 | 85.9 |
| 9798 | 189.9 | 73.1 | 263.0 | 72.2 |
| 9899 | 168.3 | 87.6 | 255.9 | 65.8 |
| 9900 | 188.0 | 90.3 | 278.3 | 67.6 |
| Means | 194.8 | 84.7 | 279.5 | 69.9 |

Table 3. (cont).
Port Cluster 10

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 240.8 | 150.0 | 390.8 | 61.6 |
| 9091 | 345.9 | 143.9 | 489.8 | 70.6 |
| 9192 | 301.6 | 84.6 | 386.2 | 78.1 |
| 9293 | 219.0 | 84.6 | 303.6 | 72.1 |
| 9394 | 279.2 | 112.9 | 392.1 | 71.2 |
| 9495 | 159.3 | 63.0 | 222.3 | 71.7 |
| 9596 | 255.5 | 75.8 | 331.3 | 77.1 |
| 9697 | 267.0 | 52.6 | 319.6 | 83.5 |
| 9798 | 219.2 | 101.7 | 320.9 | 68.3 |
| 9899 | 211.4 | 118.0 | 329.4 | 64.2 |
| 9900 | 214.9 | 91.3 | 306.2 | 70.2 |
| Means | 246.7 | 98.0 | 344.7 | 71.7 |

Port Cluster 11

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total Percent Fall |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 144.5 | 76.8 | 221.3 | 65.3 |
| 9091 | 204.3 | 86.0 | 290.3 | 70.4 |
| 9192 | 127.5 | 43.6 | 171.1 | 74.5 |
| 9293 | 129.6 | 37.8 | 167.4 | 77.4 |
| 9394 | 162.5 | 45.7 | 208.2 | 78.0 |
| 9495 | 95.0 | 48.1 | 143.1 | 66.4 |
| 9596 | 157.7 | 40.1 | 197.8 | 79.7 |
| 9697 | 230.0 | 34.2 | 264.2 | 87.1 |
| 9798 | 165.7 | 62.9 | 228.6 | 72.5 |
| 9899 | 153.6 | 88.8 | 242.4 | 63.4 |
| 9900 | 194.2 | 73.0 | 267.2 | 72.7 |
| Means | 160.4 | 57.9 | 218.3 | 73.4 |

Port Cluster 12

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total | Percent Fall |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 121.1 | 95.6 | 216.7 | 55.9 |
| 9091 | 124.3 | 66.9 | 191.2 | 65.0 |
| 9192 | 121.9 | 39.0 | 160.9 | 75.8 |
| 9293 | 117.7 | 44.9 | 162.6 | 72.4 |
| 9394 | 110.6 | 52.2 | 162.8 | 67.9 |
| 9495 | 71.1 | 47.1 | 118.2 | 60.2 |
| 9596 | 118.3 | 30.8 | 149.1 | 79.3 |
| 9697 | 122.0 | 24.6 | 146.6 | 83.2 |
| 9798 | 105.7 | 39.8 | 145.5 | 72.6 |
| 9899 | 89.0 | 57.6 | 146.6 | 60.7 |
| 9900 | 108.0 | 40.5 | 148.5 | 72.7 |
| Means | 110.0 | 49.0 | 159.0 | 69.6 |

Table 3. (cont.)
Port Cluster 13

| Season | Fall | Spring | Total |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8990 | 89.9 | 94.5 | 184.4 | 48.8 |
| 9091 | 118.1 | 80.7 | 198.8 | 59.4 |
| 9192 | 104.9 | 43.7 | 148.6 | 70.6 |
| 9293 | 85.7 | 41.5 | 127.2 | 67.4 |
| 9394 | 73.2 | 53.8 | 127.0 | 57.6 |
| 9495 | 54.8 | 48.0 | 102.8 | 53.3 |
| 9596 | 108.7 | 41.9 | 150.6 | 72.2 |
| 9697 | 111.1 | 37.1 | 148.2 | 75.0 |
| 9798 | 112.2 | 64.1 | 176.3 | 63.6 |
| 9899 | 104.9 | 65.1 | 170.0 | 61.7 |
| 9900 | 123.4 | 53.6 | 177.0 | 69.7 |
| Means | 98.8 | 56.7 | 155.5 | 63.6 |

Table 4. Average catch (tonnes) per boat by fall and spring season by port cluster for seasons beginning from 1989-1999.

|  | Fall |  | Spring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Port Cluster | Catch (tonnes) | Boats | Catch/Boat |  |  |  |  |  | Catch (tonnes) | Boats | Catch/Boat |
| 1 | 15 | 11 | 1.3 | 7 | 7 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 39 | 40 | 1.0 | 17 | 27 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 91 | 74 | 1.2 | 40 | 54 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 105 | 85 | 1.2 | 43 | 57 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 32 | 32 | 1.0 | 19 | 21 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 49 | 47 | 1.0 | 17 | 33 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 151 | 62 | 2.4 | 52 | 49 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 101 | 46 | 2.2 | 30 | 32 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 195 | 61 | 3.2 | 85 | 61 | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 247 | 100 | 2.5 | 98 | 92 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 160 | 77 | 2.1 | 58 | 56 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 110 | 37 | 3.0 | 49 | 36 | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 99 | 54 | 1.8 | 57 | 46 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1393 | 726 | 1.9 | 572 | 569 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. Average tonnes and pounds for LFA 33 port clusters from 1989-1999.

| Port Cluster |  | Ave Tonnes |  |  | Ave Pounds |  |  | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Total | Fall | Spring | Total |  |
|  | 1 | 14.8 | 6.8 | 21.6 | 32560 | 14960 | 47520 | 1 |
|  | 2 | 38.9 | 17.0 | 55.9 | 85580 | 37400 | 122980 | 3 |
|  | 3 | 91.4 | 40.1 | 131.5 | 201080 | 88220 | 289300 | 7 |
|  | 4 | 104.9 | 43.4 | 148.3 | 230780 | 95480 | 326260 | 8 |
|  | 5 | 31.5 | 19.0 | 50.5 | 69300 | 41800 | 111100 | 3 |
|  | 6 | 48.7 | 17.1 | 65.8 | 107140 | 37620 | 144760 | 3 |
|  | 7 | 151.4 | 52.2 | 203.6 | 333080 | 114840 | 447920 | 10 |
|  | 8 | 101.0 | 29.6 | 130.6 | 222200 | 65120 | 287320 | 7 |
|  | 9 | 194.8 | 84.7 | 279.5 | 428560 | 186340 | 614900 | 14 |
|  | 10 | 246.7 | 98.0 | 344.7 | 542740 | 215600 | 758340 | 18 |
|  | 11 | 160.4 | 57.9 | 218.3 | 352880 | 127380 | 480260 | 11 |
|  | 12 | 110.0 | 49.0 | 159.0 | 242000 | 107800 | 349800 | 8 |
|  | 13 | 98.8 | 56.7 | 155.5 | 217360 | 124740 | 342100 | 8 |
| Total |  | 1393.3 | 571.5 | 1964.8 | 3065260 | 1257300 | 4322560 | 100 |

Table 6. p-values for Fall area regressions. Shaded cells show p-values $<0.05$.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 0.069 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0.161 | 0.004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.274 | 0.003 | 0.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0.296 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.172 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.388 | 0.412 | 0.951 | 0.781 | 0.553 | 0.560 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.759 | 0.221 | 0.576 | 0.636 | 0.270 | 0.571 | 0.155 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.425 | 0.580 | 0.781 | 0.717 | 0.798 | 0.854 | 0.431 | 0.010 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.697 | 0.614 | 0.350 | 0.345 | 0.825 | 0.794 | 0.140 | 0.027 | 0.016 |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.979 | 0.056 | 0.213 | 0.125 | 0.022 | 0.055 | 0.401 | 0.044 | 0.179 | 0.118 |  |  |
| 12 | 0.364 | 0.925 | 0.298 | 0.539 | 0.819 | 0.785 | 0.054 | 0.009 | 0.061 | 0.006 | 0.106 |  |
| 13 | 0.359 | 0.002 | 0.147 | 0.060 | 0.055 | 0.011 | 0.054 | 0.020 | 0.150 | 0.176 | 0.013 | 0.089 |

Table 7. p-values for regression analyses among port clusters. Shaded cells are p-values that are $<=0.05$.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 0.004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 0.585 | 0.050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 0.405 | 0.564 | 0.039 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 0.658 | 0.898 | 0.409 | 0.018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0.892 | 0.315 | 0.029 | 0.000 | 0.003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 0.646 | 0.921 | 0.153 | 0.339 | 0.063 | 0.247 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 0.885 | 0.222 | 0.001 | 0.177 | 0.524 | 0.233 | 0.052 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 0.622 | 0.169 | 0.068 | 0.688 | 0.683 | 0.712 | 0.010 | 0.004 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.564 | 0.620 | 0.079 | 0.136 | 0.082 | 0.225 | 0.000 | 0.024 | 0.005 |  |  |  |
| 11 | 0.780 | 0.512 | 0.016 | 0.025 | 0.010 | 0.007 | 0.004 | 0.061 | 0.162 | 0.005 |  |  |
| 12 | 0.827 | 0.904 | 0.382 | 0.725 | 0.126 | 0.631 | 0.000 | 0.110 | 0.006 | 0.000 | 0.028 |  |
| 13 | 0.627 | 0.891 | 0.262 | 0.195 | 0.012 | 0.149 | 0.000 | 0.160 | 0.037 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.000 |

Table 8. Anova tables for port cluster voluntary logbook CPUE analysis of fall portion of the seasons.

Port Clusters 1-4 Fall (1986-1999)

| Source | Sum Sq. | d.f. | Mean Sq | F | Prob>F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 20.988 \\ 67.031 \\ 8.138 \\ 16.15 \\ 129.723 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 7 \\ 13 \\ 183 \\ 208 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.19756 \\ & 9.57584 \\ & 0.62602 \\ & 0.08825 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 47.56 \\ 108.51 \\ 7.09 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Port Clusters 5-9 Fall (1984-1999) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | Sum Sq | d.f | Mean Sq. | F | Prob>F |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | 100.675 312.92 37.981 74.394 494.832 | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 7 \\ 15 \\ 727 \\ 766 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.9221 \\ 44.7029 \\ 2.5321 \\ 0.1023 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 57.87 \\ 436.85 \\ 24.74 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Port Clusters 10-13 Fall (1993-1999) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | Sum Sq | d.f. | Mean Sq. | F | Prob>F |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 13.22 \\ 86.893 \\ 7.779 \\ 16.089 \\ 126.277 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 171 \\ 188 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.305 \\ 12.4132 \\ 1.2965 \\ 0.0941 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 35.13 \\ 131.93 \\ 13.78 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 9. Anova tables port cluster voluntary logbook CPUE analysis of spring portion of the seasons.

| Port Clusters 1-4 Spring (1986-1999) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | Sum Sq | d.f | Mean Sq | F | Prob>F |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 1.8419 \\ 4.8639 \\ 4.4605 \\ 2.5692 \\ 15.4679 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 5 \\ 12 \\ 27 \\ 46 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.92095 \\ & 0.97278 \\ & 0.37171 \\ & 0.09516 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.68 \\ 10.22 \\ 3.91 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0007 \\ & 0 . \\ & 0.0016 \end{aligned}$ |
| Port Clusters 5-9 Spring (1984-1999) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | Sum Sq | d.f | Mean Sq. | F | Prob $>$ F |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 28.158 \\ 34.581 \\ 37.501 \\ 45.06 \\ 163.787 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16 \\ 7 \\ 15 \\ 397 \\ 435 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.75989 \\ & 4.94012 \\ & 2.50008 \\ & 0.1135 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.51 \\ & 43.53 \\ & 22.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Port Clusters 10-13 Spring (1993-1999) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source | Sum Sq. | d.f | Mean Sq | F | Prob>F |
| Fisher <br> Week <br> Year <br> Error <br> Total | $\begin{array}{r} 26.7506 \\ 24.4678 \\ 5.1023 \\ 26.0767 \\ 96.8999 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 7 \\ 6 \\ 114 \\ 132 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.35013 \\ & 3.4954 \\ & 0.85038 \\ & 0.22874 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.39 \\ 15.28 \\ 3.72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0.0021 \end{aligned}$ |



Fig. 1. Port Cluster boundaries for LFA 33 are indicated by different shadings. Main port in each cluster is identified.


Fig. 2. Detailed map of ports with landings in each Port Cluster. Port Cluster codes are in Appendix 1.


Fig. 3. Detailed map of ports with landings in each Port Cluster. Port Cluster codes are in Appendix 1.


Fig. 4. Catch by groups of port clusters from 1989-1999 for spring and fall portions of seasons combined. Year indicated on the $x$-axis is the year that the season started on the last Monday in November.


Fig. 5. Scatterplots and regressions for fall landings among indicated port clusters. Regressions with $p$-values $<0.05$ are shown by including linear predicted line.


Fig. 6. Scatterplots and regressions for spring landings among indicated port clusters. Regressions with p-values < 0.05 are shown by including linear predicted line.


Fig. 7. Regression analysis between fall and spring catches for Port Clusters 6 and 7. All other port cluster relationships were not significant.


Fig. 8. CPUE (kg/trap haul) from voluntary logbooks for fall portion of the season from groups of indicated port clusters for LFA 33.


Fig. 9. Correlations in CPUE among port cluster groups for the fall portion of the season using analysis in Figs. 8.


Fig. 10. CPUE (kg/trap haul) from voluntary logbooks for spring portion of the season from groups of indicated port clusters for LFA 33.


Fig. 11. Correlations in CPUE among port cluster groups for spring portion of the season using analysis in Figs. 10.


Fig. 12. Average carapace lengths for males and females measured in port sampling from port clusters 1-3 in LFA 33. Sequence for figures is port clusters 1-3 in order for males at top and females for the bottom three figures.


Fig. 13. Average carapace lengths for males and females measured in port sampling from port clusters 5-8 in LFA 33. Sequence for figures is port clusters 5-8 in order for males at top and females for the bottom four figures.


Fig. 14. Average carapace lengths for males and females measured in port sampling from port cluster 9 in LFA 33.


Fig. 15. Average carapace lengths for males and females measured in port sampling from port cluster 13 in LFA 33.

Appendix 1. Ports with landings in LFA 33 indciating county, Port Cluster, and geographic location.

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Map } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | Port Code | Name | County | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Port } \\ \text { Cluster } \end{array}$ | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11801 | EASTERN PASSAGE | Halifax | 1 | 44.6197 | 63.4797 |
| 2 | 12212 | PORTUGUESE COVE | Halifax | 2 | 44.5169 | 63.5381 |
| 3 | 12207 | KETCH HARBOUR | Halifax | 2 | 44.4797 | 63.5567 |
| 4 | 12206 | HERRING COVE | Halifax | 2 | 44.5700 | 63.5700 |
| 5 | 12214 | PURCELL'S COVE | Halifax | 2 | 44.5933 | 63.5700 |
| 6 | 12219 | SAMBRO HEAD | Halifax | 2 | 44.4797 | 63.5797 |
| 7 | 12201 | SAMBRO | Halifax | 2 | 44.4697 | 63.6000 |
| 8 | 12101 | HALIFAX | Halifax | 2 | 44.6497 | 63.6000 |
| 9 | 12209 | PENNANT | Halifax | 2 | 44.4697 | 63.6300 |
| 10 | 12221 | WEST PENNANT | Halifax | 2 | 44.4753 | 63.6542 |
| 11 | 12216 | TERRANCE BAY | Halifax | 3 | 44.4697 | 63.7197 |
| 12 | 12208 | LOWER PROSPECT | Halifax | 3 | 44.4500 | 63.7297 |
| 13 | 12215 | SHAD BAY | Halifax | 3 | 44.5200 | 63.7800 |
| 14 | 12213 | PROSPECT | Halifax | 3 | 44.4811 | 63.7872 |
| 15 | 12202 | BAYSIDE | Halifax | 3 | 44.5317 | 63.8075 |
| 16 | 12306 | EAST DOVER | Halifax | 3 | 44.4933 | 63.8517 |
| 17 | 12322 | MCGRATH'S COVE | Halifax | 3 | 44.5033 | 63.8583 |
| 18 | 12321 | WEST DOVER | Halifax | 3 | 44.4972 | 63.8697 |
| 19 | 12316 | PEGGY'S COVE | Halifax | 3 | 44.5042 | 63.9125 |
| 20 | 12309 | GLEN MARGARET | Halifax | 3 | 44.5794 | 63.9131 |
| 21 | 12307 | FRENCH VILLAGE | Halifax | 3 | 44.6281 | 63.9175 |
| 22 | 12310 | HACKETT'S COVE | Halifax | 3 | 44.5700 | 63.9200 |
| 23 | 12318 | SEABRIGHT | Halifax | 3 | 44.6206 | 63.9236 |
| 24 | 12313 | INDIAN HARBOUR | Halifax | 3 | 44.5200 | 63.9297 |
| 25 | 12303 | BOUTILIER'S POINT | Halifax | 3 | 44.6497 | 63.9500 |
| 26 | 12325 | INGRAMPORT | Halifax | 3 | 44.6700 | 63.9500 |
| 27 | 12317 | QUEENSLAND | Halifax | 3 | 44.6300 | 64.0300 |
| 28 | 12312 | HUBBARDS | Halifax | 3 | 44.6300 | 64.0697 |
| 29 | 12521 | NORTHWEST COVE | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5300 | 64.0217 |
| 30 | 12501 | ASPOTOGAN | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5247 | 64.0503 |
| 31 | 12518 | MILL COVE | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5797 | 64.0697 |
| 32 | 12513 | FOX POINT | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.6197 | 64.0700 |
| 33 | 12520 | NEW HARBOUR | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4722 | 64.0828 |
| 34 | 12509 | DEEP COVE | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5333 | 64.1167 |
| 35 | 12505 | BLANDFORD | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4811 | 64.1175 |
| 36 | 12515 | LITTLE TANCOOK | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4697 | 64.1297 |
| 37 | 12503 | BIG TANCOOK | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4811 | 64.1667 |
| 38 | 12511 | EAST RIVER | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5806 | 64.1669 |
| 39 | 12512 | EAST RIVER POINT | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5700 | 64.1700 |
| 40 | 12506 | CHESTER | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5497 | 64.2500 |
| 41 | 12530 | MARTIN'S POINT | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4797 | 64.3197 |
| 42 | 12528 | WESTERN SHORE | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5250 | 64.3197 |
| 43 | 12534 | GOLD RIVER | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5417 | 64.3197 |
| 44 | 12507 | CHESTER BASIN | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.5700 | 64.3197 |
| 45 | 12529 | INDIAN POINT | Lunenburg | 4 | 44.4542 | 64.3256 |

Appendix 1. (cont.)

| Map <br> No. | Port <br> Code | Name | County | Port <br> Cluster |  | Latitude |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Longitude

Appendix 1. (cont.)

| Map No. | Port Code | Name | County | Port Cluster | Latitude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84 | 13012 | PORT HEBERT | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7997 | 64.9300 |
| 85 | 13020 | JONES HARBOUR | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7500 | 64.9667 |
| 86 | 13007 | LITTLE HARBOUR | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7197 | 65.0300 |
| 87 | 13002 | ALLENDALE | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7500 | 65.0997 |
| 88 | 13001 | LOCKEPORT | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7000 | 65.1200 |
| 89 | 13010 | OSBORNE HARBOUR | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7197 | 65.1200 |
| 90 | 13016 | WEST GREEN HARBOUR | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7197 | 65.1700 |
| 91 | 13004 | EAST JORDAN | Shelburne | 10 | 43.7694 | 65.2275 |
| 92 | 13112 | JORDAN BAY | Shelburne | 11 | 43.7000 | 65.2300 |
| 93 | 13115 | LOWER SANDY POINT | Shelburne | 11 | 43.6817 | 65.2981 |
| 94 | 13125 | SANDY POINT | Shelburne | 11 | 43.7000 | 65.3197 |
| 95 | 13101 | SHELBURNE | Shelburne | 11 | 43.7700 | 65.3197 |
| 96 | 13107 | CARLETON VILLAGE | Shelburne | 11 | 43.6692 | 65.3353 |
| 97 | 13110 | GUNNING COVE | Shelburne | 11 | 43.6797 | 65.3497 |
| 98 | 13108 | CHURCHOVER | Shelburne | 11 | 43.7197 | 65.3700 |
| 99 | 13123 | ROSEWAY | Shelburne | 12 | 43.6300 | 65.3497 |
| 100 | 13117 | NORTH EAST HARBOUR | Shelburne | 12 | 43.5542 | 65.3633 |
| 101 | 13111 | INGOMAR | Shelburne | 12 | 43.5700 | 65.3700 |
| 102 | 13105 | BLANCHE | Shelburne | 12 | 43.4983 | 65.4110 |
| 103 | 13126 | SMITHVILLE | Shelburne | 13 | 43.4833 | 65.4667 |
| 104 | 13127 | UPPER PORT LA TOUR | Shelburne | 13 | 43.5200 | 65.4697 |
| 105 | 13120 | PORT LA TOUR | Shelburne | 13 | 43.5000 | 65.4800 |

Appendix 2. Workshop minutes.

## LFA 33 lobster workshop, Sambro N.S.

October 10, 2000.
Attendees:

| Industry: |  | DFO: | Ross Claytor <br> Raymond Naugle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R. Passage |  |  | Ron Duggan |

Following a round table introduction, fishers were asked to give an individual perspective of the fishery in their respective areas.

Fishers from Sambro and Dover felt that lobster stocks are in good shape for the following reasons,
a) Effort has been increasing for the past few years but individual landings are still increasing by a small amount each year.
b) The area fished has increased slightly by moving further offshore but lobsters aren't found in deeper water as in ports further west. Maximum depth fished is 25 fathoms.
c) More fishers are fishing more traps and more days in spring than in the past when groundfish were more plentiful.
d) More kelp and fewer urchins on bottom than in 1980's.
e) Absence of groundfish lessens predation on small lobsters.

Fishers from Eastern Passage thought landings were holding steady for last 5 years but are shared among more licenses than in the past. They agreed that more effort is expended in spring than in 1980's. The fishery takes place in $5-25$ fathoms and grounds have expanded only slightly. Lobsters didn't move to shallower nearshore water as usual last spring.

Individual observations put forth in support of stable lobster stocks included:
a) The silver hake fishery depleted hake stocks that provided spawn for deep-water lobsters to feed on. Since the fishery ended, hake is more abundant and lobsters are more plentiful.
b) The number of draggers has declined to about one tenth of the 700 that operated at one time. The trawl design has changed and is less harmful to the bottom, which allows for better lobster habitat.

Areas of joint and individual concern for future of the lobster fishery were also advanced.
a) The seal population is still growing and fishers are concerned about increased lobster predation.
b) Warm water in early part of 1998 and 1999 spring fishery resulted in unusual amount of large females being landed and we should be concerned about recruitment in 7-8 years.

Carl MacDonald gave a brief presentation on the FSRS recruitment study. To date, data analysis for the spring portion of the 1999 season has been completed.

Recent and historical CPUE data from voluntary logs and length frequency data from port sampling were presented by R. Claytor. Fishers requested that from now on data be presented in inches and pounds as still used by buyers and shippers. The consensus was that voluntary logbook data provides an accurate description of the CPUE trends in the fishery. Steve Nolan explained that port sampling data, (length frequencies), are collected at a consistent time of year from unsorted catches and from a number of boats from each port. Given these sampling conditions it was agreed that the length frequencies presented were consistent with observations of those fishing in the area. He also noted that there was a scarcity of logkeepers from the eastern end of LFA 33 and made an appeal for those present to consider keeping individual logs. Two attendees said they would try to get some of their colleagues to keep logs. The current system used by statistics branch for calculating annual landings from mandatory logs was thought to be inefficient and probably underestimates total landings by about 10-15\%. The underestimation is consistent from year to year.

Ross Claytor outlined a project designed to learn more about lobster abundance by conducting short term tag, release, and recovery. A discussion followed about the timing of such a project and why it could not be conducted during the fall fishery. The explanation that utilization of time and resources would be more efficient and provide more and better data during a short term concentrated project was accepted. It was indicated that this project would not serve as a trade off for future conservation measures. Fishers expressed concern about poaching of traps during a pre-season project. Fishers from port clusters 2 and 3 agreed to participate depending on the outcome of cost sharing arrangements. Fishers were in favour of research activities conducted on a more local basis because they feel conditions differ from port to port and recommended that at least two sites be tested. A follow up meeting will be held to finalize details.

LFA 33 lobster workshop, Bridgewater N.S.
October 3, 2000.

Attendees:

| Industry: | DFO: | Ross Claytor <br> Stephen Nolan |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Myles Bush | West Dublin |  | Son Duggan |
| Gary Tanner | Bayport | FSRS | Kory Jollimore |
| Keith Bush | West Dublin | Rose Bay |  |
| Jaan Kariler | First South |  |  |
| Dale Cook | Lunenburg |  |  |
| Austin Green | Bridgewater |  |  |
| Barry Levy | Riverport |  |  |
| Junior Risser | Hunts Point |  |  |
| Michael Lunn | Liverpool |  |  |
| Stephen Scobey |  |  |  |

Following a round table introduction, fishers were asked to give an individual perspective of the fishery in their respective areas. From this there appeared to be general consensus on several points.
a) Landings are high compared to those in the late 70 s and early 80 s and there is no real concern for future of fishery given current regulations.
b) Except for one fisher, landings have increased or at least remained stable for the past 4-5 years.
c) Fishers have been expanding area fished by moving gear to deeper water since mid 1980's. i.e. from 15 fathoms to as much as 40 fathoms in some areas.
d) Larger run of lobsters from deeper water at first but average size has since decreased.
e) Water temperatures are higher than 1980's. Non native fish thought to have come from southern waters were observed .
f) Lobster movement to deeper water in fall and back onshore spring-summer.

Some individual observations were also put forth:
c) Landings are the same but have to work harder and fish more ground to maintain.
d) Deeper water lobsters are not on hard bottom.
e) Fishing large lobsters from an area makes more ground available for smaller lobsters.
f) Absense of groundfish inshore allows more small lobsters to survive.
g) Seals are major predators on lobster.
h) Appears to be a concentration of berried females on a 24-30 fathom ridge in fall

Kory Jollimore gave a brief presentation on the FSRS recruitment study. (See attachment) To date, data analysis for the spring portion of the 1999 season has been completed.

Recent and historical CPUE data from voluntary logs and length frequency data from port sampling, were presented by R. Claytor. The consensus was that voluntary logbook data provides an accurate description of the CPUE trends in the fishery. It was explained that port sampling data are collected at a consistent time of year from unsorted catches and from a number of boats from each port. Given these sampling conditions it was agreed that the length frequencies presented were consistent with observations of those fishing in the area. The current system for calculating annual landings from mandatory logs was thought to be inefficient and to
underestimate total landings. The underestimation is consistent from year to year. The current system does not produce timely reports on landings.

Ross Claytor outlined a project designed to learn more about lobster abundance by conducting short term tag, release, and recovery. Fishers were in favour of research activities conducted on a more local basis because they feel conditions differ from port to port. It was agreed that the best geographic location for these projects would be one bay or fishing area that would represent port clusters 5-7 combined and one bay or fishing area that would represent port clusters 8-9 combined. A number of attendees volunteered to assist by providing manpower and vessel time. It was agreed that late summer - early fall would be the best time to conduct tests. A follow up meeting will be called to finalize details.

LFA 33 lobster workshop, Jordan Bay, N.S.
Attendees:

| Industry: |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| David Nickerson | RR3 Shelburne |
| Fred Perry | Port Saxon |
| Cecil Williams | Sable River |
| Gordon Atwood Barrington |  |
| William Acker | RR2 Shelburne |
| Robert Lloyd | Osborne Hbr. |
| Wade Hemeon | RR2 Shelburne |
| Shane Blenkhorn | RR2 Shelburne |
| Ernie Pierce | RR2 Shelburne |
| John Acker | RR2 Shelburne |
| Robert Hopkins RR2 Shelburne |  |
| Alex Bower | Jordan Bay |
| Wilford Smith | Port Latour |
| Ricky Hallet | Lockeport |

FSRS: Kory Jollimore
William Acker RR2 Shelburne
Robert Lloyd Osborne Hbr.
RR2 Shelburne
Shelburne

John Acker RR2 Shelburne
Robert Hopkins RR2 Shelburne
Alex Bower Jordan Bay
Ricky Hallet Lockeport

Following a round table introduction, fishers were asked to give an individual perspective of the fishery in their respective areas.

Fishers from port cluster 10 felt that lobster stocks are still holding up because although there are more boats in the area now and many are fishing more days per season, landings have been steady with minor fluctuations for the last 5 years. The fishery in this area extends to about 20 fathoms. Concern was expressed as to what effect a salmon farm might have on absence of lobsters in an area where they were previously found.

Port cluster 11 fishers reported slight increases in landings over last 5 years. Several indicated that they are fishing "longer and harder'. The area fished has been moving further from shore each year and in some cases individuals are out to 30 fathoms and feel that they will have to move out more in the next few years. One comment indicated that the last 5 years were the best of the last 15.

Port cluster 12 reported that although they have been moving to deeper water over the last 5 years, they are maintaining good landings by working harder. The main body of lobsters appears to concentrate further offshore than in past. There are more lobsters on more open bottom and the reason for this is thought to be the absence of predators due to downturn in groundfish. Fishery extends to 25 fathoms.

Port cluster 13: The one representative from this area said that fishers had moved off to deeper water as much as 15-20 years ago and some are now at 40 fathoms. Landings per boat are holding steady but number of boats has increased from 15 to 70 . Also, several boats now fish throughout entire 6 months of season. There are more small, ( 3 "- 4 " overall length) and more lobsters on all types of bottom where they couldn't catch any 5-6 years ago. They feel that this is due to a combination of warmer water and fewer predators.

One interesting idea shared by several fishers from different areas was that if an attempt is made to fish on bottom where there are very few lobsters, there will be lobsters in that area in the following year. It appears that lobsters will move to the area if it is "baited". It was generally agreed that there is a larger run of lobsters from deeper water and that spring run of lobsters is larger than in the fall. Large "fantail" female lobsters are caught later in the spring in shallow water.

Kory Jollimore gave a brief presentation on the FSRS recruitment study. To date, data analysis for the spring portion of the 1999 season has been completed which shows varying numbers of pre recruit lobsters are caught for different LFA's.

Recent and historical CPUE data from voluntary logs and length frequency data from port sampling were presented by R. Claytor. After some discussion on the validity of data from individual voluntary logs a consensus was reached that voluntary logbook data provides an accurate description of the CPUE trends in the fishery. Steve Nolan explained that port sampling data, (length frequencies), are collected at a consistent time of year from unsorted catches and from a number of boats from each port. Given these sampling conditions it was agreed that the length frequencies presented were consistent with observations of those fishing in the area. He also noted that there was a scarcity of logkeepers from the some areas of LFA 33 and made an appeal for those present to consider keeping individual logs. Fishers requested that from now on data is presented in inches and pounds as still used by buyers and shippers. The current system used by statistics branch for calculating annual landings from mandatory logs was thought to be inefficient and probably underestimates total landings by about 10-15\%. The underestimation is consistent from year to year.

Ross Claytor outlined a project designed to learn more about lobster abundance by conducting short term tag, release, and recovery. It was indicated that this project would not serve as a trade off for future conservation measures. Fishers were in favour of research activities conducted on a more local basis because they feel conditions differ from port to port and recommended that at least two sites be tested. A follow up meeting will be held to finalize details.

## LFA 33 lobster workshop, Bridgewater N.S.

February 18, 2001.

| Name | Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Robert Swim | Port Mouton |
| Jack Dunlop | Port Cluster 9 |
| Rick Clottenburg | Hunt's Point |
| Winfred Risser | Riverport |
| Barry Levy | Bridgewater/ Lunenburg |
| Jim Jamieson | DFO |
| Bradford Crouse | Liverpool East |
| Stephen Scobey | Mersey Point |
| Moyle L. Tumblin | La Have |
| Ross Claytor | DFO |

Ross Claytor presented an outline of data and preliminary analytical results that would be used to examine associations among fisheries in port clusters 1-13 in LFA 33, catch rates in LFA 41, and the effect of temperature on lobster trap catch rates using the FSRS recruitment trap data.

The presentation on the associations among port clusters began with a description of the number of boats and catch per boat by fall and spring portions of the season in each port cluster. Correlations among the port clusters for catches indicated that port clusters 1-5 and 8-13 formed two groups of associated port clusters with 6 and 7 being intermediate. The only port clusters where fall landings and spring landings were associated were port clusters 6 and 7 . Port clusters were grouped into 1-4, 5-9, and 10-13 for catch rate analysis based on voluntary logbook reports for the fall portion of the season. Catch rates in each of these three areas increased appreciably during the fall season in each of the groups. All three groups were correlated for fall season for the years of common data collection.

Analysis of LFA 41 catch rates indicated an increase in catch rates in the most recent year compared to last years analysis. In general Crowell Basin was distinct from Georges Bank in terms of landing and catch rate trends in LFA 41. The other areas were intermediate. An initial look at temperature was inconclusive and more work is required.

The FSRS data indicated that in general for the fall portion of the season temperature influences catch rate and that it might make up to a $5 \%$ difference in exploitation rate on average for all areas. Additional work is required to determine the reasons for differences among areas and the uncertainty involved in these estimates. The FSRS data looks very promising as a method for sorting out the relationship between temperature and catch rates.

Industry comments:

- The number of boats fishing in spring 1998-1999 was too low.
- The split between port clusters 1-6 and 7-13 was reasonable
- B licenses should be split out from the number of boats. There is one in port cluster 9, and other areas have abouit 1-4.
- The catches in the logbooks could be used to check correlations among areas if individual fishermen are consistent among years and between areas, but could be used to check on fall to spring correlations.
- Depth is a likely important factor in affecting CPUE.
- During the late 1980s there was an increase in berried females.
- Localized native fisheries are important.


## LFA 33 lobster workshop, Jordan Bay N.S. February 19, 2001

| Name | Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fred Perry | Ingomar |
| David Nickerson | Ingomar |
| Robert Lloyd | Osborne Harbour |
| James D. Benham | Osborne Harbour |
| Ernie Pierce | Jordan Bay |
| Jim Jamieson | DFO |
| Wilfred Smith | Port La Tour |
| Allen B. Holmes | NSDFA |
| Ross Claytor | DFO |

Ross Claytor presented an outline of data and preliminary analytical results that would be used to examine associations among fisheries in port clusters 1-13 in LFA 33, catch rates in LFA 41, and the effect of temperature on lobster trap catch rates using the FSRS recruitment trap data.

The presentation on the associations among port clusters began with a description of the number of boats and catch per boat by fall and spring portions of the season in each port cluster. Correlations among the port clusters for catches indicated that port clusters 1-5 and 8-13 formed two groups of associated port clusters with 6 and 7 being intermediate. The only port clusters where fall landings and spring landings were associated were port clusters 6 and 7 . Port clusters were grouped into 1-4, 5-9, and 10-13 for catch rate analysis based on voluntary logbook reports for the fall portion of the season. Catch rates in each of these three areas increased appreciably during the fall season in each of the groups. All three groups were correlated for fall season for the years of common data collection.

Analysis of LFA 41 catch rates indicated an increase in catch rates in the most recent year compared to last years analysis. In general Crowell Basin was distinct from Georges Bank in terms of landing and catch rate trends in LFA 41. The other areas were intermediate. An initial look at temperature was inconclusive and more work is required.

The FSRS data indicated that in general for the fall portion of the season temperature influences catch rate and that it might make up to a $5 \%$ difference in exploitation rate on average for all areas. Additional work is required to determine the reasons for differences among areas and the uncertainty involved in these estimates. The FSRS data looks very promising as a method for sorting out the relationship between temperature and catch rates.

Industry comments:

- Check on B licenses, Cape Sable island also has about 20 boats that fish in LFA 33 to improve analysis of number of boats
- Remove spring 1998-1999 from analysis it is too low
- No B licenses in port cluster 13
- West Halifax to Lunenburg different from other areas
- Spring season had easterly winds, instead of dividing go into Green Harbour
- Inside fishing was not as good as last year
- Those that stayed inside did not do as well as those that went outside.
- Effort is outside, and farther and farther, baiting is making new bottom
- What is the influence of herring seiner catches on lobster CPUE

LFA 33 lobster workshop, Sambro, N.S. February 20, 2001.

| Name | Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Victor Gray | Sambro |
| James M. Gray | Sambro |
| Stephen Gray | Ketch Harbour |
| John Sihru | Cow Bay |
| Tom Henneberry | Eastern Passage |
| Patrick Gray | Sambro Harbour |
| Gerald Mason | NSAF |
| Jeff Graves | FSRS |
| Vincent Boutilier | Port Cluster 4B |
| Eugene D Young | Hubbards |
| Lionel Young | Hubbards |
| Bill Bell | Hubbards |
| Kevin Duffy | Terence Bay |

Ross Claytor presented an outline of data and preliminary analytical results that would be used to examine associations among fisheries in port clusters 1-13 in LFA 33, catch rates in LFA 41, and the effect of temperature on lobster trap catch rates using the FSRS recruitment trap data.

The presentation on the associations among port clusters began with a description of the number of boats and catch per boat by fall and spring portions of the season in each port cluster. Correlations among the port clusters for catches indicated that port clusters 1-5 and 8-13 formed two groups of associated port clusters with 6 and 7 being intermediate. The only port clusters where fall landings and spring landings were associated were port clusters 6 and 7 . Port clusters were grouped into 1-4, 5-9, and 10-13 for catch rate analysis based on voluntary logbook reports for the fall portion of the season. Catch rates in each of these three areas increased appreciably during the fall season in each of the groups. All three groups were correlated for fall season for the years of common data collection.

Analysis of LFA 41 catch rates indicated an increase in catch rates in the most recent year compared to last year's analysis. In general Crowell Basin was distinct from Georges Bank in terms of landing and catch rate trends in LFA 41. The other areas were intermediate. An initial look at temperature was inconclusive and more work is required.

The FSRS data indicated that in general for the fall portion of the season temperature influences catch rate and that it might make up to a $5 \%$ difference in exploitation rate on average for all areas. Additional work is required to determine the reasons for differences among areas and the uncertainty involved in these estimates. The FSRS data looks very promising as a method for sorting out the relationship between temperature and catch rates.

Industry comments:

- In port cluster 2 there were about 8 too many, and there are about 3 B Licenses.
- 1999 seemed ok
- In port cluster 1 there are about 17 licenses now.
- Port cluster 3 is ok, about 70 licenses
- Port cluster 4 was not sure.
- Port cluster 3 fall and spring should be about equal
- In port cluster 2 it should be equal in last two years, but there may be about a 5 boat difference
- In port cluster 1 there are less in spring than fall
- Water warms up more quickly in Shelburne and Liverpool at about two weeks before St. Margaret's Bay
- Timing of spring is important for landings
- In port cluster 1 more fishing was at 20-30 fathoms
- Urchin die off in 1996-97
- For 2000 port cluster 4 predicts lower catch rates because of sea urchins
- Sea urchins take over bottom
- A type of green moss is a problem
- Green crab are becoming a concern
- Size increase and V-notching too much change too quickly
- Difficult to sell larger lobsters to buyers
- Remember that 133-134 licenses are set to retire in LFA 33, B Licenses and part time
- In port cluster 1 off shore when season started
- Freshwater table in deep water
- In port cluster 4A, St. Margarets Bay, not many in 8-10 fathoms, most 5-6 fathoms
- In 4B Indian Pt. About 30\% down from last year, same for Mahone Bay

Appendix 3.1. Port samples collected from port cluster 1.

| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 394 | 320 | 0 | 714 | 88.36 | 86.70 | 87.62 | 558 | 535 | 548 |
| Fall | 1985 | 450 | 379 | 0 | 829 | 88.94 | 87.60 | 88.33 | 569 | 551 | 561 |
| Fall | 1986 | 392 | 298 | 0 | 690 | 90.77 | 89.03 | 90.02 | 606 | 577 | 593 |
| Fall | 1987 | 361 | 321 | 0 | 682 | 89.67 | 87.75 | 88.77 | 584 | 554 | 570 |
| Fall | 1988 | 127 | 108 | 0 | 235 | 94.32 | 91.68 | 93.11 | 682 | 628 | 657 |
| Fall | 1989 | 207 | 212 | 0 | 419 | 89.66 | 88.56 | 89.10 | 583 | 568 | 576 |
| Fall | 1990 | 174 | 161 | 0 | 335 | 88.82 | 88.35 | 88.59 | 567 | 565 | 566 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 394 | 320 | 0 | 714 | 3.48 | 3.41 | 3.45 | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.21 |
| Fall | 1985 | 450 | 379 | 0 | 829 | 3.50 | 3.45 | 3.48 | 1.25 | 1.22 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1986 | 392 | 298 | 0 | 690 | 3.57 | 3.51 | 3.54 | 1.34 | 1.27 | 1.31 |
| Fall | 1987 | 361 | 321 | 0 | 682 | 3.53 | 3.45 | 3.49 | 1.29 | 1.22 | 1.26 |
| Fall | 1988 | 127 | 108 | 0 | 235 | 3.71 | 3.61 | 3.67 | 1.50 | 1.38 | 1.45 |
| Fall | 1989 | 207 | 212 | 0 | 419 | 3.53 | 3.49 | 3.51 | 1.29 | 1.25 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1990 | 174 | 161 | 0 | 335 | 3.50 | 3.48 | 3.49 | 1.25 | 1.24 | 1.25 |


|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 354 | 351 | 0 | 705 | 89.97 | 90.13 | 90.05 | 585.54 | 597.75 | 591.62 |
| Spring | 1987 | 163 | 177 | 0 | 340 | 92.59 | 92.21 | 92.39 | 639.57 | 638.20 | 638.85 |
| Spring | 1988 | 171 | 171 | 0 | 342 | 92.49 | 89.69 | 91.09 | 637.49 | 589.47 | 613.48 |
| Spring | 1989 | 176 | 164 | 0 | 340 | 89.28 | 88.20 | 88.76 | 571.76 | 561.79 | 566.95 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 354 | 351 | 0 | 705 | 3.54 | 3.55 | 3.55 | 1.29 | 1.32 | 1.30 |
| Spring | 1987 | 163 | 177 | 0 | 340 | 3.65 | 3.63 | 3.64 | 1.41 | 1.41 | 1.41 |
| Spring | 1988 | 171 | 171 | 0 | 342 | 3.64 | 3.53 | 3.59 | 1.41 | 1.30 | 1.35 |
| Spring | 1989 | 176 | 164 | 0 | 340 | 3.51 | 3.47 | 3.49 | 1.26 | 1.24 | 1.25 |

Appendix 3.2. Port samples collected from port cluster 2.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1985 | 244 | 242 | 0 | 486 | 90.44 | 90.22 | 90.33 | 599 | 599 | 599 |
| Fall | 1986 | 149 | 147 | 0 | 296 | 90.88 | 90.61 | 90.74 | 608 | 607 | 608 |
| Fall | 1987 | 250 | 199 | 0 | 449 | 90.63 | 90.06 | 90.38 | 603 | 596 | 600 |
| Fall | 1988 | 91 | 86 | 0 | 177 | 98.75 | 96.57 | 97.69 | 785 | 728 | 758 |
| Fall | 1991 | 128 | 129 | 0 | 257 | 93.59 | 94.18 | 93.89 | 666 | 678 | 672 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1985 | 244 | 242 | 0 | 486 | 3.56 | 3.55 | 3.56 | 1.32 | 1.32 | 1.32 |
| Fall | 1986 | 149 | 147 | 0 | 296 | 3.58 | 3.57 | 3.57 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 |
| Fall | 1987 | 250 | 199 | 0 | 449 | 3.57 | 3.55 | 3.56 | 1.33 | 1.32 | 1.32 |
| Fall | 1988 | 91 | 86 | 0 | 177 | 3.89 | 3.80 | 3.85 | 1.73 | 1.61 | 1.67 |
| Fall | 1991 | 128 | 129 | 0 | 257 | 3.68 | 3.71 | 3.70 | 1.47 | 1.49 | 1.48 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | ales | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1991 | 135 | $\begin{aligned} & 168 \\ & 190 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 303 | 93.15 | 93.46 | 93.32 | 651.53 | 663.14 | 657.96 |
| Spring | 1998 | 162 |  |  | 352 | 97.10 | 97.01 | 97.05 | 740.39 | 737.83 | 739.01 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1991 | 135 | 168 | 0 | 303 | 3.67 | 3.68 | 3.67 | 1.44 | 1.46 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1998 | 162 | 190 | 0 | 352 | 3.82 | 3.82 | 3.82 | 1.63 | 1.63 | 1.63 |

Appendix 3.3. Port samples collected from port cluster 3.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 165 | 155 | 0 | 320 | 96.03 | 91.06 | 94 | 721 | 616 | 670 |
| Fall | 1992 | 417 | 412 | 0 | 829 | 90.46 | 89.28 | 90 | 600 | 582 | 591 |
| Fall | 1993 | 399 | 350 | 0 | 749 | 89.54 | 88.11 | 89 | 581 | 560 | 571 |
| Fall | 1994 | 152 | 124 | 0 | 276 | 89.40 | 88.60 | 89 | 578 | 569 | 574 |
| Fall | 1995 | 373 | 304 | 0 | 677 | 88.86 | 88.35 | 89 | 568 | 565 | 566 |
| Fall | 1996 | 485 | 324 | 0 | 809 | 88.31 | 87.43 | 88 | 557 | 548 | 553 |
| Fall | 1997 | 236 | 237 | 0 | 473 | 90.02 | 88.06 | 89 | 591 | 559 | 575 |
| Fall | 1998 | 199 | 139 | 0 | 338 | 88.36 | 86.67 | 88 | 558 | 534 | 548 |
|  |  | umber |  |  |  | Length | inches |  | Weight | unds |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 165 | 155 | 0 | 320 | 3.78 | 3.58 | 3.69 | 1.59 | 1.36 | 1.48 |
| Fall | 1992 | 417 | 412 | 0 | 829 | 3.56 | 3.51 | 3.54 | 1.32 | 1.28 | 1.30 |
| Fall | 1993 | 399 | 350 | 0 | 749 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.50 | 1.28 | 1.24 | 1.26 |
| Fall | 1994 | 152 | 124 | 0 | 276 | 3.52 | 3.49 | 3.51 | 1.28 | 1.25 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1995 | 373 | 304 | 0 | 677 | 3.50 | 3.48 | 3.49 | 1.25 | 1.24 | 1.25 |
| Fall | 1996 | 485 | 324 | 0 | 809 | 3.48 | 3.44 | 3.46 | 1.23 | 1.21 | 1.22 |
| Fall | 1997 | 236 | 237 | 0 | 473 | 3.54 | 3.47 | 3.51 | 1.30 | 1.23 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1998 | 199 | 139 | 0 | 338 | 3.48 | 3.41 | 3.45 | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.21 |


|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  |  | Weight b |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total |
| Spring | 1992 | 220 | 232 | 2 | 454 | 90.72 | 92.56 | 98.00 | 91.69 | 600.71 | 645.07 | 759.57 | 624.08 |
| Spring | 1993 | 148 | 144 | 0 | 292 | 97.50 | 98.22 | 0.00 | 97.85 | 749.85 | 764.35 | 0.00 | 757.00 |
| Spring | 1995 | 160 | 162 | 0 | 322 | 94.89 | 95.77 | 0.00 | 95.33 | 689.71 | 711.19 | 0.00 | 700.52 |
| Spring | 1996 | 150 | 129 | 0 | 279 | 93.19 | 93.33 | 0.00 | 93.25 | 652.36 | 660.60 | 0.00 | 656.17 |
| Spring | 1997 | 180 | 150 | 0 | 330 | 93.94 | 88.03 | 0.00 | 91.25 | 668.71 | 558.73 | 0.00 | 618.72 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total |
| Spring | 1993 | 148 | 144 | 0 | 292 | 3.84 | 3.87 | 0.00 | 3.85 | 1.65 | 1.69 | 0.00 | 1.67 |
| Spring | 1995 | 160 | 162 | 0 | 322 | 3.74 | 3.77 | 0.00 | 3.75 | 1.52 | 1.57 | 0.00 | 1.54 |
| Spring | 1996 | 150 | 129 | 0 | 279 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 0.00 | 3.67 | 1.44 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1997 | 180 | 150 | 0 | 330 | 3.70 | 3.47 | 0.00 | 3.59 | 1.47 | 1.23 | 0.00 | 1.36 |

Appendix 3.4. Port samples collected from port cluster 5.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 309 | 226 | 0 | 535 | 92.62 | 88.09 | 90.70 | 645 | 560 | 609 |
| Fall | 1985 | 545 | 490 | 0 | 1035 | 89.50 | 87.84 | 88.72 | 580 | 555 | 569 |
| Fall | 1986 | 426 | 403 | 0 | 829 | 90.50 | 88.36 | 89.46 | 600 | 565 | 583 |
| Fall | 1987 | 220 | 199 | 0 | 419 | 89.48 | 88.56 | 89.05 | 580 | 569 | 574 |
| Fall | 1988 | 231 | 217 | 0 | 448 | 89.46 | 88.96 | 89.22 | 579 | 576 | 578 |
| Fall | 1989 | 195 | 186 | 0 | 381 | 93.04 | 91.85 | 92.46 | 654 | 631 | 643 |
| Fall | 1990 | 206 | 196 | 0 | 402 | 88.50 | 88.04 | 88.28 | 561 | 559 | 560 |
| Fall | 1991 | 147 | 127 | 0 | 274 | 93.94 | 91.96 | 93.02 | 673 | 633 | 655 |
| Fall | 1993 | 199 | 162 | 0 | 361 | 91.34 | 89.87 | 90.68 | 618 | 593 | 607 |
| Fall | 1994 | 258 | 168 | 0 | 426 | 87.98 | 87.84 | 87.92 | 550 | 555 | 552 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 309 | 226 |  | 535 | 3.65 | 3.47 | 3.57 | 1.42 | 1.23 | 1.34 |
| Fall | 1985 | 545 | 490 |  | 1035 | 3.52 | 3.46 | 3.49 | 1.28 | 1.22 | 1.25 |
| Fall | 1986 | 426 | 403 |  | 829 | 3.56 | 3.48 | 3.52 | 1.32 | 1.25 | 1.29 |
| Fall | 1987 | 220 | 199 |  | 419 | 3.52 | 3.49 | 3.51 | 1.28 | 1.25 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1988 | 231 | 217 |  | 448 | 3.52 | 3.50 | 3.51 | 1.28 | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1989 | 195 | 186 |  | 381 | 3.66 | 3.62 | 3.64 | 1.44 | 1.39 | 1.42 |
| Fall | 1990 | 206 | 196 |  | 402 | 3.48 | 3.47 | 3.48 | 1.24 | 1.23 | 1.23 |
| Fall | 1991 | 147 | 127 |  | 274 | 3.70 | 3.62 | 3.66 | 1.48 | 1.40 | 1.44 |
| Fall | 1993 | 199 | 162 |  | 361 | 3.60 | 3.54 | 3.57 | 1.36 | 1.31 | 1.34 |
| Fall | 1994 | 258 | 168 |  | 426 | 3.46 | 3.46 | 3.46 | 1.21 | 1.22 | 1.22 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 433 | 297 | 0 | 730 | 95.36 | 91.23 | 93.68 | 700.34 | 618.81 | 667.17 |
| Spring | 1987 | 199 | 134 | 0 | 333 | 91.14 | 86.85 | 89.41 | 609.17 | 537.64 | 580.38 |
| Spring | 1988 | 430 | 412 | 0 | 842 | 89.89 | 88.24 | 89.08 | 583.82 | 562.66 | 573.47 |
| Spring | 1989 | 180 | 203 | 0 | 383 | 94.28 | 92.43 | 93.30 | 676.16 | 642.54 | 658.34 |
| Spring | 1990 | 157 | 164 | 0 | 321 | 98.38 | 97.95 | 98.16 | 770.77 | 758.35 | 764.43 |
| Spring | 1991 | 172 | 155 | 0 | 327 | 90.39 | 87.28 | 88.92 | 593.95 | 545.34 | 570.91 |
| Spring | 1992 | 182 | 172 | 0 | 354 | 91.30 | 90.62 | 90.97 | 612.60 | 607.17 | 609.96 |
| Spring | 1993 | 148 | 154 | 0 | 302 | 94.47 | 92.12 | 93.27 | 680.33 | 636.39 | 657.92 |
| Spring | 1994 | 222 | 190 | 0 | 412 | 91.27 | 92.56 | 91.87 | 611.94 | 645.12 | 627.24 |
|  |  |  | Number |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 433 | 297 | 0 | 730 | 3.75 | 3.59 | 3.69 | 1.54 | 1.36 | 1.47 |
| Spring | 1987 | 199 | 134 | 0 | 333 | 3.59 | 3.42 | 3.52 | 1.34 | 1.19 | 1.28 |
| Spring | 1988 | 430 | 412 | 0 | 842 | 3.54 | 3.47 | 3.51 | 1.29 | 1.24 | 1.26 |
| Spring | 1989 | 180 | 203 | 0 | 383 | 3.71 | 3.64 | 3.67 | 1.49 | 1.42 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1990 | 157 | 164 | 0 | 321 | 3.87 | 3.86 | 3.86 | 1.70 | 1.67 | 1.69 |
| Spring | 1991 | 172 | 155 | 0 | 327 | 3.56 | 3.44 | 3.50 | 1.31 | 1.20 | 1.26 |
| Spring | 1992 | 182 | 172 | 0 | 354 | 3.59 | 3.57 | 3.58 | 1.35 | 1.34 | 1.34 |
| Spring | 1993 | 148 | 154 | 0 | 302 | 3.72 | 3.63 | 3.67 | 1.50 | 1.40 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1994 | 222 | 190 | 0 | 412 | 3.59 | 3.64 | 3.62 | 1.35 | 1.42 | 1.38 |

Appendix 3.5. Port samples collected from port cluster 6.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1992 | 210 | 182 | 0 | 392 | 89.39 | 87.71 | 88.61 | 578 | 553 | 566 |
| Fall | 1995 | 213 | 137 | 0 | 350 | 92.52 | 89.73 | 91.43 | 643 | 590 | 622 |
| Fall | 1996 | 171 | 164 | 0 | 335 | 91.74 | 88.91 | 90.35 | 626 | 575 | 601 |
| Fall | 1997 | 192 | 178 | 0 | 370 | 90.77 | 88.92 | 89.88 | 606 | 575 | 591 |
| Fall | 1998 | 204 | 202 | 0 | 406 | 88.75 | 87.50 | 88.13 | 565 | 549 | 557 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1992 | 210 | 182 | 0 | 392 | 3.52 | 3.45 | 3.49 | 1.27 | 1.22 | 1.25 |
| Fall | 1995 | 213 | 137 | 0 | 350 | 3.64 | 3.53 | 3.60 | 1.42 | 1.30 | 1.37 |
| Fall | 1996 | 171 | 164 | 0 | 335 | 3.61 | 3.50 | 3.56 | 1.38 | 1.27 | 1.33 |
| Fall | 1997 | 192 | 178 | 0 | 370 | 3.57 | 3.50 | 3.54 | 1.34 | 1.27 | 1.30 |
| Fall | 1998 | 204 | 202 | 0 | 406 | 3.49 | 3.44 | 3.47 | 1.25 | 1.21 | 1.23 |
| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. B. Fem |  | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1995 | 185 | 184 | 0 | 369 | 93.72 | 91.96 | 92.84 | 663.90 | 633.10 | 648.54 |
| Spring | 1996 | 254 | 179 | 0 | 433 | 89.93 | 92.30 | 90.91 | 584.68 | 639.92 | 607.52 |
| Spring | 1997 | 149 | 164 | 0 | 313 | 100.67 | 98.45 | 99.51 | 827.48 | 769.62 | 797.16 |
| Spring | 1998 | 172 | 191 | 0 | 363 | 96.03 | 94.55 | 95.25 | 715.57 | 685.64 | 699.82 |
| Spring | 1999 | 179 | 213 | 0 | 392 | 93.72 | 92.37 | 92.98 | 663.81 | 641.30 | 651.58 |
| Season | Start <br> Year | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
|  |  | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1995 | 185 | 184 | 0 | 369 | 3.69 | 3.62 | 3.66 | 1.46 | 1.40 | 1.43 |
| Spring | 1996 | 254 | 179 | 0 | 433 | 3.54 | 3.63 | 3.58 | 1.29 | 1.41 | 1.34 |
| Spring | 1997 | 149 | 164 | 0 | 313 | 3.96 | 3.88 | 3.92 | 1.82 | 1.70 | 1.76 |
| Spring | 1998 | 172 | 191 | 0 | 363 | 3.78 | 3.72 | 3.75 | 1.58 | 1.51 | 1.54 |
| Spring | 1999 | 179 | 213 | 0 | 392 | 3.69 | 3.64 | 3.66 | 1.46 | 1.41 | 1.44 |

Appendix 3.6. Port samples collected from port cluster 7.

| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 257 | 171 | 0 | 428 | 90.38 | 87.33 | 89.16 | 598 | 546 | 577 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 257 | 171 | 0 | 428 | 3.56 | 3.44 | 3.51 | 1.32 | 1.20 | 1.27 |

Appendix 3.7. Port samples collected from port cluster 8.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 231 | 174 | 0 | 405 | 88.81 | 89.29 | 89.02 | 567 | 582 | 573 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 231 | 174 | 0 | 405 | 3.50 | 3.52 | 3.50 | 1.25 | 1.28 | 1.26 |


|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1997 | 148 | 159 | 0 | 307 | 95.77 | 92.68 | 94.17 | 709.65 | 647.44 | 677.43 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1997 | 148 | 159 | 0 | 307 | 3.77 | 3.65 | 3.71 | 1.56 | 1.43 | 1.49 |

Appendix 3.8. Port samples collected from port cluster 9.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1946 | 507 | 449 | 0 | 956 | 88.47 | 88.45 | 88.46 | 560 | 566 | 563 |
| Fall | 1949 | 496 | 386 | 0 | 882 | 92.05 | 92.02 | 92.04 | 633 | 634 | 633 |
| Fall | 1984 | 579 | 469 | 0 | 1048 | 90.07 | 88.27 | 89.27 | 592 | 563 | 579 |
| Fall | 1985 | 603 | 482 | 0 | 1085 | 88.60 | 88.13 | 88.39 | 562 | 561 | 562 |
| Fall | 1986 | 470 | 394 | 0 | 864 | 89.17 | 87.91 | 88.60 | 574 | 557 | 566 |
| Fall | 1987 | 476 | 358 | 0 | 834 | 89.89 | 87.62 | 88.92 | 588 | 551 | 572 |
| Fall | 1988 | 209 | 183 | 0 | 392 | 88.73 | 87.93 | 88.36 | 565 | 557 | 561 |
| Fall | 1989 | 234 | 246 | 0 | 480 | 88.19 | 87.68 | 87.93 | 555 | 553 | 553 |
| Fall | 1990 | 222 | 167 | 0 | 389 | 90.44 | 88.91 | 89.78 | 599 | 575 | 589 |
| Fall | 1991 | 238 | 155 | 0 | 393 | 89.94 | 89.76 | 89.87 | 589 | 591 | 590 |
| Fall | 1992 | 210 | 170 | 0 | 380 | 90.62 | 90.86 | 90.73 | 603 | 612 | 607 |
| Fall | 1993 | 196 | 139 | 0 | 335 | 93.46 | 94.37 | 93.84 | 663 | 682 | 671 |
| Fall | 1994 | 225 | 173 | 0 | 398 | 89.64 | 88.03 | 88.94 | 583 | 559 | 573 |
| Fall | 1995 | 197 | 194 | 0 | 391 | 90.11 | 89.07 | 89.60 | 593 | 578 | 585 |
| Fall | 1996 | 227 | 196 | 0 | 423 | 87.40 | 87.45 | 87.42 | 539 | 548 | 543 |
| Fall | 1997 | 302 | 228 | 0 | 530 | 90.94 | 89.89 | 90.49 | 609 | 593 | 602 |
| Fall | 1998 | 228 | 183 | 0 | 411 | 88.57 | 87.58 | 88.13 | 562 | 551 | 557 |


|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1946 | 507 | 449 | 0 | 956 | 3.48 | 3.48 | 3.48 | 1.23 | 1.25 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1949 | 496 | 386 | 0 | 882 | 3.62 | 3.62 | 3.62 | 1.40 | 1.40 | 1.40 |
| Fall | 1984 | 579 | 469 | 0 | 1048 | 3.55 | 3.48 | 3.51 | 1.30 | 1.24 | 1.28 |
| Fall | 1985 | 603 | 482 | 0 | 1085 | 3.49 | 3.47 | 3.48 | 1.24 | 1.24 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1986 | 470 | 394 | 0 | 864 | 3.51 | 3.46 | 3.49 | 1.26 | 1.23 | 1.25 |
| Fall | 1987 | 476 | 358 | 0 | 834 | 3.54 | 3.45 | 3.50 | 1.30 | 1.22 | 1.26 |
| Fall | 1988 | 209 | 183 | 0 | 392 | 3.49 | 3.46 | 3.48 | 1.25 | 1.23 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1989 | 234 | 246 | 0 | 480 | 3.47 | 3.45 | 3.46 | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.22 |
| Fall | 1990 | 222 | 167 | 0 | 389 | 3.56 | 3.50 | 3.53 | 1.32 | 1.27 | 1.30 |
| Fall | 1991 | 238 | 155 | 0 | 393 | 3.54 | 3.53 | 3.54 | 1.30 | 1.30 | 1.30 |
| Fall | 1992 | 210 | 170 | 0 | 380 | 3.57 | 3.58 | 3.57 | 1.33 | 1.35 | 1.34 |
| Fall | 1993 | 196 | 139 | 0 | 335 | 3.68 | 3.72 | 3.69 | 1.46 | 1.50 | 1.48 |
| Fall | 1994 | 225 | 173 | 0 | 398 | 3.53 | 3.47 | 3.50 | 1.29 | 1.23 | 1.26 |
| Fall | 1995 | 197 | 194 | 0 | 391 | 3.55 | 3.51 | 3.53 | 1.31 | 1.27 | 1.29 |
| Fall | 1996 | 227 | 196 | 0 | 423 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.20 |
| Fall | 1997 | 302 | 228 | 0 | 530 | 3.58 | 3.54 | 3.56 | 1.34 | 1.31 | 1.33 |
| Fall | 1998 | 228 | 183 | 0 | 411 | 3.49 | 3.45 | 3.47 | 1.24 | 1.21 | 1.23 |

Appendix 3.8. Port samples collected from port cluster 9 (continued)

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start <br> Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1946 | 409 | 458 | 0 | 867 | 89.00 | 88.05 | 88.50 | 566.34 | 559.20 | 562.56 |
| Spring | 1986 | 492 | 467 | 0 | 959 | 88.94 | 88.28 | 88.62 | 565.14 | 563.35 | 564.27 |
| Spring | 1987 | 495 | 417 | 0 | 912 | 90.20 | 88.69 | 89.51 | 590.20 | 570.87 | 581.36 |
| Spring | 1988 | 337 | 360 | 0 | 697 | 91.97 | 91.65 | 91.81 | 626.57 | 627.13 | 626.86 |
| Spring | 1989 | 199 | 173 | 0 | 372 | 90.62 | 90.47 | 90.55 | 598.68 | 604.33 | 601.31 |
| Spring | 1990 | 203 | 182 | 0 | 385 | 95.85 | 93.31 | 94.65 | 711.41 | 660.08 | 687.15 |
| Spring | 1991 | 156 | 174 | 0 | 330 | 94.42 | 92.30 | 93.30 | 679.23 | 639.87 | 658.47 |
| Spring | 1992 | 164 | 176 | 0 | 340 | 93.96 | 91.95 | 92.92 | 669.11 | 633.06 | 650.45 |
| Spring | 1993 | 158 | 159 | 0 | 317 | 95.49 | 92.22 | 93.85 | 703.36 | 638.31 | 670.73 |
| Spring | 1994 | 205 | 188 | 0 | 393 | 93.36 | 93.48 | 93.42 | 656.02 | 663.66 | 659.67 |
| Spring | 1995 | 194 | 187 | 0 | 381 | 95.13 | 91.61 | 93.40 | 695.24 | 626.29 | 661.40 |
| Spring | 1996 | 207 | 213 | 0 | 420 | 92.33 | 90.91 | 91.61 | 634.04 | 612.63 | 623.18 |
| Spring | 1997 | 201 | 195 | 0 | 396 | 94.44 | 91.99 | 93.23 | 679.81 | 633.75 | 657.13 |
| Spring | 1998 | 209 | 176 | 0 | 385 | 94.80 | 93.06 | 94.01 | 687.73 | 655.13 | 672.83 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1946 | 409 | 458 | 0 | 867 | 3.50 | 3.47 | 3.48 | 1.25 | 1.23 | 1.24 |
| Spring | 1986 | 492 | 467 | 0 | 959 | 3.50 | 3.48 | 3.49 | 1.25 | 1.24 | 1.24 |
| Spring | 1987 | 495 | 417 | 0 | 912 | 3.55 | 3.49 | 3.52 | 1.30 | 1.26 | 1.28 |
| Spring | 1988 | 337 | 360 | 0 | 697 | 3.62 | 3.61 | 3.61 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 1.38 |
| Spring | 1989 | 199 | 173 | 0 | 372 | 3.57 | 3.56 | 3.57 | 1.32 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| Spring | 1990 | 203 | 182 | 0 | 385 | 3.77 | 3.67 | 3.73 | 1.57 | 1.46 | 1.51 |
| Spring | 1991 | 156 | 174 | 0 | 330 | 3.72 | 3.63 | 3.67 | 1.50 | 1.41 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1992 | 164 | 176 | 0 | 340 | 3.70 | 3.62 | 3.66 | 1.48 | 1.40 | 1.43 |
| Spring | 1993 | 158 | 159 | 0 | 317 | 3.76 | 3.63 | 3.69 | 1.55 | 1.41 | 1.48 |
| Spring | 1994 | 205 | 188 | 0 | 393 | 3.68 | 3.68 | 3.68 | 1.45 | 1.46 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1995 | 194 | 187 | 0 | 381 | 3.75 | 3.61 | 3.68 | 1.53 | 1.38 | 1.46 |
| Spring | 1996 | 207 | 213 | 0 | 420 | 3.63 | 3.58 | 3.61 | 1.40 | 1.35 | 1.37 |
| Spring | 1997 | 201 | 195 | 0 | 396 | 3.72 | 3.62 | 3.67 | 1.50 | 1.40 | 1.45 |
| Spring | 1998 | 209 | 176 | 0 | 385 | 3.73 | 3.66 | 3.70 | 1.52 | 1.44 | 1.48 |

Appendix 3.9. Port samples collected from port cluster 10.

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 440 | 278 | 0 | 718 | 88.42 | 86.47 | 87.66 | 559 | 531 | 548 |
| Fall | 1998 | 228 | 230 | 0 | 458 | 88.88 | 87.34 | 88.11 | 568 | 546 | 557 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1997 | 440 | 278 | 0 | 718 | 3.48 | 3.40 | 3.45 | 1.23 | 1.17 | 1.21 |
| Fall | 1998 | 228 | 230 | 0 | 458 | 3.50 | 3.44 | 3.47 | 1.25 | 1.20 | 1.23 |

Appendix 3.9. Port samples collected from port cluster 10 (continued)

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1997 | 189 | 201 | 0 | 390 | 94.95 | 91.22 | 93.03 | 691.04 | 618.68 | 653.75 |
| Spring | 1998 | 219 | 200 | 0 | 419 | 93.10 | 90.31 | 91.76 | 650.41 | 601.11 | 626.87 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1997 | 189 | 201 | 0 | 390 | 3.74 | 3.59 | 3.66 | 1.52 | 1.36 | 1.44 |
| Spring | 1998 | 219 | 200 | 0 | 419 | 3.67 | 3.56 | 3.61 | 1.43 | 1.33 | 1.38 |

Appendix 3.10. Port samples collected from port cluster 13.

| Season | Start Year | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 420 | 276 | 0 | 696 | 92.23 | 88.95 | 90.93 | 637 | 576 | 612 |
| Fall | 1985 | 282 | 243 | 0 | 525 | 90.30 | 87.32 | 88.92 | 596 | 546 | 573 |
| Fall | 1986 | 422 | 383 | 0 | 805 | 91.62 | 90.09 | 90.89 | 623 | 597 | 611 |
| Fall | 1987 | 440 | 353 | 0 | 793 | 92.36 | 88.74 | 90.75 | 639 | 572 | 609 |
| Fall | 1988 | 220 | 182 | 0 | 402 | 89.03 | 87.38 | 88.28 | 571 | 547 | 560 |
| Fall | 1989 | 219 | 219 | 0 | 438 | 88.79 | 88.10 | 88.44 | 566 | 560 | 563 |
| Fall | 1990 | 203 | 194 | 0 | 397 | 89.26 | 88.98 | 89.12 | 575 | 576 | 576 |
| Fall | 1991 | 196 | 168 | 0 | 364 | 89.40 | 88.73 | 89.09 | 578 | 572 | 575 |
| Fall | 1992 | 220 | 211 | 0 | 431 | 89.19 | 89.05 | 89.12 | 574 | 578 | 576 |
| Fall | 1994 | 213 | 187 | 0 | 400 | 90.23 | 88.47 | 89.41 | 595 | 567 | 582 |
| Fall | 1995 | 462 | 311 | 0 | 773 | 89.36 | 87.66 | 88.68 | 577 | 552 | 567 |
| Fall | 1996 | 217 | 220 | 0 | 437 | 89.69 | 87.05 | 88.36 | 584 | 541 | 562 |
| Fall | 1997 | 371 | 291 | 0 | 662 | 90.71 | 88.50 | 89.74 | 605 | 567 | 588 |
| Fall | 1998 | 229 | 177 | 0 | 406 | 89.52 | 87.81 | 88.77 | 581 | 555 | 569 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Fall | 1984 | 420 | 276 | 0 | 696 | 3.63 | 3.50 | 3.58 | 1.40 | 1.27 | 1.35 |
| Fall | 1985 | 282 | 243 | 0 | 525 | 3.56 | 3.44 | 3.50 | 1.32 | 1.20 | 1.26 |
| Fall | 1986 | 422 | 383 | 0 | 805 | 3.61 | 3.55 | 3.58 | 1.37 | 1.32 | 1.35 |
| Fall | 1987 | 440 | 353 | 0 | 793 | 3.64 | 3.49 | 3.57 | 1.41 | 1.26 | 1.34 |
| Fall | 1988 | 220 | 182 | 0 | 402 | 3.51 | 3.44 | 3.48 | 1.26 | 1.21 | 1.23 |
| Fall | 1989 | 219 | 219 | 0 | 438 | 3.50 | 3.47 | 3.48 | 1.25 | 1.23 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1990 | 203 | 194 | 0 | 397 | 3.51 | 3.50 | 3.51 | 1.27 | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1991 | 196 | 168 | 0 | 364 | 3.52 | 3.49 | 3.51 | 1.27 | 1.26 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1992 | 220 | 211 | 0 | 431 | 3.51 | 3.51 | 3.51 | 1.27 | 1.27 | 1.27 |
| Fall | 1994 | 213 | 187 | 0 | 400 | 3.55 | 3.48 | 3.52 | 1.31 | 1.25 | 1.28 |
| Fall | 1995 | 462 | 311 | 0 | 773 | 3.52 | 3.45 | 3.49 | 1.27 | 1.22 | 1.25 |
| Fall | 1996 | 217 | 220 | 0 | 437 | 3.53 | 3.43 | 3.48 | 1.29 | 1.19 | 1.24 |
| Fall | 1997 | 371 | 291 | 0 | 662 | 3.57 | 3.48 | 3.53 | 1.33 | 1.25 | 1.30 |
| Fall | 1998 | 229 | 177 | 0 | 406 | 3.52 | 3.46 | 3.50 | 1.28 | 1.22 | 1.26 |

Appendix 3.10. Port samples collected from port cluster 13 (continued)

|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length mm |  |  | Weight g |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 320 | 416 | 0 | 736 | 93.47 | 92.17 | 92.74 | 658.59 | 637.33 | 646.57 |
| Spring | 1987 | 393 | 413 | 0 | 806 | 90.19 | 89.02 | 89.59 | 589.99 | 577.04 | 583.35 |
| Spring | 1988 | 348 | 270 | 0 | 618 | 90.80 | 88.87 | 89.95 | 602.21 | 574.12 | 589.94 |
| Spring | 1989 | 172 | 163 | 0 | 335 | 94.62 | 90.33 | 92.53 | 683.79 | 601.49 | 643.75 |
| Spring | 1990 | 194 | 184 | 0 | 378 | 96.11 | 94.94 | 95.54 | 717.39 | 693.67 | 705.84 |
| Spring | 1991 | 194 | 188 | 0 | 382 | 91.38 | 91.98 | 91.68 | 614.24 | 633.54 | 623.74 |
| Spring | 1992 | 181 | 175 | 0 | 356 | 93.14 | 92.20 | 92.68 | 651.31 | 637.91 | 644.72 |
| Spring | 1993 | 185 | 185 | 0 | 370 | 91.80 | 92.23 | 92.01 | 622.94 | 638.44 | 630.69 |
| Spring | 1994 | 212 | 132 | 0 | 344 | 93.70 | 90.83 | 92.60 | 663.55 | 611.23 | 643.47 |
| Spring | 1995 | 179 | 156 | 0 | 335 | 95.20 | 92.27 | 93.84 | 696.75 | 639.28 | 669.99 |
| Spring | 1996 | 162 | 163 | 0 | 325 | 93.73 | 91.80 | 92.76 | 664.10 | 630.09 | 647.05 |
| Spring | 1997 | 185 | 183 | 0 | 368 | 96.81 | 94.05 | 95.44 | 733.65 | 675.31 | 704.64 |
| Spring | 1998 | 187 | 170 | 0 | 357 | 98.16 | 93.56 | 95.97 | 765.59 | 665.18 | 717.78 |
| Spring | 1999 | 183 | 193 | 0 | 376 | 96.55 | 92.52 | 94.48 | 727.50 | 644.23 | 684.76 |
|  |  | Number |  |  |  | Length inches |  |  | Weight pounds |  |  |
| Season | Start Year | Males | Fem. | B. Fem | Total | Males | Fem. | Total | Males | Fem. | Total |
| Spring | 1986 | 320 | 416 | 0 | 736 | 3.68 | 3.63 | 3.65 | 1.45 | 1.41 | 1.43 |
| Spring | 1987 | 393 | 413 | 0 | 806 | 3.55 | 3.50 | 3.53 | 1.30 | 1.27 | 1.29 |
| Spring | 1988 | 348 | 270 | 0 | 618 | 3.57 | 3.50 | 3.54 | 1.33 | 1.27 | 1.30 |
| Spring | 1989 | 172 | 163 | 0 | 335 | 3.73 | 3.56 | 3.64 | 1.51 | 1.33 | 1.42 |
| Spring | 1990 | 194 | 184 | 0 | 378 | 3.78 | 3.74 | 3.76 | 1.58 | 1.53 | 1.56 |
| Spring | 1991 | 194 | 188 | 0 | 382 | 3.60 | 3.62 | 3.61 | 1.35 | 1.40 | 1.38 |
| Spring | 1992 | 181 | 175 | 0 | 356 | 3.67 | 3.63 | 3.65 | 1.44 | 1.41 | 1.42 |
| Spring | 1993 | 185 | 185 | 0 | 370 | 3.61 | 3.63 | 3.62 | 1.37 | 1.41 | 1.39 |
| Spring | 1994 | 212 | 132 | 0 | 344 | 3.69 | 3.58 | 3.65 | 1.46 | 1.35 | 1.42 |
| Spring | 1995 | 179 | 156 | 0 | 335 | 3.75 | 3.63 | 3.69 | 1.54 | 1.41 | 1.48 |
| Spring | 1996 | 162 | 163 | 0 | 325 | 3.69 | 3.61 | 3.65 | 1.46 | 1.39 | 1.43 |
| Spring | 1997 | 185 | 183 | 0 | 368 | 3.81 | 3.70 | 3.76 | 1.62 | 1.49 | 1.55 |
| Spring | 1998 | 187 | 170 | 0 | 357 | 3.86 | 3.68 | 3.78 | 1.69 | 1.47 | 1.58 |
| Spring | 1999 | 183 | 193 | 0 | 376 | 3.80 | 3.64 | 3.72 | 1.60 | 1.42 | 1.51 |

