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## Introduction

From April 2023 through March 2024 the Yellow Perch Task Group (YPTG) addressed the following charges:

1. Maintain and update the centralized time series of datasets required for population models and assessment including:
a. Fishery harvest, effort, age composition, biological and stock parameters.
b. Survey indices of young-of-year, juvenile and adult abundance, size-at-age and biological parameters.
c. Fishing harvest and effort by grid.
2. Report Recommended Allowable Harvest (RAH) levels for LEC TAC decisions.
3. Ensure population models are current and produce the most scientifically defensible and reliable method for estimating and forecasting abundance, recruitment, and mortality.
a. Evaluate the impact of recruitment indices on ADMB model results.
b. Evaluate ADMB model parameter sensitivity.
4. Supply needed technical support throughout the upcoming Yellow Perch Management Plan (YPMP) review process.

## Charge 1: 2023 Fisheries Review and Population Dynamics

The lakewide total allowable catch (TAC) of Yellow Perch in 2023 was 6.573 million pounds. This allocation represented a $9 \%$ decrease from a TAC of 7.185 million pounds in 2022. For Yellow Perch assessment and allocation, Lake Erie is partitioned into four management units (MUs; Figure 1.1). The 2023 TAC allocation was $2.430,0.477,3.082$, and 0.584 million pounds for MUs 1 through 4, respectively. In March 2023 the Lake Erie Committee (LEC) applied the harvest policy within the Yellow Perch Management Plan to set the TAC. For MU1, the LEC set the TAC equal to 2.430 million pounds, which was a $20 \%$ decrease from 2022. In MU2, the target fishing mortality rate was reduced to $\mathrm{F}=0.106$, lowering the mean RAH and range. The target fishing mortality rate was reduced to ensure the spawning stock biomass in 2024 would not fall below the limit reference point, $\mathrm{B}_{\text {msy, }}$ with a probabilistic risk tolerance of 0.20 (i.e., $\mathrm{P}^{*}$ ). For MU2, the LEC set the TAC at 0.477 million pounds, which was equal to the mean RAH, representing an $11 \%$ decrease from 2022. For MU3, the LEC set the TAC at the same amount as the 2022 TAC ( 3.082 million pounds). This was slightly lower than the mean RAH ( 3.543 millions pounds) due to uncertainty about the MU3 abundance estimates. In MU4, the LEC set the TAC at 0.584 million pounds, which was the mean RAH and was $11 \%$ higher than the 2022 TAC.

The lakewide harvest of Yellow Perch in 2023 was 4.305 million pounds, or $65 \%$ of the total 2023 TAC. This was a $27 \%$ increase from the 2022 harvest of 3.400 million pounds. Harvest from MUs 1 through 4 was $2.376,0.287,1.236$, and 0.406 million pounds, respectively (Table 1.1). The portion of TAC harvested was $98 \%, 60 \%, 40 \%$, and $70 \%$, in MUs 1 through 4, respectively. In 2023, Ontario harvested 2.523 million pounds, followed by Ohio ( 1.554 million lbs.) , Michigan ( 0.104 million Ibs.), New York ( 0.069 million Ibs.) , and Pennsylvania ( 0.056 million lbs.).

Ontario's fraction of allocation harvested was 103\% in MU1, 97\% in MU2, 60\% in MU3, and 99\% in MU4 (see paragraph below regarding Ontario's harvest reporting and commercial ice allowance policy). Ohio fishers attained $103 \%$ of their TAC in the western basin (MU1), 29\% in the west central basin (MU2), and 22\% in the east central basin (MU3). Michigan anglers in MU1 attained $47 \%$ of their TAC. Pennsylvania fisheries harvested $12 \%$ of their TAC in MU3 and 2\% of their TAC in MU4. New York fisheries attained 38\% of their TAC in MU4. Ontario's portion of the lakewide Yellow Perch harvest in 2023 was 59\% (Table 1.1). Ohio's proportion of lakewide harvest was $36 \%$, and harvest in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York waters combined represented around 5\% of the lakewide harvest in 2023.

Ontario continued to employ a commercial ice allowance policy implemented in 2002, by which $3.3 \%$ is subtracted from commercial landed weight. This step was taken so that ice was not debited towards fishers' quotas. Ontario's landed weights in the YPTG report have not been adjusted to account for ice content. Ontario's reported Yellow Perch harvest in tables and figures is represented exclusively by the commercial gill net fishery. Yellow Perch sport harvest from Ontario waters is assessed periodically, which last occurred in 2014, but is not reported here. Reported sport harvests for Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York are based on creel survey estimates. Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York trap net harvest and effort are based on commercial catch reports of landed fish. Additional fishery documentation is available in annual agency reports.

Harvest, fishing effort, and fishery harvest rates are summarized from 2014 to 2023 by management unit, year, agency, and gear type in Tables 1.2 to 1.5. Trends across a longer time series (1975 to 2023) are depicted graphically for harvest (Figure 1.2), fishing effort (Figure 1.3), and harvest rates (Figure 1.4) by management unit and gear type. The spatial distributions of harvest (all gears) and effort by gear type for 2023 in ten-minute interagency grids are presented in Figures 1.5 through 1.8.

Ontario's Yellow Perch harvest from large mesh (3 inches or greater stretched mesh) gill nets in 2023 was $2 \%, 10 \%, 2 \%$, and $<1 \%$ of the gill net harvest in management units $1-4$,
respectively. Harvest, effort, and catch per unit effort from (1) small mesh Yellow Perch effort ( $2.25^{\prime \prime}=<$ stretched mesh<3") and (2) larger mesh sizes, are distinguished in Tables 1.2 to 1.5. Harvest from targeted small mesh gill nets in 2023 increased by $32 \%$ in MU1, $24 \%$ in MU2, $4 \%$ in MU3 and 7\% in MU4, relative to 2022. Ontario trap nets, which primarily target white bass, harvested zero yellow perch in 2023. Ontario commercial Rainbow Smelt trawlers incidentally caught Yellow Perch in management units 3 and 4, and this harvest is included in Tables 1.4 and 1.5. In 2023, 11 pounds of Yellow Perch were harvested in trawl nets in MU3 and 453 pounds were harvested in MU4.

Targeted (i.e., small mesh) gill net effort in 2023 decreased from 2022 effort in MU1 ($16 \%$ ) and increased in units MU2, MU3 and MU4 by 8\%, 19\%, and 25\% respectively. Targeted gill net harvest rates in 2023 increased by 58\% and 15\% relative to 2022 rates in MU1 and MU2 respectively, while decreasing in MU3 by 12\%, and MU4 by 15\% (Figure 1.4).

Compared to 2022, sport harvest in 2023 in U.S. waters increased by 76\% in MU1 ( $944,587 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), while decreasing $43 \%$ in MU2 ( $11,415 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), $26 \%$ in MU3 ( $5,009 \mathrm{lbs}$ ) and $20 \%$ in MU4 (55,890 lbs.) (Figure 1.2). Angling effort in U.S. waters during 2023 was highest in MU1 and lowest in MU2. Angler effort in 2023 increased 39\% compared to 2022 in MU1, and decreased 85\%, 22\%, and 34\% in MU2, MU3 and MU4 respectively (Figure 1.3). In 2023, angling effort in U.S. waters of MU3 at 4,780 hours was at its lowest in the time series, while effort of 4,011 hours in MU2 was the second lowest in time series (Figure 1.3).

Sport fishing harvest rates are commonly expressed as fish harvested per angler hour for those seeking Yellow Perch. These harvest rates are presented in Tables 1.2 to 1.5. Compared to 2022 rates, harvest per angler hour increased in Michigan (+101\%) and Ohio (+43\%) waters of MU1. In the central basin, the sport angler harvest rate increased in the Ohio waters of MU2 ( $+35 \%$ ) although the rate of 0.7 fish/hour is still one of the lowest in the time series. In MU3, the sport harvest rate increased (+209\%) from the second lowest catch rate in the time series in the Ohio waters, while decreasing in Pennsylvania (-89\%) waters of MU3 to the lowest value observed in the time series. Sport harvest rates in both MU2 and MU3 should be interpreted with caution as values are based on small sample sizes and continue to reflect low sport effort in the central basin. In MU4, harvest rates increased in New York waters (+34\%) and Pennsylvania waters, where the catch rate increased from near 0 fish/hour to 1.3 fish per/hour.

Trap net harvest increased by $120 \%$ in MU1, and $1 \%$ in MU3, while decreasing by $34 \%$ in MU2 and 7\% in MU4 compared to 2022 (Tables 1.2 to 1.5). Trap net effort (lifts) in 2023 decreased in MU2, MU3, and MU4 by 82\%, 19\%, and 11\% respectively, relative to 2022 trap net effort, while increasing $35 \%$ in MU1. Total trap net effort during 2023 was highest in MU1 at

6,696 lifts. Trap net effort in MU2 during 2023 (289 lifts) was $4^{\text {th }}$ lowest in the 1981-2023 time series reflecting the reduced 2023 TAC in MU2. Trap net harvest rates increased from 2022 rates by $62 \%, 261 \%, 26 \%$, and $4 \%$ in MU1, MU2, MU3 and MU4, respectively. The trap net harvest rate in MU2 increased to $102 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{lift}$ in 2023 compared to $28 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{lift}$ in 2022 which was the lowest value observed since 1999.

## Age Composition and Growth

Lakewide, age-2 fish (2021 YC) contributed the most to the Yellow Perch harvest (43\%), followed by age-3 fish (2020 YC; 29\%), with age-4, age-5, and age-6-and-older fish contributing $22 \%, 4 \%$, and $2 \%$, respectively; Table 1.6). In MU1, age-2 fish (2021 year class, 61\%) contributed most to the fishery, followed by age-3 (2020 year class, 26\%) and age-4 fish (2019 year class, 8\%). In MU2, age-4 fish (2019 year class, 38\%), age-2 fish (2021 year class, 29\%) and age-3 fish (2020 year class 26\%) contributed most to the fishery. In MU3, age-4 fish (2019 year class, 47\%) contributed most to the fishery, followed by age-3 fish (2020 year class, 29\%), and age-2 fish (2021 year class, 16\%). In MU4, age-3 (2020 year class, 52\%) contributed most to the fishery, followed by age-4 fish (2019 year class, 28\%), and age-2 fish (2021 year class, 13\%).

The task group continues to update Yellow Perch growth data in: (1) weight-at-age values recorded annually in the harvest and (2) length- and weight-at-age values taken from interagency trawl and gill net surveys. These values are applied in the calculation of population biomass and the forecasting of harvest in the approaching year. Therefore, changes in weight-at-age factor into the changes in overall population biomass projections and determination of recommended allowable harvest (RAH).

## Statistical Catch-at-Age Analysis

Population size for each management unit was estimated by statistical catch-at-age analysis (SCAA) using the Auto Differentiation Model Builder (ADMB) computer program (Fournier et al. 2012). In 2024, the YPTG continued to use the ADMB model developed by the Quantitative Fisheries Center (QFC) at Michigan State University (referred to as the Peterson-Reilly or PR model) as part of the Lake Erie Percid Management Advisory Group (LEPMAG) review of Yellow Perch management on Lake Erie.

The PR model uses harvest and effort data from commercial gill net, commercial trap net, and recreational fisheries within each MU. Survey catch-at-age of age-2 and older fish from gill net and trawl surveys are also incorporated. In addition, age-0 and age-1 recruitment data are incorporated into the model as a recruitment index. The PR model estimates selectivity for all ages in the fisheries and surveys. There is a commercial gill net selectivity block beginning in 1998. Catchabilities for all fisheries and surveys vary annually as a correlated random walk. The model is fit to total catch and proportions-at-age (multinomial age composition) as separate data sets.

Running the PR model is a three-step process. In the first step, an ADMB model without recruitment data is run iteratively until the maximum effective sample size for the multinomial age composition stabilizes (i.e., does not change by more than 1-2 units). Second, age-2 abundance estimates from the first model are combined with age-0 and age-1 recruitment data (from trawl and gill net assessment surveys) in a multi-model inference (MMI) R-based model to determine parameters for estimating recruitment. Recruitment data from the last nine years are removed from the model to minimize possible retrospective effects. Further, years with missing data in one or more data sets are removed from all data sets. Surveys missing data for the projection year (e.g., 2020 year class in the 2022 TAC year) are also removed from the analysis. A list of all possible non-redundant models is generated from the survey data and fit using the R-based glmulti package (Calcagno 2013). All models falling within 2 AIC units of the best model are used to generate the model-averaged coefficients. Surveys are not weighted equally in the final modelaveraged coefficients; each model may contain a different set of surveys and the models with lower AIC values are weighted more heavily and have greater influence on the recruitment predictions. Parameter estimates for the model-averaged coefficients for each MU are detailed in Appendix Table 2. A recruitment index is generated to estimate age-2 fish for each year class available in the recruitment data, using the age-0 and age- 1 survey data. This process is repeated using just age-0 data, which is only used to estimate recruitment in two years' time. Data from trawl and gill net index recruitment series for the time period examined are presented in Appendix Table 3, and a key that summarizes abbreviations used for the trawl and gill net series is presented in Appendix Table 4.

In the third step, the recruitment index is added to the ADMB model, and this data set is used to inform age-2 abundance estimates within the objective function. This model is then run iteratively until the maximum effective sample size for the multinomial age composition stabilizes. Estimates of population size, from 2004 to 2023, and projections for 2024, are presented in Table 1.7. Abundance, biomass, survival, and exploitation rates are presented by management unit
graphically for 1975 to 2023 in Figures 1.9 to 1.12. Mean weights-at-age from assessment surveys were applied to abundance estimates to generate population biomass estimates (Figure 1.10). Projections of abundance and biomass in 2024 are included in Figures 1.9 and 1.10. Population abundance and biomass estimates are critical to monitoring the status of stocks and determining recommended allowable harvest.

Abundance estimates should be interpreted with several caveats. Inclusion of abundance estimates from 1975 to 2023 implies that the time series are continuous. Lack of data continuity for the entire time series weakens the validity of this assumption. Survey data from multiple agencies are represented only in the latter part of the time series (since the late 1980s); methods of fishery data collection have also varied. Some model parameters, such as natural mortality, are constrained to constants. This technique lessens our ability to directly compare abundance levels across three decades. In addition, with SCAA the most recent year's population estimates inherently have the widest error bounds, which is to be expected for cohorts that remain at-large under less than full selectivity in the population.

In the SCAA model, population estimates are derived by minimizing an objective function weighted by data sources, including fishery effort, fishery catch, and survey catch rates. In 20112012, the YPTG group determined data weightings (referred to as lambdas in ADMB) using an expert opinion approach for evaluating potential sources of bias in data sets that could negatively influence model performance (YPTG 2012). These data weightings were used during 2024 and are presented in Appendix Table 1. The additional recruitment index (generated from the glmulti process) was given a lambda weighting of 1 during the LEPMAG process.

## 2024 Population Size Projection

The SCAA model was used to project age-2-and-older Yellow Perch stock size in 2024 (Table 1.7). Standard errors and ranges for 2024 projections are provided for each age, and descriptions of minimum, mean, and maximum population estimates refer to the age-specific mean estimates minus or plus one standard deviation (Table 2.2).

Stock size estimates for 2023 (Table 1.7) were higher than those projected last year in MU1, MU2 and MU3, and slightly lower in MU4 (YPTG 2023). Increases in MU1, MU2 and MU3 were due to higher estimates of age-2 fish compared to those projected last year. Whereas the estimates of ages 3 and older fish were lower than those projected last year in MU1, MU2 and MU3. The lakewide projection of age-2 and older fish using 2022 data was 155.251 million age-2 and older Yellow Perch in 2023 (YPTG 2023), while estimates using 2023 data in the 2024 model
run estimated 2023 abundance of age-2 and older Yellow Perch at 208.004 million fish. Lakewide abundance of age-2-and-older Yellow Perch in 2024 is projected to be 168.673 million fish, a decrease of $19 \%$ from 2023 estimates.

Abundance projections for 2024 are $59.552,44.314,56.598$, and 8.210 million age- 2 -andolder Yellow Perch in management units 1 through 4, respectively. Abundance of age-2-and-older Yellow Perch in 2024 are projected to decrease 19\%, 16\%, 23\%, and 3\% in MU1, MU2, MU3, and MU4 respectively, relative to the 2023 abundance estimates (Table 1.7, Figure 1.9).

Projected age-2 Yellow Perch recruitment in 2024 (the 2022 year class) was 21.421, $9.836,11.978$, and 3.860 million fish in management units 1 through 4, respectively (Table 1.7.). Age-3-and-older Yellow Perch abundance in 2024 is projected to be $38.130,34.478,44.620$, and 4.350 million fish in MUs 1 through 4, respectively. Abundance estimates for age-3-and-older Yellow Perch in 2024 are projected to increase from the 2023 estimates in MU1, MU2 and MU3 by $224 \%, 113 \%$, and $87 \%$, respectively. These increases are largely due to high estimates of age-2 fish in 2023, which are projected forward to age-3 fish in 2024. Abundance for age-3-andolder Yellow Perch for 2024 in MU4 are projected to decrease 13\% from the 2023 estimates.

As a function of population abundance and mean weight-at-age from fishery-independent surveys, total biomass of age-2-and-older Yellow Perch for 2024 are projected to decrease in management units $1-4$ by $18 \%, 12 \%, 7 \%$ and $3 \%$, respectively, compared to 2023 estimates (Figure 1.10).

Estimates of Yellow Perch survival for age-3-and-older in 2023 were $30 \%, 62 \%, 51 \%$, and 44\% in MUs 1 through 4, respectively (Figure 1.11). Estimates of Yellow Perch survival in 2023 for age-2-and-older fish were: $52 \%$ in MU1, $65 \%$ in MU2, $61 \%$ in MU3, and $51 \%$ in MU4. Estimated exploitation rates of ages-3-and-older Yellow Perch in 2023 were $47 \%, 6 \%, 20 \%$, and $29 \%$ in management units 1 through 4, respectively. Estimates of Yellow Perch exploitation for ages-2-and-older fish in 2023 were: 19\% in MU1, $2 \%$ in MU2, $7 \%$ in MU3, and 19\% in MU4 (Figure 1.12). Exploitation rate for ages-2-and-older fish in MU2 during 2021, 2022 and 2023 were the lowest in the 49 year time series.

## Charge 2: Harvest Strategy and Recommended Allowable Harvest (RAH)

In 2024 the YPTG applied the harvest control rules finalized by the LEC and LEPMAG in 2020. The harvest control rules are comprised of:

- Target fishing mortality as a percent of the fishing mortality at maximum sustainable yield ( $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{msy}}$ )
- Limit reference point of the biomass at maximum sustainable yield ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{msy}}$ )
- Probabilistic risk tolerance, P-star, $\mathrm{P}^{*}=0.20$
- A limit on the annual change in TAC of $\pm 20 \%$ (when $P\left(S S B<B_{\text {msy }}\right)<P^{*}$ ); see Yellow Perch Management Plan, Lake Erie Committee, 2020.

Target fishing rates and limit reference points are estimated annually using SCAA model results. Estimating reference points and recommended allowable harvest is a three-step process. First, estimated recruitment and spawning stock biomass from the SCAA model, along with maturity, weight, and average selectivity at age, are entered into an ADMB model that: 1) estimates the parameters of a Ricker stock-recruitment model and 2) calculates the theoretical spawning stock biomass without fishing ( $\mathrm{SSB}_{0}$ ). The stock-recruitment relationships for management units 1,2 , and 3 , are fit using a hierarchical framework, while management unit 4 is fit independently. In the second step, maturity, weight, and average selectivity at age, along with the parameters of the stock-recruitment relationship are entered in an R-based model. This model estimates $F_{m s y}$ and $B_{m s y}$ for the harvest control rule. Finally, $F_{m s y}, F_{\text {target }}$ (as a percent of $F_{m s y}$ ), and $B_{\text {msy }}$ (as a percent of $S S B_{0}$ ), are entered into the SCAA model to estimate RAH in each management unit. If the model estimates that fishing at $F_{\text {target }}$ meets or exceeds a 0.20 probability $\left(\mathrm{P}^{*}\right)$ that the projected spawning stock biomass will be less than the limit reference point ( $B_{\text {msy }}$ ), then the fishing rate is reduced until the probability is less than 0.20 . Values of $S S B_{0}$, $B_{\text {msy }}, F_{\text {msy }}$, and $F_{\text {target }}$ for each management unit can be found in Table 2.1. Target fishing rates are applied to population estimates and their standard errors to determine minimum, mean, and maximum RAH values for each management unit (Tables 2.2 and 2.3). In addition, RAH values may be subject to a $\pm 20 \%$ limit on the annual change in TAC when $P(S S B<B m s y)<0.20$ (ie: when $\mathrm{P}^{*}$ harvest control rule is not invoked).

With the addition of 2023 data, the limit reference point estimate, $B_{\text {msy }}$ increased from 1.813 M to 2.193 M kg in MU1 while the target fishing rate, $\mathrm{F}_{\text {target }}$ decreased from 0.540 to 0.431 . In MU2, $B_{\text {msy }}$ increased marginally from 3.871 to 3.988 M kg and $F_{\text {target }}$ increased from 0.588 to 0.620. In MU3, $B_{\text {msy }}$ decreased slightly from 3.714 to 3.705 M kg and $F_{\text {target }}$ decreased from 0.640 to 0.576 . In MU4, $B_{\text {msy }}$ decreased from 0.483 to 0.462 M kg and $\mathrm{F}_{\text {target }}$ decreased from 0.558 to 0.544 (Table 2.1).

The Yellow Perch Management Plan (YPMP) includes a provision on how to estimate RAH in a TAC year where $P^{*}$ is not invoked, but $P^{*}$ has persisted for multiple years prior. In
this case the LEC will determine what the TAC would have been using the target $F$ and the $20 \%$ TAC constraint for each of the years during that period, thus establishing what can be considered an "assumed TAC". The previous years assumed TAC can then be used as a benchmark for the implementation of the 20\% TAC constraint and a new TAC moving forward (LEC, 2020). In 2024, the P value in MU2 is 0.11, marking the first year that MU2 has not invoked the $P^{*}$ rule since the YPMP took effect in 2019. Following guidance from the YPMP the maximum 2024 RAH in MU2 is 2.748 million pounds. However, there is evidence of retrospective patterns in SCAA abundance estimates (see Charge 3). Also, there are conflicting poor status indicators in MU2 and no indication of a large year class recruiting to the fishery. Therefore, a precautionary approach is warranted in MU2, and the YPTG recommends holding the 2024 MU2 TAC at the 2023 level ( 0.477 million pounds) or increasing by $20 \%$ ( 0.572 million pounds). The YPMP permits the LEC to deviate from the harvest control rules in cases where there is compelling evidence to indicate the sustainability of the yellow perch population is at risk, or if there is strong social or economic rationale to do so. If the LEC chooses to deviate from the harvest control rules, clear and transparent justification will be provided to stakeholders (LEC, 2020).

Quota allocation by management unit and jurisdiction for 2024 was determined by the same methods applied in 2009-2023, using GIS applications of jurisdictional surface area of waters within each MU (Figure 2.1). The allocation of shares by management unit and jurisdiction are:

| Allocation of TAC within Management Unit and Jurisdiction, 2024: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MU1: | ONT | $40.6 \%$ | OH | $50.3 \%$ | MI | $9.1 \%$ |
| MU2: | ONT | $45.6 \%$ | OH | $54.4 \%$ |  |  |
| MU3: | ONT | $52.3 \%$ | OH | $32.4 \%$ | PA | $15.3 \%$ |
| MU4: | ONT | $58.0 \%$ | NY | $31.0 \%$ | PA | $11.0 \%$ |

## Charge 3: Utilize existing population models to produce the most scientifically defensible and reliable method for estimating and forecasting abundance, recruitment, and mortality.

The YPTG has been using the current configuration of the SCAA ADMB model for 6 years. It has been found that abundance estimates in the last year of the model often decrease between the first estimate in the model and subsequent years estimates in the model. On average age- 2
estimates for the various MUs decrease between $11 \%$ and $40 \%$ from the first time they are estimated by the model to the second time they are estimated by the model. Further, age- 2 estimates decrease an average of $29 \%$ to $63 \%$ between the first time they are estimated by the model to the third time they are estimated by the model, with the lowest change occurring in MU4 and the highest in MU1. In this year's model run the age-2 abundance values in 2023 are the first model estimates of this year class. The 2023 age-2 estimates are projected forward to age-3 abundance in 2024 using survival estimates. This leads to a potential overestimate of age-3 fish in 2024, which is used in RAH calculations.

Reasons for this retrospective pattern are unknown. The model estimates catchability using a random walk. Changes in catchability estimates between model runs can contribute to changes in abundance estimates, with increases in catchability leading to reduced abundance estimates. Patterns of declining catchability in surveys may be contributing to variable abundance estimates. In addition, constant selectivity in the model may contribute to different abundance estimates, as changes in selectivity will not be recognized by the model when they occur. There has been an increase in size at age of yellow perch in recent years, particularly in MU1 and MU2, which may be leading to changes in selectivity not observed in the model. Additional work is required to evaluate retrospective patterns in model results and their causes.

## Charge 4. Supply needed technical support throughout the upcoming YPMP review process

The Yellow Perch Management Plan (YPMP) runs from 2020 to 2024. A review of the YPMP will evaluate the existing Yellow Perch assessment model and the harvest control rule. To begin the review, YPTG met with the Lake Erie Committee and Michigan State University's Quantitative Fisheries Center (QFC) to discuss several aspects of the YPMP to incorporate into the review. Some of the items discussed included: the use of the recruitment survey data in the assessment model, model convergence issues and retrospective patterns, methods used to estimate catchability and selectivity, the data used in the stock recruit relationship to estimate the reference points, and the harvest control rules. At this meeting the QFC recommended implementing the statistical catch-at-age models using Template Model Builder (TMB) to alleviate some concerns relating to the ADMB model. Converting the statistical catch-at-age models to TMB will be incorporated into the YPMP review which may take up to two years.
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Table 1.1. Lake Erie Yellow Perch harvest in pounds by management unit (Unit) and agency, 2014-2023

|  | Year | Ontario* |  | Ohio |  | Michigan |  | Pennsylvania |  | New York |  | Total Harvest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Harvest | \% | Harvest | \% | Harvest | \% | Harvest | \% | Harvest | \% |  |
| Unit 1 | 2014 | 620,667 | 56 | 391,361 | 36 | 87,511 | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,099,539 |
|  | 2015 | 541,938 | 48 | 485,744 | 43 | 94,225 | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,121,907 |
|  | 2016 | 947,052 | 42 | 886,068 | 40 | 397,044 | 18 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,230,164 |
|  | 2017 | 1,277,587 | 46 | 1,239,575 | 45 | 255,605 | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,772,767 |
|  | 2018 | 1,262,229 | 54 | 956,016 | 41 | 107,789 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,326,034 |
|  | 2019 | 847,476 | 69 | 357,533 | 29 | 15,745 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,220,754 |
|  | 2020 | 857,561 | 64 | 391,231 | 29 | 84,613 | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,333,405 |
|  | 2021 | 959,259 | 58 | 625,787 | 38 | 69,575 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,654,621 |
|  | 2022 | 770,476 | 51 | 658,935 | 44 | 67,667 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,497,078 |
|  | 2023 | 1,016,545 | 43 | 1,254,927 | 53 | 104,388 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,375,860 |
| Unit 2 | 2014 | 1,679,175 | 52 | 1,543,226 | 48 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3,222,401 |
|  | 2015 | 1,489,433 | 57 | 1,131,993 | 43 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,621,426 |
|  | 2016 | 1,283,379 | 62 | 792,869 | 38 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,076,248 |
|  | 2017 | 1,498,437 | 70 | 643,554 | 30 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,141,991 |
|  | 2018 | 1,271,365 | 69 | 559,122 | 31 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,830,487 |
|  | 2019 | 740,490 | 63 | 433,477 | 37 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,173,967 |
|  | 2020 | 407,553 | 60 | 268,213 | 40 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 675,766 |
|  | 2021 | 205,377 | 63 | 121,200 | 37 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 326,577 |
|  | 2022 | 177,919 | 60 | 117,860 | 40 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 295,779 |
|  | 2023 | 210,716 | 73 | 76,269 | 27 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 286,985 |
| Unit 3 | 2014 | 2,668,921 | 70 | 979,937 | 26 | -- | -- | 168,690 | 4 | -- | -- | 3,817,548 |
|  | 2015 | 2,131,211 | 77 | 572,736 | 21 | -- | -- | 77,558 | 3 | -- | -- | 2,781,505 |
|  | 2016 | 2,020,470 | 76 | 522,549 | 20 | -- | -- | 107,972 | 4 | -- | -- | 2,650,991 |
|  | 2017 | 2,027,235 | 77 | 504,223 | 19 | -- | -- | 107,335 | 4 | -- | -- | 2,638,793 |
|  | 2018 | 1,807,645 | 78 | 460,797 | 20 | -- | -- | 54,085 | 2 | -- | -- | 2,322,527 |
|  | 2019 | 1,328,966 | 79 | 320,756 | 19 | -- | -- | 38,953 | 2 | -- | -- | 1,688,675 |
|  | 2020 | 478,837 | 71 | 175,550 | 26 | -- | -- | 18,022 | 3 | -- | -- | 672,408 |
|  | 2021 | 704,636 | 75 | 220,127 | 23 | -- | -- | 18,938 | 2 | -- | -- | 943,701 |
|  | 2022 | 932,682 | 77 | 211,444 | 18 | -- | -- | 63,872 | 5 | -- | -- | 1,207,998 |
|  | 2023 | 959,420 | 78 | 222,369 | 18 | -- | -- | 54,538 | 4 | -- | -- | 1,236,327 |
| Unit 4 | 2014 | 485,899 | 74 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 16,671 | 3 | 149,669 | 23 | 652,239 |
|  | 2015 | 297,716 | 77 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10,055 | 3 | 76,597 | 20 | 384,368 |
|  | 2016 | 231,063 | 87 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6,791 | 3 | 28,078 | 11 | 265,932 |
|  | 2017 | 179,730 | 76 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 16,078 | 7 | 39,598 | 17 | 235,407 |
|  | 2018 | 272,733 | 90 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,452 | 0 | 29,159 | 10 | 303,344 |
|  | 2019 | 326,179 | 85 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,485 | 0 | 56,219 | 15 | 383,883 |
|  | 2020 | 384,737 | 91 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2,664 | 1 | 36,083 | 9 | 423,484 |
|  | 2021 | 311,866 | 84 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,677 | 0 | 57,567 | 16 | 371,110 |
|  | 2022 | 314,039 | 79 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 533 | 0 | 84,399 | 21 | 398,971 |
|  | 2023 | 336,237 | 83 |  |  |  |  | 1,035 | 0 | 68,691 | 17 | 405,963 |
| Lakewide | 2014 | 5,454,662 | 62 | 2,914,524 | 33 | 87,511 | 1 | 185,361 | 2 | 149,669 | 2 | 8,791,727 |
| Totals | 2015 | 4,460,298 | 65 | 2,190,473 | 32 | 94,225 | 1 | 87,613 | 1 | 76,597 | 1 | 6,909,206 |
|  | 2016 | 4,481,964 | 62 | 2,201,486 | 30 | 397,044 | 5 | 114,763 | 2 | 28,078 | 0 | 7,223,335 |
|  | 2017 | 4,982,989 | 64 | 2,387,352 | 31 | 255,605 | 3 | 123,413 | 2 | 39,598 | 1 | 7,788,958 |
|  | 2018 | 4,613,972 | 68 | 1,975,935 | 29 | 107,789 | 2 | 55,537 | 1 | 29,159 | 0 | 6,782,393 |
|  | 2019 | 3,243,111 | 73 | 1,111,766 | 25 | 15,745 | 0 | 40,437 | 1 | 56,219 | 1 | 4,467,278 |
|  | 2020 | 2,128,688 | 69 | 834,994 | 27 | 84,613 | 3 | 20,685 | 1 | 36,083 | 1 | 3,105,063 |
|  | 2021 | 2,181,138 | 66 | 967,114 | 29 | 69,575 | 2 | 20,615 | 1 | 57,567 | 2 | 3,296,009 |
|  | 2022 | 2,195,116 | 65 | 988,239 | 29 | 67,667 | 2 | 64,405 | 2 | 84,399 | 2 | 3,399,826 |
|  | 2023 | 2,522,918 | 59 | 1,553,565 | 36 | 104,388 | 2 | 55,573 | 1 | 68,691 | 2 | 4,305,135 |

*processor weight (quota debit weight) to 2001; fisher/observer weight from 2002 to 2023 (negating ice allowance).

Table 1.2. Harvest, effort and harvest per unit effort summaries for Lake Erie Yellow Perch fisheries in Management Unit 1 (Western Basin) by agency and gear type, 2014-2023.

|  | Year | Unit 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Michigan | Ohio |  | Ontario Gill Nets |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Ontario } \\ \hline \text { Trap Nets } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Sport | Trap Nets | Sport | Small Mesh | Large Mesh* |  |
| Harvest (pounds) | 2014 | 87,511 | 0 | 391,361 | 596,956 | 23,633 | 78 |
|  | 2015 | 94,225 | 0 | 485,744 | 533,167 | 8,712 | 59 |
|  | 2016 | 397,044 | 103,345 | 782,723 | 938,558 | 8,445 | 49 |
|  | 2017 | 255,605 | 447,263 | 792,312 | 1,271,282 | 5,466 | 839 |
|  | 2018 | 107,789 | 439,720 | 516,296 | 1,248,042 | 14,031 | 156 |
|  | 2019 | 15,745 | 193,243 | 164,290 | 818,773 | 28,670 | 33 |
|  | 2020 | 84,613 | 136,555 | 254,676 | 853,096 | 4,463 | 2 |
|  | 2021 | 69,575 | 182,521 | 443,266 | 939,063 | 20,179 | 17 |
|  | 2022 | 67,667 | 188,739 | 470,196 | 756,770 | 13,706 | 0 |
|  | 2023 | 104,388 | 414,728 | 840,199 | 1,001,296 | 15,249 | 0 |
| Harvest (Metric) (tonnes) | 2014 | 40 | 0 | 177 | 271 | 11 | 0.04 |
|  | 2015 | 43 | 0 | 220 | 242 | 4 | 0.03 |
|  | 2016 | 180 | 47 | 355 | 426 | 4 | 0.02 |
|  | 2017 | 116 | 203 | 359 | 577 | 2 | 0.38 |
|  | 2018 | 49 | 199 | 234 | 566 | 6 | 0.07 |
|  | 2019 | 7 | 88 | 75 | 371 | 13 | 0.01 |
|  | 2020 | 38 | 62 | 115 | 387 | 2 | 0.00 |
|  | 2021 | 32 | 83 | 201 | 426 | 9 | 0.01 |
|  | 2022 | 31 | 86 | 213 | 343 | 6 | 0.00 |
|  | 2023 | 47 | 188 | 381 | 454 | 7 | 0.00 |
| Effort <br> (a) |  | 76,996 | 0 | 630,989 | 3,398 | 362 | -- |
|  | 2015 | 137,246 | 0 | 659,460 | 4,074 | 508 | -- |
|  | 2016 | 251,426 | 2,446 | 824,418 | 6,091 | 431 | -- |
|  | 2017 | 204,877 | 3,830 | 775,334 | 5,656 | 600 | -- |
|  | 2018 | 137,930 | 3,500 | 500,695 | 5,143 | 667 | -- |
|  | 2019 | 57,929 | 3,811 | 284,068 | 6,363 | 714 | -- |
|  | 2020 | 151,528 | 3,341 | 500,595 | 9,183 | 393 | -- |
|  | 2021 | 113,935 | 3,741 | 628,491 | 10,489 | 1,124 | -- |
|  | 2022 | 115,916 | 4,943 | 621,067 | 8,588 | 1,354 | -- |
|  | 2023 | 97,889 | 6,696 | 923,523 | 7,212 | 1,020 | -- |
| Harvest Rates (b) | 2014 | 2.2 | -- | 3.0 | 79.7 | 29.6 | -- |
|  | 2015 | 2.7 | -- | 3.1 | 59.4 | 7.8 | -- |
|  | 2016 | 4.8 | 19.2 | 4.1 | 69.9 | 8.9 | -- |
|  | 2017 | 4.3 | 53.0 | 3.4 | 101.9 | 4.1 | -- |
|  | 2018 | 2.3 | 57.0 | 2.9 | 110.1 | 9.5 | -- |
|  | 2019 | 0.8 | 23.0 | 1.7 | 58.4 | 18.2 | -- |
|  | 2020 | 1.8 | 18.5 | 1.6 | 42.1 | 5.2 | -- |
|  | 2021 | 1.7 | 22.1 | 2.0 | 40.6 | 8.1 | -- |
|  | 2022 | 1.5 | 17.3 | 2.1 | 40.0 | 4.6 | -- |
|  | 2023 | 3.0 | 28.1 | 2.9 | 63.0 | 6.8 | -- |

(a) sport effort in angler-hours; gill net effort in km; trap net effort in lifts
(b) harvest rates for sport in fish/hr, gill net in kg/km, trap net in kg/lift
(c) the Ontario sport fishery harvested approximately 19,579 Ibs of yellow perch in the 2014 creel survey
(*) large mesh catch rates are not targeted and are therefore of limited value.

Table 1.3. Harvest, effort and harvest per unit effort summaries for Lake Erie Yellow Perch fisheries in Management Unit 2 (western Central Basin) by agency and gear type, 2014-2023.

|  | Year | Unit 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ohio |  | Ontario Gill Nets |  | Ontario Trawls |
|  |  | Trap Nets | Sport | Small Mesh | Large Mesh* |  |
| Harvest (pounds) | 2014 | 1,280,184 | 263,042 | 1,550,722 | 128,453 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 1,005,061 | 126,932 | 1,471,107 | 18,268 | 58 |
|  | 2016 | 688,033 | 104,836 | 1,248,729 | 34,631 | 19 |
|  | 2017 | 590,447 | 53,107 | 1,435,508 | 62,872 | 57 |
|  | 2018 | 528,234 | 30,888 | 1,204,621 | 66,744 | 0 |
|  | 2019 | 419,631 | 13,846 | 569,850 | 170,640 | 0 |
|  | 2020 | 248,721 | 19,492 | 376,946 | 30,604 | 3 |
|  | 2021 | 116,109 | 5,091 | 151,859 | 53,518 | 0 |
|  | 2022 | 97,659 | 20,201 | 152,490 | 25,429 | 0 |
|  | 2023 | 64,854 | 11,415 | 189,619 | 21,097 | 0 |
| Harvest <br> (Metric) <br> (tonnes) | 2014 | 581 | 119 | 703 | 58 | 0.0 |
|  | 2015 | 456 | 58 | 667 | 8 | 0.0 |
|  | 2016 | 312 | 48 | 566 | 16 | 0.0 |
|  | 2017 | 268 | 24 | 651 | 29 | 0.0 |
|  | 2018 | 240 | 14 | 546 | 30 | 0.0 |
|  | 2019 | 190 | 6 | 258 | 77 | 0.0 |
|  | 2020 | 113 | 9 | 171 | 14 | 0.0 |
|  | 2021 | 53 | 2 | 69 | 24 | 0.0 |
|  | 2022 | 44 | 9 | 69 | 12 | 0.0 |
|  | 2023 | 29 | 5 | 86 | 10 | 0.0 |
| Effort <br> (a) | 2014 | 5,713 | 280,018 | 6,653 | 1,816 | -- |
|  | 2015 | 6,309 | 217,637 | 9,459 | 1,207 | -- |
|  | 2016 | 4,510 | 204,745 | 6,424 | 1,934 | -- |
|  | 2017 | 2,567 | 119,163 | 6,094 | 1,946 | -- |
|  | 2018 | 1,551 | 45,683 | 5,964 | 2,155 | -- |
|  | 2019 | 2,192 | 24,826 | 4,431 | 4,050 | -- |
|  | 2020 | 2,177 | 27,006 | 4,294 | 1,920 | -- |
|  | 2021 | 839 | 1,898 | 1,951 | 2,999 | -- |
|  | 2022 | 1,571 | 26,634 | 1,479 | 1,881 | -- |
|  | 2023 | 289 | 4,011 | 1,593 | 1,756 | -- |
| Harvest Rates(b) | 2014 | 101.6 | 2.7 | 105.7 | 32.1 | -- |
|  | 2015 | 72.2 | 1.5 | 70.5 | 6.9 | -- |
|  | 2016 | 69.2 | 1.2 | 88.2 | 8.1 | -- |
|  | 2017 | 104.3 | 0.8 | 106.8 | 14.7 | -- |
|  | 2018 | 154.5 | 0.8 | 91.6 | 14.0 | -- |
|  | 2019 | 86.8 | 0.4 | 58.3 | 19.1 | -- |
|  | 2020 | 51.8 | 1.1 | 39.8 | 7.2 | -- |
|  | 2021 | 62.8 | 0.1 | 35.3 | 8.1 | -- |
|  | 2022 | 28.2 | 0.5 | 46.8 | 6.1 | -- |
|  | 2023 | 101.8 | 0.7 | 54.0 | 5.4 | -- |

(a) sport effort in angler-hours; gill net effort in km; trap net effort in lifts
(b) harvest rates for sport in fish/hr, gill net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{km}$, trap net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{lift}$
(c) the Ontario sport fishery harvested approximately 6,825 Ibs of yellow perch in the 2014 creel survey
(*) large mesh catch rates are not targeted and therefore of limited value

Table 1.4. Harvest, effort and harvest per unit effort summaries for Lake Erie Yellow Perch fisheries in
Management Unit 3 (eastern Central Basin) by agency and gear type, 2014-2023.


[^0]Table 1.5. Harvest, effort and harvest per unit effort summaries for Lake Erie Yellow Perch fisheries in Management Unit 4 (Eastern Basin) by agency and gear type, 2014-2023.

(a) sport effort in angler-hours; gill net effort in km; trap net effort in lifts
(b) harvest rates for sport in fish/hr, gill net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{km}$, trap net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{lift}$
(c) the Ontario sport fishery harvested approximately 21,361 lbs of yellow perch in the 2014 creel survey
(*) large mesh catch rates are not targeted and therefore of limited value
Table 1.6. Estimated 2023 Lake Erie Yellow Perch harvest by age and numbers of fish by gear and management unit (Unit).

| Gear | Age | Unit 1 |  | Unit 2 |  | Unit 3 |  | Unit 4 |  | Lakewide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Gill Nets | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2 | 2,282,172 | 64.5 | 215,106 | 33.5 | 382,418 | 12.6 | 125,292 | 13.6 | 3,004,989 | 37.0 |
|  | 3 | 902,357 | 25.5 | 172,300 | 26.8 | 986,584 | 32.6 | 498,041 | 54.2 | 2,559,283 | 31.5 |
|  | 4 | 265,839 | 7.5 | 236,173 | 36.7 | 1,537,507 | 50.8 | 258,623 | 28.2 | 2,298,142 | 28.3 |
|  | 5 | 64,622 | 1.8 | 15,149 | 2.4 | 75,370 | 2.5 | 15,973 | 1.7 | 171,114 | 2.1 |
|  | 6+ | 25,969 | 0.7 | 3,980 | 0.6 | 47,437 | 1.6 | 20,616 | 2.2 | 98,001 | 1.2 |
|  | Total | 3,540,960 | 45.7 | 642,708 | 80.0 | 3,029,316 | 82.9 | 918,546 | 88.0 | 8,131,529 | 61.4 |
| Trap Nets | 1 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2 | 715,060 | 56.5 | 13,973 | 9.8 | 216,901 | 35.2 | 1,478 | 4.0 | 947,412 | 45.9 |
|  | 3 | 354,788 | 28.0 | 37,759 | 26.4 | 76,718 | 12.4 | 14,286 | 38.7 | 483,551 | 23.4 |
|  | 4 | 120,556 | 9.5 | 62,931 | 44.1 | 169,952 | 27.6 | 13,547 | 36.7 | 366,986 | 17.8 |
|  | 5 | 65,715 | 5.2 | 19,199 | 13.4 | 64,957 | 10.5 | 2,463 | 6.7 | 152,334 | 7.4 |
|  | 6+ | 9,807 | 0.8 | 8,961 | 6.3 | 88,041 | 14.3 | 5,172 | 14.0 | 111,981 | 5.4 |
|  | Total | 1,265,926 | 16.3 | 142,823 | 17.8 | 616,569 | 16.9 | 36,946 | 3.5 | 2,062,264 | 15.6 |
| Sport | 1 | 27,529 | 0.9 | 563 | 3.2 | 210 | 2.6 | 454 | 0.5 | 28,755 | 0.9 |
|  | 2 | 1,765,833 | 60.0 | 5,367 | 30.5 | 2,354 | 29.5 | 4,836 | 5.5 | 1,778,390 | 58.2 |
|  | 3 | 719,741 | 24.5 | 1,929 | 11.0 | 1,037 | 13.0 | 31,551 | 35.8 | 754,257 | 24.7 |
|  | 4 | 197,172 | 6.7 | 2,376 | 13.5 | 1,368 | 17.1 | 24,756 | 28.1 | 225,672 | 7.4 |
|  | 5 | 203,757 | 6.9 | 1,355 | 7.7 | 691 | 8.7 | 4,535 | 5.1 | 210,338 | 6.9 |
|  | 6+ | 29,169 | 1.0 | 6,023 | 34.2 | 2,327 | 29.1 | 21,954 | 24.9 | 59,473 | 1.9 |
|  | Total | 2,943,200 | 38.0 | 17,613 | 2.2 | 7,987 | 0.2 | 88,085 | 8.4 | 3,056,885 | 23.1 |
| All Gear | 1 | 27,529 | 0.4 | 563 | 0.1 | 210 | 0.0 | 454 | 0.0 | 28,755 | 0.2 |
|  | 2 | 4,763,065 | 61.5 | 234,446 | 29.2 | 601,673 | 16.5 | 131,606 | 12.6 | 5,730,791 | 43.2 |
|  | 3 | 1,976,886 | 25.5 | 211,988 | 26.4 | 1,064,339 | 29.1 | 543,878 | 52.1 | 3,797,091 | 28.7 |
|  | 4 | 583,568 | 7.5 | 301,480 | 37.5 | 1,708,827 | 46.8 | 296,926 | 28.5 | 2,890,800 | 21.8 |
|  | 5 | 334,094 | 4.3 | 35,703 | 4.4 | 141,018 | 3.9 | 22,971 | 2.2 | 533,786 | 4.0 |
|  | 6+ | 64,944 | 0.8 | 18,964 | 2.4 | 137,805 | 3.8 | 47,742 | 4.6 | 269,455 | 2.0 |
|  | Total | 7,750,086 | 58.5 | 803,144 | 6.1 | 3,653,872 | 27.6 | 1,043,577 | 7.9 | 13,250,678 | 100.0 |

Note: Values in italics delineate harvest percentage by gear in each Unit, while the values in the 'All Gear' boxes are for lakewide harvest percentage by Unit.
Table 1．7．Yellow Perch stock size（millions of fish）in each Lake Erie management unit．Estimated abundance in the years 2005 to 2023 and projected abundance in 2024 from the ADMB catch－age analysis．

| $\underset{N}{\underset{N}{N}}$ | 국 웅응 융응 <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nop } \\ & \text { Non } \\ & \text { in m } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { } \circ \stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sim} \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{N}} \\ & \dot{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\dot{\sim}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{N} \end{gathered}$ |  | 寺 |  <br>  | －r |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \stackrel{\text { N }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |
| $\underset{N}{N}$ | NNNN － 0 mo |  |  <br>  | Nơ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \underset{\gamma}{\sim} \\ \end{gathered}$ |  | 긍 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{\lambda} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\dot{o}} \underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Nّ |  | $\stackrel{N}{o}$ |
| ONN | 요 융 N No OO | ¢ |  | No |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{N}}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \circ \\ \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0}_{\infty}^{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $$ |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Qon } \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N in } \\ & \hat{6} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\mathrm{N}}{\mathbf{N}}$ |  | 웄숯 |  | © |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  | min |  |  <br>  | $\underset{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | へへ |  |  |  | ¢ \％ |  | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}} \underset{\sim}{\star}}$ |
| $\underset{N}{\underset{N}{*}}$ |  | ¢ $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ |  | N |  | 坴 |  | セio |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}$ |  | $\stackrel{-}{\infty}$ $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{\dagger}$ |  | へio |  | ¢ |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{N}$ |  | 으N |  | 宮寺 |  |  |  | ণi大ֵN |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No o } \\ & i n \\ & \text { óm } \end{aligned}$ |  | M |  |  |  <br> －mio | 侖令 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \exists \begin{array}{l} \text { a } \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \text { in } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 승융수ㅅㅜㅠㄱ ヘi |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 응 능 형눙 웅 लंबーテ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nö } \\ & \text { or } \\ & \text { it } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | Hin No No No N N N $\underset{\sim}{\top} へ 0 \mathrm{om}$ |  |  <br>  | －${ }_{\text {－}}^{\text {O }}$ |  |  |  mmóio | へิָ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\circ} \\ & \hline \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { or } \\ & \text { ָ } \\ & \text { gi } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\infty \times \infty$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{N} \stackrel{n}{\stackrel{N}{\circ}}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty 0_{0}^{N} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \dot{\sim} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sim} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |
| $\stackrel{0}{8}$ | Nのナー + |  | Nのナレ＋ |  | Nのナー |  | Nツナレ＋ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت- } \\ & \stackrel{\text { n }}{5} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | n <br> $\stackrel{4}{5}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{t}{5} \end{aligned}$ |  |

Table 2.1. Parameters of the stock-recruitment relationship, spawning stock biomass, limit reference point and target fishing rate for each management unit.

| Unit | Spawn/ Recruit RelationshipParameters |  |  | Spawning Stock Biomass(Unfished Population) |  | Spawning Stock Biomass (kgs) |  | Biomass at MSY (Limit Reference Point) |  |  | Fishing Rate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | log(alpha) | beta | sigma | SSB ${ }_{0}$ | $\mathbf{s d}\left(\operatorname{logSSB}{ }_{0}\right)$ | 2024 | $2025{ }^{(a)}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{\text {msy }}$ | \%SSB ${ }_{0}$ | P | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {msy }}$ | \% $\mathrm{F}_{\text {msy }}$ | $F_{\text {target }}$ | $F_{\text {actual }}$ |
| MU1 | 2.48 | $2.55 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 0.97 | 8,014,090 | 0.20 | 5,218,700 | 5,774,530 | 2,192,760 | 27\% | 0.00 | 1.54 | 28\% | 0.431 | 0.431 |
| MU2 | 2.17 | 1.40E-07 | 0.97 | 14,152,966 | 0.22 | 6,365,940 | 5,401,060 | 3,987,859 | 28\% | 0.11 | 1.77 | 35\% | 0.620 | 0.620 |
| MU3 | 2.21 | 1.42E-07 | 0.97 | 13,297,953 | 0.20 | 6,279,750 | 6,009,320 | 3,704,558 | 28\% | 0.03 | 1.80 | 32\% | 0.576 | 0.576 |
| MU4 | 1.98 | 1.20E-06 | 1.02 | 1,626,858 | 0.25 | 1,052,110 | 1,062,740 | 461,961 | 28\% | 0.00 | 1.60 | 34\% | 0.544 | 0.544 |

Table 2.2. Estimated harvest range of Lake Erie Yellow Perch for 2024 using the proposed fishing policy and selectivity-at-age from combined fishing gears.

|  | Age | 2024Stock Size (millions of fish) |  |  | 2024 <br> Mean Biomass <br> mil. Ibs | Exploitation Rate |  |  |  | 2024Catch (millions of fish) |  |  | 3-yr Mean Weight in Harvest (kg) | 2024 Harvest Range <br> Catch (millions of Ibs) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Min. | Mean | Max. |  | F | s(age) | F(age) | (u) | Min. | Mean | Max. |  | Min. | Mean | Max. |
| Unit 1 | 2 | 14.006 | 21.421 | 28.837 | 4.893 | 0.431 | 0.174 | 0.075 | 0.060 | 0.836 | 1.279 | 1.721 | 0.125 | 0.230 | 0.352 | 0.474 |
|  | 3 | 26.736 | 34.604 | 42.472 | 11.047 | 0.431 | 0.571 | 0.246 | 0.181 | 4.848 | 6.275 | 7.702 | 0.153 | 1.635 | 2.117 | 2.598 |
|  | 4 | 2.290 | 3.056 | 3.823 | 1.252 | 0.431 | 0.899 | 0.388 | 0.268 | 0.614 | 0.820 | 1.025 | 0.183 | 0.248 | 0.331 | 0.414 |
|  | 5 | 0.241 | 0.365 | 0.489 | 0.170 | 0.431 | 1.000 | 0.431 | 0.293 | 0.070 | 0.107 | 0.143 | 0.227 | 0.035 | 0.053 | 0.072 |
|  | 6+ | 0.057 | 0.105 | 0.153 | 0.059 | 0.431 | 0.384 | 0.166 | 0.126 | 0.007 | 0.013 | 0.019 | 0.271 | 0.004 | 0.008 | 0.012 |
|  | Total | 43.330 | 59.552 | 75.774 | 17.420 |  |  |  | 0.143 | 6.376 | 8.494 | 10.611 | 0.153 | 2.149 | 2.861 | 3.569 |
|  | (3+) | 29.324 | 38.130 | 46.937 | 12.528 |  |  |  | 0.189 | 5.540 | 7.215 | 8.890 | 0.158 | 1.923 | 2.509 | 3.095 |
| Unit 2 | 2 | 7.110 | 9.836 | 12.562 | 2.472 | 0.620 | 0.083 | 0.051 | 0.041 | 0.294 | 0.407 | 0.520 | 0.141 | 0.092 | 0.127 | 0.162 |
|  | 3 | 20.654 | 24.346 | 28.039 | 9.275 | 0.620 | 0.400 | 0.248 | 0.183 | 3.769 | 4.443 | 5.117 | 0.160 | 1.330 | 1.567 | 1.805 |
|  | 4 | 4.463 | 5.197 | 5.930 | 2.666 | 0.620 | 0.775 | 0.480 | 0.319 | 1.425 | 1.659 | 1.893 | 0.193 | 0.606 | 0.706 | 0.806 |
|  | 5 | 2.590 | 3.017 | 3.443 | 1.831 | 0.620 | 0.985 | 0.610 | 0.384 | 0.995 | 1.159 | 1.322 | 0.215 | 0.472 | 0.549 | 0.627 |
|  | 6+ | 1.614 | 1.918 | 2.222 | 1.464 | 0.620 | 1.000 | 0.620 | 0.388 | 0.627 | 0.745 | 0.863 | 0.310 | 0.429 | 0.509 | 0.590 |
|  | Total | 36.431 | 44.314 | 52.196 | 17.708 |  |  |  | 0.190 | 7.110 | 8.413 | 9.716 | 0.186 | 2.922 | 3.458 | 3.989 |
|  | (3+) | 29.321 | 34.478 | 39.634 | 15.236 |  |  |  | 0.232 | 6.816 | 8.006 | 9.196 | 0.189 | 2.836 | 3.332 | 3.827 |
| Unit 3 | 2 | 7.979 | 11.978 | 15.978 | 2.181 | 0.576 | 0.027 | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.103 | 0.155 | 0.207 | 0.131 | 0.030 | 0.045 | 0.060 |
|  | 3 | 26.392 | 32.490 | 38.587 | 9.290 | 0.576 | 0.240 | 0.138 | 0.107 | 2.823 | 3.475 | 4.128 | 0.150 | 0.934 | 1.149 | 1.365 |
|  | 4 | 5.543 | 6.798 | 8.054 | 2.791 | 0.576 | 0.608 | 0.350 | 0.246 | 1.366 | 1.676 | 1.985 | 0.171 | 0.515 | 0.632 | 0.748 |
|  | 5 | 3.215 | 4.136 | 5.057 | 2.122 | 0.576 | 0.850 | 0.490 | 0.324 | 1.042 | 1.341 | 1.639 | 0.196 | 0.450 | 0.579 | 0.708 |
|  | 6+ | 0.860 | 1.196 | 1.532 | 0.906 | 0.576 | 1.000 | 0.576 | 0.368 | 0.316 | 0.440 | 0.563 | 0.256 | 0.178 | 0.248 | 0.318 |
|  | Total | 43.989 | 56.598 | 69.206 | 17.290 |  |  |  | 0.125 | 5.652 | 7.087 | 8.523 | 0.170 | 2.104 | 2.654 | 3.200 |
|  | (3+) | 36.010 | 44.620 | 53.229 | 15.108 |  |  |  | 0.155 | 5.548 | 6.932 | 8.316 | 0.171 | 2.078 | 2.609 | 3.140 |
| Unit 4 |  | 2.304 | 3.860 | 5.416 | 0.949 | 0.544 | 0.090 | 0.049 | 0.039 | 0.091 | 0.152 | 0.213 | 0.139 | 0.028 | 0.047 | 0.065 |
|  | 3 | 1.640 | 2.166 | 2.692 | 0.966 | 0.544 | 0.404 | 0.220 | 0.164 | 0.268 | 0.355 | 0.441 | 0.159 | 0.094 | 0.124 | 0.154 |
|  | 4 | 1.192 | 1.616 | 2.041 | 0.934 | 0.544 | 0.842 | 0.458 | 0.308 | 0.367 | 0.497 | 0.628 | 0.174 | 0.141 | 0.191 | 0.241 |
|  | 5 | 0.295 | 0.460 | 0.625 | 0.322 | 0.544 | 1.000 | 0.544 | 0.352 | 0.104 | 0.162 | 0.220 | 0.216 | 0.049 | 0.077 | 0.105 |
|  | 6+ | 0.065 | 0.107 | 0.150 | 0.091 | 0.544 | 0.784 | 0.426 | 0.290 | 0.019 | 0.031 | 0.044 | 0.277 | 0.011 | 0.019 | 0.027 |
|  | Total | 5.496 | 8.210 | 10.924 | 3.262 |  |  |  | 0.146 | 0.848 | 1.197 | 1.545 | 0.173 | 0.323 | 0.458 | 0.592 |
|  | (3+) | 3.192 | 4.350 | 5.508 | 2.313 |  |  |  | 0.240 | 0.758 | 1.045 | 1.332 | 0.178 | 0.296 | 0.411 | 0.527 |

Table 2.3. Lake Erie Yellow Perch fishing rates and the Recommended Allowable Harvest (RAH; in millions of pounds) for 2024 by Management Unit (Unit). RAH values are calculated in Table 2.2. RAH values may be subject to a limit on the annual change in TAC ( $\pm 20 \%$ ).

| Unit | Fishing Rate | Recommended Allowable Harvest (millions Ibs.) |  |  | $\pm 20 \%$ of previous year TAC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MIN | MEAN | MAX | MIN (-20\%) | MAX (+20\%) |
| 1 | 0.431 | 2.149 | 2.861 | 3.569 | 1.944 | 2.916 |
| 2 |  | See Text Page 9 |  |  | 0.382 | 0.572 |
| 3 | 0.576 | 2.104 | 2.654 | 3.200 | 2.466 | 3.698 |
| 4 | 0.544 | 0.323 | 0.458 | 0.592 | 0.467 | 0.701 |


Figure 1.1. The Yellow Perch Management Units (MUs) of Lake Erie defined by the YPTG and LEC, for illustrative





Management Unit 3
 targeted effort with small mesh ( $<3^{\prime \prime}$ ).

Figure 1.3.


Figure 1.5. Spatial distribution of Yellow Perch total harvest (lbs.) in 2023 by 10-minute grid.


Figure 1.6. Spatial distribution of Yellow Perch small mesh gill net effort (km) in 2023 by 10-minute grid.


Figure 1.7. Spatial distribution of Yellow Perch sport effort (angler hours) in 2023 by 10-minute grid.


Figure 1.8. Spatial distribution of Yellow Perch trap net effort (lifts) in 2023 by 10-minute grid.



Figure 1.9. Lake Erie Yellow Perch population estimates by management unit for age 2 (dark bars) and ages $3+$ (light bars), 1975 to 2024, from the ADMB model.
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Figure 2.1. Calculations for subunit areas in the Yellow Perch Task Group Management Units.

Appendix Table 1. Expert Opinion (EO) Lambda ( $\lambda$ ) values and relative number of terms associated with catch-at-age analysis data sources by management unit (Unit).

| Unit | Data Source | $\lambda$ | Relative Number of Terms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Commercial Gill Net Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Sport Effort | 0.7 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Effort | 0.5 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Gill Net Harvest | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Sport Harvest | 0.9 | 5 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Harvest | 0.7 | 5 |
|  | Trawl Survey Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Partnership Gill Net Index Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
| 2 | Commercial Gill Net Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Sport Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Effort | 0.6 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Gill Net Harvest | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Sport Harvest | 0.9 | 5 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Harvest | 0.7 | 5 |
|  | Trawl Survey Catch Rates | 0.9 | 5 |
|  | Partnership Gill Net Index Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
| 3 | Commercial Gill Net Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Sport Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Effort | 0.6 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Gill Net Harvest | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Sport Harvest | 0.8 | 5 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Harvest | 0.6 | 5 |
|  | Trawl Survey Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Partnership Gill Net Index Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
| 4 | Commercial Gill Net Effort | 0.8 | 1 |
|  | Sport Effort | 0.7 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Effort | 0.6 | 1 |
|  | Commercial Gill Net Harvest | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Sport Harvest | 0.7 | 5 |
|  | Commercial Trap Net Harvest | 0.6 | 5 |
|  | NY Gill Net Survey Catch Rates | 1.0 | 5 |
|  | Partnership Gill Net Index Catch Rates | 0.9 | 5 |

Appendix Table 2. Surveys selected by multi-model inference (MMI) age-2 recruitment

| MU | Survey | Parameter <br> Estimate | Number of <br> Models |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MU1 | OHF10 | 0.223 | 1 |
|  | OOS11 | 0.594 | 2 |
|  | (Intercept) | 13.560 | 2 |
| MU2 | OHF21 | 0.037 | 1 |
|  | OHF20 | 0.268 | 2 |
|  | OPSF21 | 0.301 | 2 |
|  | (Intercept) | 14.804 | 2 |
| MU3 | OHJ31A | 0.262 | 1 |
|  | OPSF31 | 0.310 | 1 |
|  | (Intercept) | 14.899 | 1 |
|  | OPSF41 | -0.017 | 1 |
|  | NYGN41 | -0.028 | 1 |
|  | NYF41 | 0.451 | 3 |
|  | LPC41 | 0.270 | 3 |
|  | (Intercept) | 13.208 | 3 |























Appendix Table 4. Lakewide recruitment index codes and series names used in Appendix Tables 2 and 3. All series are reported in arithmetic mean catch per hectare, except LPS41, NYGN41, and OPSF11-41, gill net indices which are reported in mean catch per lift.
Abbreviations in Appendix Table 3 ending with a ' B ' represent survey indices blocked by depth strata.

| Abbreviation | Series |
| :--- | :--- |
| OHF10 | Ohio Management Unit 1 fall age 0 |
| OHF11 | Ohio Management Unit 1 fall age 1 |
| OOS10 | Ontario/Ohio Management Unit 1 summer age 0 |
| OOS11 | Ontario/Ohio Management Unit 1 summer age 1 |
| OHF20 | Ohio Management Unit 2 fall age 0 |
| OHF21 | Ohio Management Unit 2 fall age 1 |
| OHF30 | Ohio Management Unit 3 fall age 0 |
| OHF31 | Ohio Management Unit 3 fall age 1 |
| OHJ21 | Ohio Management Unit 2 June age 1 |
| OHJ31 | Ohio Management Unit 3 June age 1 |
| LPC40 | Long Point Composite Management Unit 4 age 0 |
| LPC41 | Long Point Composite Management Unit 4 age 1 |
| NYF40 | New York Management Unit 4 fall trawl age 0 |
| NYF41 | New York Management Unit 4 fall trawl age 1 |
| NYGN41 | New York Management Unit 4 gill net age 1 |
| OPSF11 | Ontario Partnership Gill Net Management Unit 1 fall age 1 |
| OPSF21 | Ontario Partnership Gill Net Management Unit 2 fall age 1 |
| OPSF31 | Ontario Partnership Gill Net Management Unit 3 fall age 1 |
| OPSF41 | Ontario Partnership Gill Net Management Unit 4 fall age 1 |


[^0]:    (a) sport effort in angler-hours; gill net effort in km; trap net effort in lifts
    (b) harvest rates for sport in fish/hr, gill net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{km}$, trap net in $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{lift}$
    (c) the Ontario sport fishery harvested approximately 132,585 lbs of yellow perch in the 2014 creel survey
    (*) large mesh catch rates are not targeted and therefore of limited value

