

SYMBIOSES

## SYMBIOSES

An integrated modeling framework for decision support in marine ecosystem based management


Larval and adult fish modelling


## Symbioses: part 2

In order to evaluate effects on fish populations we need to model:

Eggs and Larvae
Where they spawn
How the move, feed, grow, and die
Fish
How many larvae become fish
How does the fish population develop
What happens when you add oil

We take the oil concentrations and impact on the plankton and on to fish larvae and fish populations

Eggs and Larvae: LARMOD

- Individual Based Model
-Runs in high resolution in the Lofotens

Fish: Gadget

- Statistical multispecies fisheries model
- Barents Sea
- Not spatially detailed

We take the oil concentrations and impact on the plankton and on to fish larvae and fish populations

Eggs and Larvae: LARMOD

- Individual Based Model
-Runs in high resolution in the Lofotens
0-group ("swimming larvae")
Fish: Gadget
- Statistical multispecies fisheries model
- Barents Sea
- Not spatially detailed

Models eggs through to the end of the drifting larval stage

Individual Based Model (IBM) depth and position

Models vertical destribution, horizontal drift, growth (temperature and food dependent), feeding and mortality

## Fish eggs and larvae

- Location, timing and abundance of eggs.
- Ocean circulation model covering the larval areas
- Spatiotemporal food and predator abundance.
- Spatiotemporal concentrations of oil components.
- Body burden model, effects of egg and larvae exposure to oil.
- Model drift, growth and survival
- Until the larvae stop drifting



## Spawning grounds based on observations

## Numerical ocean model



Hypothetical oil spill
(3) Spawning ground number 3

- Oil spills can be placed in the model at hypothetical locations.
- Spawning location of fish in accordance with observations.
- The spatiotemporal circulation allows quantification of individual egg and larvae exposure to toxins aswell as prey and predators.

Oil, eggs, larvae and larval prey dispersal by simulated sujrestis


## Larval prey and toxins

## IOD days of drift of eggs and laryae spawned end of April



The trajectories of the 100 particles released from each of the 9 spawning grounds belonging to batch 6 (released 19 days after the simulation start, April $7^{\text {th }}$ ). The simulation period is 100 days, enabling 81 days of drift for these particular individuals.

## Different spawning grounds

## Vertical distribution of fish egges and larvae affect dispersal



(Rohrs et al. 2014)

(Fiksen et al. 2014)


Light is a key determinant for encounter rates of larval fish with both prey and visual predators, and it decreases with depth. Hence, vertical positioning affects immediate growth and survival, but also large-scale and long-term drift and dispersal.

## Dynamic vertical positioning of eggs and laryal migraitions

Fish larvae feeding


Indvidual larvae in LARMOD sample the modeled calanus fields from SINMOD. Larval size determines which nauplii and copepod stages they can eat.

## Growth dependent on food availabilitity

- Dynamic state variables: environmental signals (e.g. temperature, turbulens, light, advection, prey, toxins) affect the dynamic state variables (position, weight, stomach content, survival probability) in LARMOD.
- Behavior: Vertical gradients stronger than horizontal gradients. Vertical distribution of eggs and larvae important to predict environmental exposure. LARMOD allow larvae to migrate vertically. Horizontal migration considered irrelevant.
- Imposed vs emergent behavoir: Behavior is a function of environmental exposure and dynamic state.

(Kristiansen et al. 2007)

Mechanistic larval feeding formulations

## Natural mortality in fish eggs and larvae



- Egg mortality are based on fixed rates (Langangen et al. 2013).
- Larvae mortality can either be fixed rates (Langangen et al. 2013) or a combination of size and light dependence (Vikebø et al. 2007).
- A future possibility is to utilize estimates of spatial anomalies in mortality based on spring and summer observations of ELS of NEA cod in combination with a biophysical model (Langangen et al. 2014).

Langangen et al. 2014

## A key knowledge gap

## LARMOD and the DEB model



Model inputs \& outputs

## LASJMOD interaction with SYMBJOSES summarized



## Model inputs \& outputs

## Laryae to fish: LARMOD to Gadget

It is known to be difficult to go directly from the number of eggs to the number of fish the following year

Typically over 99\% mortality on larvae
=>cannot be precise enough in modelling the mortality to get the fish numbers right

Use recruitment estimates from a purely fish model

## Larvae to fish: LARMOD to Gadget

"Gadget" models recruitment as the number of "baby fish" needed to fit the data we have on the fish population.

We then just need to transfer the "extra mortality" from LARMOD to Gadget

Reduce the number of recruiting fish according to what fraction were killed by the oil

BUT...

## 0-group

LARMOD is a IBM model of the drifting larvae
Gadget is a fisheries model working from age 1+

There is a gap in the middle, swimming " 0 -group"

Cannot model 0-group as drifting particles
Difficult to directly model the processes affecting the 0-group (limited data)

We do know that there is "density dependent mortality"
(probably "food dependent" in reality but we don't have enough data to model this)

Why does density dependent mortality matter?
More 0-group=more natural mortality
Less 0-group=less mortality
Killing larvae reduces the number of 0-group =>which reduces natural mortality

Compensatory mechanism, reduces the impact of the oil spill

There is considerable year-to-year variation in

- The number of 0-group recruited
- The mortality on the 0-group
- Noisy data
- Real variability in mortality

But there is also a strong signal that comes through


We impliment this density dependent mortality And add year effects to account for the variability

Reduces number of 0 -group to get the number of fish the following year

Accounts for the reduction in the effect of oilinduced mortality

## Gadget: fish population model

GADGET: fish population model
Minimum likelihood, multi-species, multi-area, agelength structured, process-based, forwardsimulation Markovian fish population model
$\mathbf{O R}$ (in english)
Sets up a model for the main species, follows them through their lives (born, grow, breed and die), optimises the model to fit the available data

## Fish populations

## Gadget: fish population model

GADGET: fish population model

Create a model without oil influence

Tune this to best fit the historical data

Add in the extra mortality for the simulated oil spill

Model the effects on the cod population


Fish populations

## Gadget: fish population model



## Fish populations

## Gadget: fish population model



## Fish populations

## Gadget: fish populations

Historical cod population model: 1988-2010


## No oil discharge

## Gadget: fish populations

Historical cod population model: 1988-2010


## No oil discharge

OR: what is this good for?

Obvious answer: improving the current risk assessments around oil spills
=> replacing some of the "rule of thumb" safety factors with more realistic modelling

Spatial analysis of different oil spill sites

Examination of possible mitigation measure

Puts oil and fishing impacts into a common framework
=> integrated ecosystem management

## Purposes: Spatial management

The model is spatially detailed
Can evaluate the likely outcomes of oil spills in different location

Oil drilling has flexibility where a rig should be located (at a cost)

Can go beyond saying "how bad are oil spills in the Lofotens"

Can ask "is an oil spill worse here or there?"

## Purposes: Spatial management

Combines
where the oil goes from a particular place how toxic it is how it affects plankton how it affects larvae
=>overall effect on fish stock

Allows comparisons between different possible spill sites

Hypothetical scenario: kill c.60\% of "Ogroup" recruits in 1995
This will lead to a reduction in recruitment, then reduction in young fish, and eventually to a reduction in adult fish

Several years between an oil spill and reduction in adult biomass $3-4$ years before the affected yearclass is fished $6-8$ years before they become mature

Can we reduce other sources of mortality (i.e. fishing) to build up a buffer in the adult stock to prevent negative effects?

OiJ influence: no change in fishing

| year | Ogroup recruitment | Immature 3+ biomass | Mature biomass | Catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1995 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1996 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1997 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1998 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 1999 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.94 |
| 2000 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.86 |
| 2001 | 0.99 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 2002 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.89 |
| 2003 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.94 |
| 2004 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.94 | 0.98 |
| 2005 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.00 |

## Oil influence: no change in fishing

| year | Ogroup recruitment | Immature 3+ biomass | Mature biomass | Catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1995 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1996 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1997 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1998 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 1999 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.94 |
| 2000 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 0.86 |
| 2001 | 0.99 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| 2002 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.89 |
| 2003 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.94 |
| 2004 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.94 | 0.98 |
| 2005 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.00 |

## Fishing less to mitigate oil influence

Maximum 17\% reduction in SSB
10 year loss of catch is around 300,000 tonnes
But we could further curtail fishing in order to avoid stock depletion
Build up a buffer in the SSB before the depletion occurs

Response scenario:

Reduce fishing effort by $15 \%$ for 7 years
Starting the year after the oil spill
The earlier this starts the less severe the reduction needs to be

## Fishing less to mitigate oil influence

| year | Ogroup recruitment | Immature 3+ biomass | Mature biomass | Catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1995 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1996 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.88 |
| 1997 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.12 | 0.97 |
| 1998 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.25 | 1.04 |
| 1999 | 1.01 | 0.88 | 1.35 | 1.01 |
| 2000 | 1.01 | 0.86 | 1.27 | 0.90 |
| 2001 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.08 | 0.85 |
| 2002 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 0.88 |
| 2003 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.08 | 1.06 |
| 2004 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.04 |
| 2005 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 |

## Fishing less to mitigate oil influence

| year | Ogroup recruitment | Immature 3+ biomass | Mature biomass | Catches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1995 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 1996 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.88 |
| 1997 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.12 | 0.97 |
| 1998 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.25 | 1.04 |
| 1999 | 1.01 | 0.88 | 1.35 | 1.01 |
| 2000 | 1.01 | 0.86 | 27 | 0.90 |
| 2001 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.08 | 0.85 |
| 2002 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 0.88 |
| 2003 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.08 | 1.06 |
| 2004 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 08 | 1.04 |
| 2005 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 |

## Fishing less to mitigate oil influence

For this scenario, $15 \%$ reduction in fishing effort for 7 years:

- Eliminates reduction in adult biomass (SSB)
-10 year loss of catch is reduced to 190,000 tonnes
- (down from 300,000 tonnes)
- Early intervention means that the annual reduction is less severe

Important to state what we are not modelling

- Any model is only as good as its assumptions
- Here we assume that all larvae have equal impact on recruitment, oil only effects larvae not adult fish, that any larvae that survive recover fully, and that there are no lasting multi-year effects on the spawning grounds
- So far only developed for cod, best for ages 3+
- Only models the large "Skrei" Barents Sea stock, not the local coastal cod stock
- Nothing about the impact on the local enviroment
- Structure of the tool is to include the least amount of complexity required to answer our question
- => greater complexity brings with greater uncertainties
- First time anyone has combined oil mortalities on larvae into a general fisheries model
- Lower uncertainties than a "whole ecosystem model" (e.g. Atlantis)
- Have built a (preliminary) tool that allows not only risk assessments, but can place the risks in the broader context of marine ecosystem management and integrated ecosystem assessments

