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United States Report of Redfish Effort and Landings by Depth Zones for 1963
by Bradford E. Brown and Frank A. Dreyer

In Table 1 are presented the effort and landings of redfish by the United States otter trawl fleet in 1963, by 50 fathom depth zones for each month and division. The first two zones actually ranged from 0-60 and 61-100 fathoms instead of the standard 50 fathoms. Landings of redfish by gear other than otter trawl were negligible. All sizes of vessels from 26 to 300 gross tons were included without weighting. The larger boats fished the northern divisions while the smaller ones fished more in the southern divisions.

Areas and depths of the catch were obtained by interviews. Landings and effort of those trips not interviewed were prorated on the basis of the activities of interviewed vessels, within port and boat size groups. This accounted for the whole of the redfish catch.

Landings from division $5 Z$ were mainly incidental catches. Those from $5 Y$ were the product of a mixed species fishery, and thus the lower catch-per-unit-effort found there may be partly a product of effort being directed at concentrations of fish other than redfish, particularly in the $0-60$ fathom zone. The selection of only those boats that landed redfish reduced this factor to some extent.

An attempt was made to analyze these data to determine whether any significant differences existed between depth zones. In Table 2 are presented the annual average catch-per-days-fished in metric tons for both 1962 and 1963. The data for 1961 were not included because the catch-per-day for that year was calculated differently (McCann, 1963). A ranking procedure was used to examine differences between depths. Each depth zone was assigned an integral value - $1,2, \ldots$, based on the rank of the catch-per-
day within each division (Table 3). The higher the rank the lower the catch-per-day. These values were summed over divisions and years and the average rank was computed (Table 4).

It was obvious that the 0-60 fathom zone was not fished as often as the deeper waters, and that when it was fished it produced poorer catches than the other depth zones within the same division. Despite the selectivity of fishing mentioned before, this indicates a lesser abundance of redfish in that zone. The effort in that zone may have been directed away from redfish concentrations because of preference for other species.

There was a slight indication in the data from 1962 that
. the catch-per-unit-of-effort was relatively lower in the 201-250 fathom depth zone, but this was not the case in 1963. Somewhat more effort was expended in this zone than in the shallowest zone, but still much less than in the middle three zones. McCann (1963) mentioned that there might be decreased gear efficiency in the very deep waters, e.g., fewer tows per day because of longer haul time.

Between the depth zones, 51-100; 101-150; and 151-200 fathoms there appeared to be little consistency in the differences in catch-per-day.

The catch-per-day is portrayed graphically in Figure 1.
The information gathered to date suggests that in deriving catch-per-unit-effort indices for redfish, the shallow depths may best be eliminated from consideration in order to sort out effort directed primarily to other species of fish. Beyond this, consideration of depth probably has very little value, at least for present United States fishery practices.
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Table 1.--1963 redfish landings and effort by depth zone (metric tons, round, fresh).

| Depth zone (fms.) | $\frac{\text { Effort }}{\text { Landings }}$ | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Division 3 L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 151-200 | Days fished tons |  |  |  | $\frac{1.5}{9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{9} .5$ |
| Total | Days fished tons |  |  |  | $\frac{1.5}{9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{1.5}{9}$ |
| Division 3 N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101-150 | Days fished tons | $\begin{gathered} 14.1 \\ 351 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.5 \\ 468 \end{gathered}$ | $19.5$ | ${ }_{232}^{14.5}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.2 \\ 304 \end{gathered}$ | $155$ | $240^{9.5}$ | $2_{47}{ }^{5}$ | ${ }_{813}^{25.5}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.6 \\ 689 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 235 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 153.4 \\ 3749 \end{gathered}$ |
| 151-200 | Days fished tons | $184^{6.5}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.0 \\ 534 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29.0 \\ 527 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.0 \\ 96 \end{gathered}$ | - - | $\begin{aligned} & 20.8 \\ & 605 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.0 \\ & 674 \end{aligned}$ | $67.0$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.5 \\ 538 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 113.8 \\ & 355 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.0 \\ 495 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170.6 \\ & 4075 \end{aligned}$ |
| 201-250 | Days fished tons | - - | - | $255^{4.0}$ | -- | -- | -- | ${ }_{62}^{2.3}$ | - | -- | -- |  | ${ }_{18}^{2.0}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ 335 \end{array}$ |
| Total | Days fished tons | $\begin{array}{r} 20.6 \\ 53.5 \end{array}$ | ${ }_{1002}^{50.5}$ | ${ }_{451}^{11.5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.5 \\ & 759 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 115 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.6 \\ & 822 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.5 \\ 914 \end{array}$ | $114^{7.5}$ | $\stackrel{44.0}{1351}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.4 \\ 1044 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.0 \\ 748 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 332.3 \\ 8159 \end{gathered}$ |
| Division 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61-100 | Days fished tons | - - | - - | -- |  | $68^{3.5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 4.0 \\ 77 . \end{array}$ |
| 101-150 | Days fished tons | ${ }_{95}^{5.5}$ | -- - | -- | -- | $182^{9.5}$ | -- | - - | -- | $159^{9.2}$ | -- | -- | -- | $\begin{gathered} 24.2 \\ 436 \end{gathered}$ |
| 151-200 | Days fished tons | -- | $2.0$ | -- | 58.5 | $\begin{gathered} 10.5 \\ 187 \end{gathered}$ | $154.5$ | ${ }_{206}^{10.2}$ | ${ }_{214}^{17.4}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.5 \\ 171 \end{gathered}$ | -- | 87.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 83.4 \\ 1536 \end{array}$ |
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Table 2. Redfish catch/day in metric tons (underlined estimates are based on lf than 20 days fishing).

| Depth zone (fms.) | $5 Z$ | 5 Y | 3N | 30 | DIVISION |  | 4 S | 4 T | 4V | 4W | 4X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 P | 4R |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1963 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-60 | 0.1 | 1.6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 11.1 | 5.6 |
| 61-100 | 0.8 | 4.8 | --- | 19.2 | --- | --- | 18.3 | --- | 19.0 | 17.4 | 7.8 |
| 101-150 | 0.5 | 3. 3 | 24.4 | 18. 0 | 10.0 | 16.3 | 19.9 | 23.0 | 17.5 | 15.8 | 8.5 |
| 151-200 | --- | --- | 23. 9 | 18.4 | 29.5 | 22.3 | - | 19.7 | 19.1 | 11.9 | --- |
| 201-250 |  | --- | 40.4 | 21.3 | 14.8 | --- | --- | --- | 29.1 | --- | --- |
| Total | 0.5 | 4.1 | 24.6 | 19.1 | 26.7 | 17. 0 | 19. 9 | 20.6 | 19.0 | 17. 0 | 7. |

1962

| 0-60 | 0.1 | 1.4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 13.0 | 10.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 61-100 | 1.1 | 6.4 | 45.6 | 25.4 |  |  | --- | --- | 19.0 | 19.7 | 12.7 |
| 101-150 | 0.7 | 9. 9 | 28.8 | 26.2 |  | 13.5 | --- |  | 20.2 | 25.3 | 11.9 |
| 151-200 | 2. 3 | 7.5 | 30.1 | 26.4 | 18.7 | --- | --- | 8.3 | 17.7 | 26.7 | 13.5 |
| 201-250 |  | 7.0 | $\underline{24.3}$ | 16.6 | 17.4 | --- |  |  | 13.4 | 20.0 | --- |
| Total | 0.7 | 5.3 | 29.5 | 24.8 | 18.1 | 13.5 | --- | 8. 3 | 19.4 | 20.9 | 11.9 |

Table 3. Rankings of redfish catch/day

| Depth zone (fms.) | DIVISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3N | 30 | $3 P$ | 4R | 4S | 4 T | 4 V | 4W | 4X | 5 Y | $5 Z$ |
| 1962 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-60 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 61-100 | 3 | 3 | - | $\cdots$ | - | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 101-150 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | $\sim$ | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 151-200 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | - |
| 201-250 | 4 | 4 | 2 | - | - | - | 4 | 3 | - | 3 | - |
| 1963 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-60 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 61-100 | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 101-150 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 151-200 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 3 | - | - | - |
| 201-250 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |

Table 4. Average values of rankings of catch per day.

| Depth <br> zone <br> (fms.) | Sum | Number | Av. <br> Rank | Sum | Number | Av. <br> Rank | Sum | Number | Nank <br> Rank |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-60$ | 17 | 4 | 4.25 | 13 | 4 | 3.25 | 30 | 8 | 3.75 |
| $61-100$ | 20 | 7 | 2.86 | 10 | 7 | 1.43 | 30 | 14 | 2.14 |
| $101-150$ | 10 | 8 | 1.25 | 25 | 11 | 2.27 | 35 | 19 | 1.84 |
| $151-200$ | 14 | 8 | 1.50 | 14 | 7 | 2.00 | 28 | 15 | 1.87 |
| $201-250$ | 20 | 6 | 3.33 | 5 | 4 | 1.25 | 25 | 10 | 2.50 |



Figure 1. --Catch per day of redfish by area and depth zones for 1962 and 1963

