


LARGE TROUGH SHELL (MMI)

(Mactra murchisoni)

1. FISHERY SUMMARY

This species is part of the surf clam fishery and the reader is guided to the surf clam introductory chapter for information common to all relevant species.

Large trough shells (*Mactra murchisoni*) were introduced into the Quota Management System on 1 April 2004 with a total TACC of 162 t. No allowances were initially made for customary, recreational or other sources of mortality, some allowances were introduced for MMI 8 and 7 in 2013 and 2016, respectively. Biomass surveys in QMA 2 supported a TACC increase from April 2010. This increased the TACC for MMI 2 to 62 t. A subsequent biomass survey in 2012 supported a TAC increase in MMI 8 from 25 to 631 t in April 2013. Another biomass survey supported a TAC increase in MMI 7 from 61 to 144 t in April 2016; the current total TAC is 872 t (Table 1).

Table 1: Current TAC, TACC and allowances for other sources of mortality for *Mactra murchisoni*.

Fishstock	TAC (t)	TACC (t)	Recreational Allowance (t)	Customary Allowance (t)	Other sources of mortality (t)
MMI 1	2	2	0	0	0
MMI 2	3	3	0	0	0
MMI 3	65	62	0	0	3
MMI 4	1	1	0	0	0
MMI 5	1	1	0	0	0
MMI 7	144	131	1	5	7
MMI 8	631	589	0	10	32
MMI 9	25	25	0	0	0
Total	872	814	1	15	35

1.1 Commercial fisheries

All reported landings have been from MMI 3 and MMI 7. Between the 1991–92 and 1995–96 fishing years landings were small and confined to MMI 7. No further landings were reported until 2002–03; since then the reported catch has ranged between about 20 t to 64 t (Table 2). Figure 1 shows the historical landings and TACCs for the two main MMI stocks.

LARGE TROUGH SHELL (MMI)

Table 2: TACCs and reported landings (t) of Large Trough Shell by Fishstock from 1991–92 to 2015–16 from CELR and CLR data. Fishstocks where no catch has been reported are not tabulated. See Table 1 for TACC of stocks not landed.

Fishstock	MMI 3		MMI 7		Total	
	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC	Landings	TACC
1991–92	0	0	0.349	-	0.349	-
1992–93	0	0	1.541	-	1.541	-
1993–94	0	0	8.327	-	8.327	-
1994–95	0	0	10.432	-	10.432	-
1995–96	0	0	0.142	-	0.142	-
1996–97	0	0	0	-	0	-
1997–98	0	0	0	-	0	-
1998–99	0	0	0	-	0	-
1999–00	0	0	0	-	0	-
2000–01	0	0	0	-	0	-
2001–02	0	0	0	-	0	-
2002–03	0	0	22.623	-	22.623	-
2003–04	0	44	29.681	61	29.681	162
2004–05*	0	44	60.023	61	60.863	162
2005–06*	0	44	53.961	61	57.916	162
2006–07	7.476	44	54.091	61	61.567	162
2007–08	36.901	44	15.036	61	51.937	162
2008–09	32.149	44	6.657	61	38.806	162
2009–10	25.764	44	3.416	61	29.180	162
2010–11	12.600	62	17.432	61	30.032	180
2011–12	0	62	47.338	61	47.338	180
2012–13	44.445	62	32.81	61	77.265	180
2013–14	63.867	62	4.886	61	68.753	744
2014–15	58.995	62	9.685	61	68.64	744
2015–16	46.715	62	23.975	131	71.766	814

*In 2004–05 and 2005–06 0.84 and 3.9554 t respectively were reportedly landed, but the QMA is not recorded. These amounts are included in the total landings for these years.




Figure 1: Reported commercial landings and TACC for MMI 3 (South East Coast), and MMI 7 (Challenger). Note that these figures do not show data prior to entry into the QMS.

1.2 Recreational fisheries

Offshore clams such as *M. murchisoni* are likely to have been harvested for recreational use only when washed ashore after storms. There are no estimates of recreational take for this surf clam.

1.3 Customary fisheries

Offshore clams such as *M. murchisoni* are likely to have been harvested for customary use only when washed ashore after storms. Shells of this clam have been found irregularly, and in small numbers, in a few middens (Conroy et al. 1993). There are no estimates of current customary catch of this clam.

1.4 Illegal catch

There is no documented illegal catch of this clam.

1.5 Other sources of mortality

There is no quantitative information on other sources of mortality, although this clam is subject to localised catastrophic mortality from erosion during storms, high temperatures and low oxygen levels during calm summer periods, blooms of toxic algae and excessive freshwater outflow (Cranfield & Michael 2001).

2. BIOLOGY

M. murchisoni is most abundant in the lower half of the North Island and the South Island. It is found most commonly between about 4 m and 8 m in depth. Maximum length is variable between areas, ranging from 63 to 102 mm (Cranfield et al 1993) The sexes are separate, they are broadcast spawners, and the larvae are thought to be planktonic for between 20 and 30 days (Cranfield & Michael 2001). Recruitment of spat is to the same depth zone that adults occur in, although recruitment between years is highly variable (Conroy et al 1993).

3. STOCKS AND AREAS

For management purposes stock boundaries are based on FMAs, however the boundaries of stocks of surf clams are likely to be the continuous lengths of exposed sandy beaches between geographical features (rivers, headlands etc). Circulation patterns may isolate surf clams genetically as well as ecologically.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

See the introductory surf clam chapter.

5. STOCK ASSESSMENT

5.1 Estimates of fishery parameters and abundance

No estimates of fisheries parameters or abundance are available for this species.

5.2 Biomass estimates

Biomass has been estimated from MMI 2, 3, 7 and 8 at various times between 1994 and 2015 with stratified random surveying using a hydraulic dredge. Survey size has been expressed either as length of beach (Table 3), or as area (Table 4), which makes comparisons difficult.

Table 3: A summary of biomass estimates in tonnes greenweight with standard deviation in parentheses from exploratory surveys of Cloudy Bay (Cranfield et al 1994a) and Clifford Bay in Marlborough (Michael et al 1994), and Foxton beach on the Manawatu coast (White et al 2012).

Area	Cloudy Bay (MMI 7)	Clifford Bay (MMI 7)	Foxton Beach (MMI 8)
Length of beach (km)	11	21	46 [#]
Biomass (t)	248 (96)	192 (79)	3603 (342) [#]

[#] Biomass was estimated at Foxton Beach from a mix of a systematic survey in the North and a stratified survey in the South of this location.

Table 4: A summary of biomass estimates in greenweight (t) from the surveys in MMI 2 (Triantifillos 2008b), MMI 3 (Triantifillos 2008a) and MMI 7 (White et al 2015). Note: unless otherwise stated the CV is less than 20%.

Location	Five sites (MMI 2)	Ashley River to 6 nm south of the Waimakariri River (MMI 3)	Cloudy Bay (MMI 7)
Area surveyed (km ²)	28.0	13.4	5.7
Biomass (t)	33.8	444.1	1008.8

LARGE TROUGH SHELL (MMI)

5.3 Yield estimates and projections

Growth and mortality data from Cloudy Bay in Marlborough and the Kapiti Coast in Manawatu (Cranfield et al 1993) have been used in a yield per recruit model to estimate the reference fishing mortality $F_{0.1}$ (Cranfield et al 1994a, Triantifillos 2008a, 2008b). The shellfish working group (SFWG) did not accept these estimates of $F_{0.1}$ as there was considerable uncertainty in both the estimate and the method used to generate them. The MCY estimates of Triantifillos (2008a, b) and White et al (2012) using the full range of $F_{0.1}$ estimates from Cranfield et al (1993) are shown in Table 5. The SFWG recommended that MCY estimates are adequate to use to inform management decisions relevant to all surf clam fisheries, with the following caveats: 1) due to the uncertainty in $F_{0.1}$ values, for all species other than SAE, the MCY estimates should use the $F_{0.1}$ values toward the higher end of the range, and 2) there is a need to account for any substantial catch that has already come out of any surf clam fishery when estimating MCY, however there was no consensus on the best way to do this.

Estimates of MCY are available from numerous locations (Table 5) and were calculated using Method 1 for a virgin fishery (MPI 2015) with an estimate of virgin biomass B_0 , where:

$$MCY = 0.25 * F_{0.1} B_0$$

Table 5: MCY estimates (t) for *M. murchisoni* from virgin biomass at locations sampled around New Zealand (Triantifillos 2008a and b, White et al 2012). The two $F_{0.1}$ values, which are subsequently used to estimate MCY, are the minimum and maximum estimates from Cranfield et al (1993).

Location	$F_{0.1}$	MCY
Five sites (MMI 2)	0.43/0.57	47.7/63.3
Ashley River to 6 nm south of the Waimakariri River (MMI 3)	0.70/0.89	5.9/7.5
Cloudy Bay (MMI 7)	0.43/0.57	108.4/143.7
46km of coast north and south of the Manawatu River (MMI 8)	0.70/0.89	630.6/801.7

Estimation of Current Annual Yield (CAY)

CAY has not been estimated for *M. murchisoni*.

The SFWG recommended moving all surfclam fisheries away from an MCY management strategy and towards an exploitation rate management strategy. The SFWG recognised that an exploitation rate approach is more survey intensive, but better allows for the variable nature of biomass for surf clams as it allows greater flexibility in catch (in order to take greater landings from available biomass) whilst keeping catches sustainable.

6. STATUS OF THE STOCKS

- MMI 3- *Macra murchisoni*

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2008
Assessment Runs Presented	Survey biomass
Reference Points	Target: Not defined, but B_{MSY} assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -
Status in relation to Target	Unknown
Status in relation to Limits	Unlikely (< 40%) to be below the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Unlikely (< 40%) to be occurring
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	
Unknown	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	In MMI 3, landings have averaged 31.3 t since 2006–07, but landings have been highest in the most recent 3 years.

Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catches are Unlikely (< 40%) to cause declines below soft or hard limits in the short to medium term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Unlikely (< 40%)

Assessment Methodology	
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment
Assessment Method	Absolute biomass estimates from quadrat surveys
Assessment Dates	2008 Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank	-
Main data inputs (rank)	Abundance and length frequency information
Data not used (rank)	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-

Qualifying Comments	
Stock size could fluctuate markedly as a result of catastrophic mortality from a number of causes. There is a need to review fishery parameters for this species.	

Fishery Interactions	
MMI can be caught together with other surf clam species and non-QMS bivalves.	

- MMI 7

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2015
Assessment Runs Presented	Survey biomass
Reference Points	Target: Not defined, but B_{MSY} assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -
Status in relation to Target	Very Likely (> 90%) to be at or above the target.
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	
Unknown	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	In MMI 7 landings have been variable but averaged 27.5 t since 2002.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

LARGE TROUGH SHELL (MMI)

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catches are Very Unlikely (< 10%) to cause declines below soft or hard limits in the short to medium term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Absolute biomass estimates from quadrat surveys	
Assessment Dates	2015	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank		
Main data inputs (rank)	Abundance and length frequency information	
Data not used (rank)	-	
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
Stock size could fluctuate markedly as a result of catastrophic mortality from a number of causes. There is a need to review fishery parameters for this species.

Fishery Interactions
MMI can be caught together with other surf clam species and non-QMS bivalves.

- MMI 8

Stock Status	
Year of Most Recent Assessment	2012
Assessment Runs Presented	Survey biomass
Reference Points	Target: Not defined, but B_{MSY} assumed Soft Limit: 20% B_0 Hard Limit: 10% B_0 Overfishing threshold: -
Status in relation to Target	Because of the relatively low levels of exploitation of <i>M. muchisoni</i> , it is likely that MMI 8 is still effectively in a virgin state, therefore Very Likely (> 90%) to be at or above the target.
Status in relation to Limits	Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be below the soft and hard limits
Status in relation to Overfishing	Overfishing is Very Unlikely (< 10%) to be occurring
Historical Stock Status Trajectory and Current Status	
Unknown	

Fishery and Stock Trends	
Recent Trend in Biomass or Proxy	Unknown
Recent Trend in Fishing Mortality or Proxy	Fishing is light in MMI 8.
Other Abundance Indices	-
Trends in Other Relevant Indicators or Variables	-

Projections and Prognosis	
Stock Projections or Prognosis	-
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Biomass to remain below or to decline below Limits	Current catches are Very Unlikely (< 10%) to cause declines below soft or hard limits in the short to medium term.
Probability of Current Catch or TACC causing Overfishing to continue or to commence	Very Unlikely (< 10%)

Assessment Methodology and Evaluation		
Assessment Type	Level 2 - Partial Quantitative Stock Assessment	
Assessment Method	Absolute biomass estimates from quadrat surveys	
Assessment Dates	2012	Next assessment: Unknown
Overall assessment quality rank		
Main data inputs (rank)	Abundance and length frequency information	
Data not used (rank)		
Changes to Model Structure and Assumptions	-	
Major Sources of Uncertainty	-	

Qualifying Comments
Stock size could fluctuate markedly as a result of catastrophic mortality from a number of causes. There is a need to review fishery parameters for this species.

Fishery Interactions
MMI can be caught together with other surf clam species and non-QMS bivalves.

For all other MMI stocks there is no current evidence of appreciable biomass.

7. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

- Beentjes, M P; Baird, S J (2004) Review of dredge fishing technologies and practice for application in New Zealand. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2004/37*. 40 p.
- Brierley, P (Convenor) (1990) Management and development of the New Zealand sub-tidal clam fishery. Report of the surf clam working group, MAF Fisheries. (Unpublished report held in NIWA library, Wellington). 57 p.
- Conroy, A; Smith, P; Michael, K; Stotter, D (1993) Identification and recruitment patterns of juvenile surf clams, *Macra discors* and *M. murchisoni* from central New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 27, 279–285.
- Cranfield, H J; Doonan, I J; Michael, K P (1994a) Dredge survey of surf clams in Cloudy Bay, Marlborough. *New Zealand Fisheries Technical Report 39*: 18 p.
- Cranfield, H J; Michael, K P (2001) The surf clam fishery in New Zealand: description of the fishery, its management, and the biology of surf clams. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2001/62*. 24 p.
- Cranfield, H J; Michael, K P; Stotter, D R (1993) Estimates of growth, mortality, and yield per recruit for New Zealand surf clams. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1993/20. 26 p. (Unpublished report held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Cranfield, H J; Michael, K P; Stotter, D R; Doonan, I J (1994b) Distribution, biomass and yield estimates of surf clams off New Zealand beaches. New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Research Document 1994/1. 17 p. (Unpublished document held by NIWA library, Wellington.)
- Haddon, M; Willis, T J; Wear, R G; Anderlini, V C (1996) Biomass and distribution of five species of surf clam off an exposed west coast North Island beach, New Zealand. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 15: 331–339.
- Michael, K; Cranfield, H; Doonan, I; Hadfield, J (1994) Dredge survey of surf clams in Clifford Bay, Marlborough. *New Zealand Fisheries Data Report*, No. 54.
- Ministry for Primary Industries (2015). Fisheries Assessment Plenary, May 2015: stock assessments and stock status. Compiled by the Fisheries Science Group, Ministry for Primary Industries, Wellington, New Zealand. 1475 p.
- Triantifillos, L (2008a) Survey of subtidal surf clams in Pegasus Bay, November–December 2007. Prepared by NIWA for Seafood Innovations Limited and SurfCo. Limited. : 43 p.
- Triantifillos, L (2008b) Survey of subtidal surf clams in Quota Management Area 2, June–August 2008. Prepared by NIWA for Seafood Innovations Limited and SurfCo. Limited. : 40 p.
- White, W; Millar, R; Breen, B; Farrington, G (2012) Survey of subtidal surf clams from the Manawatu Coast (FMA 8), October–November 2012, Unpublished Report held by MPI Wellington. 35 p. + Addendum.
- White, W; Millar, R; Farrington, G; Breen, D; Selveraj, S (2015) Stock assessment of surf clams from Cloudy Bay, NZ. *Institute for Applied Ecology New Zealand Report 15/01*, Published by Applied Ecology New Zealand, an Institute of Auckland University of Technology: 34 p.