



Pāua population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, February 2023 update

New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/26

T.A. McCowan,
P. Neubauer

ISSN 1179-5352 (online)
ISBN 978-1-991080-69-1 (online)

May 2023



Disclaimer

This document is published by Fisheries New Zealand, a business unit of the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI). The information in this publication is not government policy. While every effort has been made to ensure the information is accurate, the Ministry for Primary Industries does not accept any responsibility or liability for error of fact, omission, interpretation, or opinion that may be present, nor for the consequence of any decisions based on this information. Any view or opinion expressed does not necessarily represent the view of Fisheries New Zealand or the Ministry for Primary Industries.

Requests for further copies should be directed to:

Fisheries Science Editor
Fisheries New Zealand
Ministry for Primary Industries
PO Box 2526
Wellington 6140
NEW ZEALAND

Email: Fisheries-Science.Editor@mpi.govt.nz
Telephone: 0800 00 83 33

This publication is also available on the Ministry for Primary Industries websites at:
<http://www.mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/publications>
<http://fs.fish.govt.nz> go to Document library/Research reports

© Crown Copyright – Fisheries New Zealand

Please cite this report as:

McCowan, T.A.; Neubauer, P. (2023). Pāua population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikoura earthquake, February 2023 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/26*. 19 p.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 The fishery closure	2
1.2 Prior research	2
1.3 Fishery re-opening	2
1.4 Project objectives	3
2. METHODS	3
2.1 Site selection	3
2.2 Sampling procedure	4
2.3 Data analyses	5
3. RESULTS	6
3.1 Survey site coverage	6
3.2 Pāua abundance trends	6
3.3 Length-frequency trends and recruitment patterns	10
4. DISCUSSION	11
4.1 Abundance trends	11
4.2 Recruitment patterns	12
4.3 Management implications	13
5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	13
6. REFERENCES	13
APPENDIX A – MODEL FIT AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLOTS	14
APPENDIX B – INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT ‘ZONES’	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

McCowan, T.A.¹; Neubauer, P.² (2023). **Pāua population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, February 2023 update.**

New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2023/26. 19 p.

The November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake caused coastal uplift resulting in high pāua (*Haliotis iris*) mortality and extensive loss of critical pāua habitats. The uplift affected approximately 120 km of coastline that supports significant customary, recreational, and commercial pāua fisheries. There has been a closure of the pāua fishery from the Conway River in the south to Marfells Beach in the north (the ‘closed area’) since November 2016 to allow for recovery of affected pāua populations. The fishery was re-opened for the first time for a three-month period on the 1st of December 2021.

The objective of this project was to monitor annually (since 2017) the abundance and length frequency of adult pāua populations in the closed area to estimate biomass trends to inform management actions at the scale of the closed fishery until mid-2023. This was achieved by continuing to monitor baseline estimates of pāua abundance and length-frequency profiles at selected sites within the closed area since 2017. These surveys have employed a modified timed-swim methodology to estimate site and area-wide (QMA) trends in pāua abundance and length frequency. Results from these surveys have shown an overall increase in adult biomass, and widespread juvenile recruitment, which supported the decision to re-open the fishery.

Data analysis followed the methods of McCowan & Neubauer (2022), namely using generalised linear mixed models. Additional diagnostics to those presented for previous surveys were inspected to ensure that the model adequately captured variation in survey data across various strata (e.g., survey strata, quota management areas, survey periods) and covariates. These efforts suggested that multi-modality in the response within survey sites is a key driver of high variability (CVs) in survey estimates, a feature that arises from patchiness of pāua distributions and is largely irreducible with limited survey effort.

During surveys undertaken during October-November 2021, all previously established survey sites were re-surveyed immediately prior to the re-opening of the fishery. After the fishing season, follow up surveys were attempted, but only 6 of 34 sites (in PAU 3A) were able to be surveyed due to poor conditions.

Analyses show that abundance of pāua (represented by estimated biomass per unit time effort) across all sites and at a fishery-wide scale has continued to increase during the most recent survey immediately prior to the fishing season. However, a decrease in abundance was estimated in PAU 3A after the fishing season. This is potentially due to the influence of poor survey conditions and bias towards low abundance sites with low site coverage.

General trends of increasing biomass are driven by the emergence of post-earthquake recruitment of small (<100 mm) pāua that are now visible during dive surveys, which is more consistently apparent in PAU 3A. In PAU 7, increasing biomass is more strongly driven by the increasing abundance of larger (>140 mm) pāua.

There is high variability in abundance and recruitment trends across surveyed sites which could be attributed to site-specific variability in uplift and habitat related factors. Overall, current trends continued to support the criteria for fishery re-opening until immediately prior to re-opening. There is uncertainty about the decrease in abundance detected after the fishing season in PAU 3A which will likely be resolved by data from surveys conducted in 2022–23.

¹ Pāua Industry Council Ltd., New Zealand.

² Dragonfly Data Science, New Zealand.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The fishery closure

The November 2016 earthquake caused coastal uplift of up to 6 m along approximately 120 km of coastline from Spyglass Point in the south to Marfells Beach in the north. This resulted in mass mortality of a range of species that inhabit the diverse shallow subtidal and intertidal habitats affected by the uplift. Pāua (*Haliotis iris*) populations in particular were severely impacted, with mass mortality at all life stages and significant loss of critical habitats. Of particular significance was the loss of intertidal and shallow subtidal rocky reef habitats (previously in less than 2 m of water) that support initial settlement and juvenile life stages. An initial assessment of the amount of the pāua fishery that was lost to the uplift was estimated at 21% of previously fished areas (Neubauer 2017). This initial finding and general observations of pāua mortality and habitat loss resulted in the emergency closure of the pāua fishery from the Conway River in the south to Marfells Beach in the north ('the closed area') under section 16 of the Fisheries Act.

The closed area contains pāua fisheries of high importance to recreational, customary, and commercial stakeholders. It spans two pāua quota management areas (QMAs), PAU 7 (Marlborough) and PAU 3 (Kaikōura-Canterbury), that have historically accounted for 15 t of total allowable commercial catch (TACC) from PAU 7 and 47 t from PAU 3 (approximately 16% and 50% of each respective QMA TACC). Since the closure, there has been a reduction of 50% of the TACC in PAU 3 and an ongoing industry initiated shelving of 12% of annual catch entitlement (ACE) in PAU 7. These effective reductions serve to stop the spread of displaced fishing effort into the remaining open parts of these QMAs. In April 2021, PAU 3 was sub-divided into two new QMAs, PAU 3A and PAU 3B (with the Conway River as the boundary). This was to help facilitate the implementation of new management strategies upon re-opening of the closed area (PAU 3A).

1.2 Prior research

Following the earthquake and closure of the pāua fishery, the Ministry for Primary Industries (now Fisheries New Zealand) funded a range of projects to assess ecological impacts of the earthquake to inform future management options. Pāua were specifically included in projects undertaken by the University of Canterbury (monitoring juvenile pāua recruitment in the intertidal zone) and by the Pāua Industry Council Ltd. (monitoring the abundance of mature pāua).

McCowan & Neubauer (2018) estimated pāua abundance and length-frequency profiles at 35 sites in the closed area, and at an area-wide scale (QMA), to establish baselines for further monitoring. In a two-year continuation of this project, re-surveying of initially surveyed sites showed an area-wide increase in pāua abundance, and evidence of post-earthquake recruitment into the shallow subtidal zone, with variability in trends between sites attributable to pre-earthquake abundance and the degree of uplift (McCowan & Neubauer 2021).

1.3 Fishery re-opening

The pāua fishery was re-opened for the first time since the closure on the 1st of December 2021 for a three-month period. The re-opening was initiated by a proposal by the Kaikōura Marine Guardians, recommending to the Minister that the fishery be re-opened based on the criteria that there has been "widespread emergence of post-earthquake recruits is observed across the fishery; and a sustained increase in pāua biomass is observed across the fishery". These criteria were adopted from the PauaMAC3 fisheries plan and supported by previous results from this project (McCowan & Neubauer 2018, 2021, 2022) and monitoring of juvenile pāua recruitment (Gerrity et al. 2020).

Commercial fishing recommenced with a TACC of 23 t in PAU 3A and under an agreed catch cap of 6 t in the earthquake affected part of PAU 7. Industry management measures were in place under the PauaMAC3 and PauaMAC7 Fisheries Plans. Recreational fishing recommenced with a bag limit of 5

pāua per person per day and minimum harvest size of 125 mm shell length. In total, 22.955 t of the TACC was harvested by the commercial sector in PAU 3A and 4.363 t in PAU 7. In PAU 7, harvesting was limited by poor diving conditions during the three-month season. Recreational harvest was estimated at 42 t in PAU 3A and 1.74 t in the earthquake affected part of PAU 7 (Holdsworth 2022).

In December 2022, the re-opening of the fishery was announced for commercial fishing on 5 January to 30 September 2023 and for the recreational fishery from 15 April to 15 June 2023.

1.4 Project objectives

This project is a three-year continuation of the monitoring established earlier by McCowan & Neubauer (2018) and continued by McCowan & Neubauer (2021) and McCowan & Neubauer (2022) with the following objectives:

- i. To complete pāua stock monitoring surveys to inform future management decisions at the scale of the earthquake fisheries closure in PAU 3 and PAU 7.
- ii. To monitor the abundance and length frequency of adult pāua populations to estimate biomass trends to inform management actions at the scale of the fishery closure until mid-2023.

The continuation of the surveys presented in this report was undertaken prior to the re-opening in December 2021 so the primary purpose this work is to inform management decisions relating to future adaptive management of the PAU 3A and PAU 7 East Coast fisheries. However, an attempt was also made to re-survey sites immediately after the fishing season to assess the effects of fishing on pāua abundance.

2. METHODS

The general survey design for this project is the same as that employed in earlier assessments of pāua abundance in the closed area (McCowan & Neubauer 2018, McCowan & Neubauer 2021), and data analyses were employed as given by McCowan & Neubauer (2022). The following is a summary of the methodologies employed.

2.1 Site selection

Site selection was based on data-driven stratification. Sampling points were allocated only within strata representing areas relevant to the fishery.

Stratification procedure

Survey sites were selected from within strata of high, medium, and low fishery utilisation. Stratification was undertaken using all available data-logger data (industry collected GPS-referenced fine-scale catch and effort data) from 2013 to 2016 from the closed area to calculate utilisation density using two dimensional kernel-based smoothing of all available dive locations. The utilisation density was then intersected with the coastline to produce a 1-dimensional map of utilisation (Figure 1). The utilisation density was cut (within each QMA) at cumulative probability levels of 5–20% (low use), 20–80% (medium use), and 80–100% (high use) to define strata for sample allocation.

Assigning sampling points

A predetermined number of sampling points were allocated in each stratum, weighted towards more samples in high- and medium-use strata (Figure 1). The number of allocated sites was initially based on a realistic number of sites that could be surveyed over one season (from approximately November to February), equating to approximately 30 dive days. Three sites (one in PAU 7 and two in PAU 3A) were fixed to be aligned with intertidal juvenile pāua surveys being conducted by the University of Canterbury. Back-up sites were also selected to give a sampling option when the primary site could not be surveyed due to poor diving conditions (i.e., swell over 1 m or visibility under 1 m). Based on the

described criteria, 36 sites were allocated with 12 primary sites in PAU 3A and 6 in PAU 7, with an equivalent number of back-up sites. During initial baseline surveys, 35 sites (23 in PAU 3A and 12 in PAU 7) were surveyed (McCowan & Neubauer 2018, 2021, 2022). Over successive survey periods, attempts were made to re-survey these same sites to estimate longitudinal trends in pāua abundance at a site and an area-wide scale.




Figure 1: Extracted fishery use strata, established from the utilisation density by intersecting the density with the coastline to produce a 1-d line, and then dividing the cumulative 1-dimensional use distribution into inter-quantile ranges as described in the text. Selected sites (black) as well as fall-back points (white) for the Kaikōura pāua survey, in relation to fishery use strata. Note that many first-choice sites are nearly co-located with fall-back sites and therefore difficult to distinguish. UC sites are those that were fixed to coincide with University of Canterbury sites for juvenile monitoring.

2.2 Sampling procedure

Dive surveys were conducted by a crew of three snorkel divers with commercial pāua diving experience. As much as possible, the same divers were used for surveys in each QMA to maintain consistency. At each sampling point a length of approximately 100 m was haphazardly delimited using float-lines or obvious geographical boundaries set by a neutral advisor so prior knowledge about pāua abundance could not be used by divers to bias the selection of the survey area within each site. Each area was roughly divided into three smaller areas and allocated to each diver to survey. In the first three surveys

(i.e., McCowan & Neubauer 2018, 2021), each diver wore a GPS dive logger ('turtle unit') during the surveys to delimit the area swum to calculate pāua density estimates. However, due to issues with data quality from the turtle units, their use was discontinued during the fourth survey round, and a proxy for density (measurements/biomass per unit time effort, or MPUE/BPUE) has been adopted (explained in detail under data analyses).

Some sites additional to those allocated under the procedure described above were also surveyed. These sites were those of interest to commercial divers and were surveyed opportunistically when conditions were favourable at these sites, but not at those allocated under the sampling procedure. Data from these sites were kept and used for observational purposes (e.g., in recruitment detection) but were not included in overall analyses.

2.3 Data analyses

Earlier stages of this project developed a novel survey design to overcome some of the issues associated with previously trialled timed-swim methodologies for estimating pāua abundance. These methods relied on estimating pāua densities at allocated sites using a modified timed-swim design, using GPS 'turtle loggers' worn by divers to account for areas swum by divers. However, after the initial round of surveys, a number of problems were encountered with the overall design. In summary, these problems were due to a large amount of survey data having to be discarded due to missing GPS positions from dive loggers and difficulties in accurately estimating detection probability and up-scaling density estimates to absolute biomass (see McCowan & Neubauer 2021).

To address these issues, McCowan & Neubauer (2021) tested the number of measurements per unit time effort (MPUE) as a potential proxy for relative density differences, similar to catch per unit effort being used as a proxy for biomass in fisheries stock assessments. That analysis confirmed MPUE as a suitable predictor, showing an approximate 1:1 relationship between density and MPUE (slope=1.00, se = 0.06; Figure A-1). MPUE was then converted to biomass per unit time effort (BPUE) as a reliable index of abundance.

Trends between surveys were then assessed using a Bayesian generalised linear mixed model to estimate: i) the overall survey year effect, ii) a survey year within industry management areas (zones A-D in PAU 3A and zones A-D in PAU 7) (Figures B-1, B-2), iii) a survey year within QMA effect, and iv) a survey year within site effect. Note that ii) differs from previous analyses which considered a priori fishery use strata, which are less relevant since the re-opening of the fishery. Updated fishery management strata are now in use to determine catch-caps and minimum harvest sizes, and these updated management strata (zones A-D) were therefore used. We used a truncated normal distribution to model the error in the (square root-transformed) response variable, with truncation to exclude negative numbers from the support of the error distribution. We also included predictors for potential nuisance variables (swell, visibility, depth, and cryptic rating) to remove potentially confounding effects (e.g., those that would affect detection probability). Survey site, diver, and survey period within site were estimated as random effects; all other parameters were specified as fixed effects. The full model may be written in the R package brms (Bürkner 2018) as:

```
sqrt(BPUE) ~ depth + visibility + cryptic_rating + QMA_zone*survey_period + survey_period*QMA + survey_period:uplift + (1|diver) + (1|site_code) + (1|site_code:survey_period)
```

Additional diagnostics to those presented for previous surveys were inspected to ensure that the model adequately captured variation in survey data across various strata (e.g., survey strata, QMAs, survey periods) and covariates. For continuous covariates (here depth and cryptic rating as the two most influential variables), diagnostics were calculated as errors of posterior predictive means (residuals) which were plotted against the covariates to inspect for potentially non-linear relationships. For model strata, we plotted posterior predictive densities against raw densities to ensure that the model captures variability within all model strata.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Survey site coverage

The first round of surveys undertaken during the initial project (McCowan & Neubauer 2018) resulted in a total of 34 sites surveyed (23 in PAU 3A and 11 in PAU 7). The number of sites surveyed initially was higher than the proposed number of ‘primary’ sites because favourable survey conditions and efficient surveying times enabled several ‘back-up’ sites to be surveyed in both QMAs. Further, due to access and logistical constraints in some remote sites, additional sites were surveyed haphazardly when crews were in the area and where it was not possible to access sites further afield that day. Baseline estimates of pāua density and length-frequency distributions were made across all of these sites (as well as other descriptive statistics).

The continuation of the project over the last three years has seen four more rounds of surveys attempted across all initially surveyed sites: 21 out of 34 sites were re-surveyed during the second survey period, 33 out of 34 during the third, and 31 out of 34 during the fourth. Over these years, incomplete coverage of sites was due to consistently poor survey conditions (large swell or poor visibility) during the survey period and/or logistical constraints. In the most recent fifth survey period, 34 out of 34 sites were surveyed immediately prior to the fishery re-opening (on the 1st of December 2021) during October and November 2021. Surveys were also attempted post-fishing season (after 28 February 2022) to assess the effects of the fishing season on pāua abundance at surveyed sites. However, poor survey conditions meant that only 6 of 34 sites (all in PAU 3A) were able to be surveyed post-fishing season (April and May 2022).

3.2 Pāua abundance trends

Figure 2 shows raw pāua abundance data expressed in measurements per hour by individual divers across sites within different fishery use strata. This shows that the number of pāua counted by each diver at each site was consistently variable across all survey periods. While there is a general trend of increasing numbers of pāua measured across the first five survey periods, there was a decrease in numbers measured at sites during the post-fishing season. There is no obvious link between abundance trends and fishery use strata.




Figure 2: Numbers of pāua counted per hour at each site across five survey periods, with points indicating results from individual divers, and lines showing the range. Colour indicates the survey stratum.

Measurement data shown in Figure 2 were used to model BPUE as proxy of pāua density. Models on square-root-transformed data had adequate fits (Figure A-2 and A-3). Estimates of coefficients are shown in Figure A-4. Coefficients for confounding variables were close to expectation, with lower visibility, higher cryptic rating, depth, and swell leading to less measurements/biomass per unit time (Figures A-5 to A-8), noting that surveys only took place when conditions were acceptable for diving (i.e., swell less than 2 m).

In PAU 7, overall pāua abundance, as approximated by BPUE, has increased steadily between the first and last survey periods. In PAU 3A, the same increase in abundance was observed until the 2021–22 pre-fishing survey period, with a decrease in abundance observed after the three-month fishing season (2021–22 post-fishing period). In PAU 3A, there was also a slight downwards trend between the first and second survey periods. Overall increases in abundances at the QMA level were slightly more pronounced in PAU 7 (Figure 3).

There was high variability in abundance trends across surveys periods between all surveyed sites. This variability was related in part to the variability in the amount of uplift at each site, as those with a larger increase in abundance were generally those with less uplift. There was no apparent relationship between previous fishery use strata and abundance trends (Figure 4).

Figure 5 shows abundance trends estimated for management ‘zones’ that have been determined by industry (PauaMAC3 and PauaMAC7) for the ongoing management and monitoring of the fishery following the re-opening (Figures B-1 and B-2). These are illustrated as they are likely to be the scales across which stock assessment is applied. Similar trends were observed across all zones, with the slight decreases in abundance during the 2021–22 pre- and post-fishing survey periods in PAU 3A, also reflected across the PAU 3A zones.




Figure 3: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for QMAs PAU 3A and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 4: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1 at each site) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for all sites (see McCowan & Neubauer 2018), plotted across industry management ‘zones’ (‘Regions’) in QMAs PAU 3A and PAU 7 from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.




Figure 5: Marginal trend (relative to a geometric mean of 1) in biomass per unit effort (BPUE) across survey years for PAU 3A and PAU 7 management ‘zones’ from the BPUE model after accounting for confounding variables.

Model diagnostics suggested that multi-modality in the response within survey sites (Figure A-2) is a key driver of high variability (CVs) in survey estimates. Although the model itself fits the data by introducing sufficient residual variation (Figure A-2), it appears to do so to accommodate the strong multi-modality in the data that is not explained by the model covariates or stratification. PAU 3A also showed a more multi-modal distribution overall than PAU 7, which had a more dominant mode at smaller biomass per unit time estimates (Figure A-2). However, this feature stems from within site variability (Figure 2) rather than variability among sites within strata and is therefore not easily reducible by further stratification.

3.3 Length-frequency trends and recruitment patterns

Length frequencies of pāua were analysed across all sites and survey periods to make size class and recruitment observations at QMA levels (Figure 6). In PAU 3A, length-frequency profiles have been reasonably stable across the larger size classes (125–150 mm) across all survey periods, whereas in PAU 7 there has been an observable increase in large pāua (>140 mm) in the recent survey periods.




Figure 6: Length-frequency profiles (as relative densities) for all pāua measured over five survey periods in PAU 3A and PAU 7. Vertical lines show the legal size of 125 mm (minimum legal size; solid line), 135 mm (dashed line), and 145 mm (dotted line).

There has generally been an increase in the number of individuals in the 80–100mm size class across survey periods in PAU 3A. This trend also exists for PAU 7; however, there was a noticeable decrease in small size classes during the 2020–21 survey period.

Figure 7 shows the length-frequency profiles of pāua over all survey periods at each site, with the x-axis showing pāua less than 100 mm, which helps to visualise post-earthquake recruitment patterns at each site. As with general patterns with pāua abundance across QMAs, trends in length-frequency profiles are subject to considerable variation between sites. Differences are most apparent in the changes in abundance of pāua in smaller size classes (80–100 mm) and the overall number of pāua being measured at each site.




Figure 7: Length-frequency profiles (by number of pāua measured) for individual sites surveyed over five survey periods. X-axis shows only individuals less than 100 mm.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Abundance trends

Abundance trends represented by BPUE over the survey period, over the fifth year of monitoring until immediately prior to the re-opening of the fishery in December 2021, showed a continued increase in abundance in pāua in both PAU 3A and PAU 7 QMAs. Up until the time of the fishery re-opening, these trends provide continuing evidence of sustained increase in pāua biomass being observed across the fishery, further supporting the criteria for re-opening.

A survey was attempted immediately after the three-month fishing season (2021–22 post-fishing period) and portrayed a notable decrease in abundance. During this period, only 6 sites were able to be surveyed due to consistently poor survey conditions. The conditions were generally worse than what had been typically experienced during the more settled spring-summer period when previous surveys have been undertaken. While visibility and swell conditions are recorded and accounted for in estimated BPUE, the previous ability to target much more optimum conditions may mean that these factors were not enough to accurately be accounted for in these much poorer conditions. Further, the small number of sampling sites means that abundance estimates may have been biased if sites were of low abundance, or if they had been subjected to higher fishing pressure than other areas during the fishing season. Trends estimated by the following round of surveys in 2022–23 will help to clarify whether this estimated decrease in abundance after the fishing season is a true signal.

A slight downward trend is also present between the first and second survey period in PAU 3A and may be attributable to the same influences of poor survey conditions and site abundance bias discussed above.

In PAU 3A, general increases in abundance can be attributed to the sustained increase in abundance of pāua across all size classes. Pāua in the < 100 mm size classes are most likely to be post-earthquake recruits that have emerged into more open habitats and are now detectable in dive surveys. In PAU 7, increases in BPUE could be explained by increasing abundance of large pāua growing through to larger size classes (> 130 mm); however, this does not appear to be due to significant increases in recruitment of emergent pāua (Figures 6 and 7).

There is notable variability in abundance trends between sites (Figure 4). This could be attributed to variability in the amount of uplift at sites and habitat related factors which make it harder to detect pāua of smaller size classes during dive surveys. Trends in some sites show that abundance may be starting to plateau (e.g., KAI33, KAI36), suggesting these sites may be close to their maximum carrying capacity for pāua within the habitats surveyed. Results from surveys for the remainder of this project will help to determine this. Figure 4 also indicates that sites that experienced higher uplift have shown weaker positive abundance trends than lower uplift sites. This is expected, because monitoring in sites with little to no uplift is really showing a ‘marine reserve’ effect, rather than population recovery post-earthquake.

Variability in abundance and uplift across sites has been considered by PāuaMAC3 in the development of their management tools with the re-opening, formalised in their 2021–2022 annual operating plan. Specifically, catch spreading has been implemented to take fishing effort away from areas with higher uplift and lower pāua abundance.

Differences in overall abundance over survey periods between PAU 3A and PAU 7 are likely to be attributable to pre-earthquake stock status, where it is anecdotally accepted that PAU 7 was under high fishing pressure relative to PAU 3A.

4.2 Recruitment patterns

Length-frequency profiles illustrate that PAU 3A has maintained a relatively stable length-frequency profile of mature pāua over all the survey periods (Figure 6). In PAU 7, there is evidence of an increase in larger pāua (>140 mm) across survey periods. This could be explained by the pre-earthquake stock status of PAU 7 relative to PAU 3A (described above), and the growth of pāua into larger size classes in PAU 7 following the closure, where pāua are anecdotally known to grow larger.

The general pattern of increasing numbers of 80–100 mm pāua in both QMAs is indicative of post-earthquake recruitment. In PAU 7, there is a noticeable decrease in the numbers of smaller pāua during the 2020–21 survey period. This may be due to individual variability in the sites that were able to be surveyed during this period, with potential bias towards sites with a lower abundance of smaller size classes, or sites where the habitat does not favour the emergence and detection of smaller size classes and may also be reflective of variation in recruitment generally.

The variability in post- earthquake recruitment across sites (Figure 7) can be attributed to these habitat related factors and is also illustrative of the fine-scale annual variability in recruitment known to occur in pāua generally (Wilson & Schiel 1995). Overall, post-earthquake recruitment pulses in the last two years can be observed across the majority of sites, meaning these results continue to support one of the agreed criteria for re-opening, that “widespread emergence of post-earthquake recruits is observed across the fishery”.

4.3 Management implications

Previous results from monitoring surveys were used to support the decision to re-open the fishery on the 1st of December 2021 for three months. Results from the most recent round of surveys continued to support the re-opening criteria immediately prior to re-opening. The 2021–22 post-fishing season surveys suggested a decrease in abundance; however, as discussed above it is inconclusive whether this is a true signal. The results from the following season’s surveys (2022–23) will be critical in monitoring the ongoing abundance and how the fishery has responded to the 2022–23 fishing season.

It is intended that BPUE will be used as an index of abundance (in conjunction with fisheries dependent data) to inform management procedures governed by a harvest control rule, to allow for the adaptive rebuild of the commercial fishery through following seasons.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded by Fisheries New Zealand project PAU2020-02. We acknowledge Fisheries New Zealand, and in particular Rich Ford, for support during the early stages of the project. We thank Tim McLeod, Pat Reid, Barry Chandler, Shayne Cuff, Phil Richardson, and Jason Ruawai for their services during dive surveys. In particular, we acknowledge the logistical and boat support of Tim McLeod, Phil Richardson, and Jason Ruawai. We thank Professor David Schiel and members of the University of Canterbury Marine Ecology Lab and Robyn Dunmore (Cawthron Institute) for their collaboration with aligning sites for surveys across various projects.

6. REFERENCES

- Burkner, P. (2018). Advanced Bayesian multilevel modelling with the R package brms. *The R Journal* 10: 395–411.
- Gerrity, S.; Alestra, T.; Fischman, H. S.; Schiel, D. R. (2020). Earthquake effects on abalone habitats and populations in southern New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 656: 153–161.
- Holdsworth, J. (2022) Harvest estimates from land-based amateur fishers – Kaikōura Marine Area to Marfell’s Beach. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/40*. 31p.
- McCowan, T.; Neubauer, P. (2018). Pāua biomass estimates and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2018/54*. 24 p.
- McCowan, T.; Neubauer, P. (2021). Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2021/26*. 23 p.
- McCowan, T.; Neubauer, P. (2022). Pāua abundance trends and population monitoring in areas affected by the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake, December 2021 update. *New Zealand Fisheries Assessment Report 2022/15*. 20 p.
- Neubauer, P. (2017). Area lost to the pāua fishery from the November 2016 Kaikōura earthquake. 7 p. (Report to the Ministry for Primary Industries, held by Fisheries New Zealand.)
- Wilson, N.H.F.; Schiel, D.R. (1995). Reproduction of two species of abalone (*Haliotis iris* and *H. australis*) in southern New Zealand. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 46 (3): 629–637.

APPENDIX A – MODEL FIT AND SUPPLEMENTARY PLOTS




Figure A-1: Relationship between density in (log) individuals per unit area, and measurements per unit time (MPUE), for the three different survey periods (shapes) and divers (colours).




Figure A-2: Model fit by QMA for the model relating biomass per unit effort (BPUE) to predictors, as assessed by draws from the posterior predictive distribution (blue lines) compared with the empirical density for density data (black line).




Figure A-3: Quantiles of residuals relative to expected quantiles, showing adequate fit of the model employed for survey analysis.




Figure A-4: Estimated coefficients in the biomass per unit effort (BPUE) model.




Figure A-5: Effect of cryptic rating in the biomass per unit effort (BPUE) model, as assessed by its marginal impact on BPUE.




Figure A-6: Effect of visibility in the biomass per unit effort (BPUE) model, as assessed by its marginal impact on BPUE.




Figure A-7: Effect of depth in the biomass per unit effort (BPUE) model, as assessed by its marginal impact on BPUE.




Figure A-8: Effect of swell in the biomass per unit effort (BPUE) model, as assessed by its marginal impact on BPUE.

APPENDIX B – INDUSTRY MANAGEMENT ‘ZONES’




Figure B-1: Statistical area map showing PauaMAC3 management zones.




Figure B-2: Statistical area map showing PauaMAC7 management zones.