Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
Journal canadien des sciences halieutiques et aquatiques

Habitat suitability modeling based on a spatio-temporal model: an example for Cusk in the Gulf of Maine

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2017-0316.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Runnebaum, Jocelyn; University of Maine, School of Marine Science Guan, Lisha; University of Maine, School of Marine Sciences Cao, Jie; University of Maine, school of marine sciences O'Brien, Loretta; National Marine Fisheries Service - NOAA, Northeast Fisheries Science Center Chen, Yong; University of Maine,
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	N/A
Keyword:	model-based Habitat Suitability Indices, spatio-temporal delta-generalized linear mixed models, data limited approaches, cusk

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Habitat suitability modeling based on a spatio-temporal model: an example for Cusk in the Gulf of Maine

Jocelyn Runnebaum^{1*}, Lisha Guan^{1,2}, Jie Cao¹, Loretta O’Brien³, and Yong Chen¹

¹*University of Maine, School of Marine Sciences, 5741 Libby Hall, Orono, ME 04469*

²*Key Laboratory for Sustainable Utilization of Marine Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Fishery Sciences, Qingdao 266071, China*

³*NOAA/NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole Laboratory, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA, 02543*

**Corresponding Author: tel: +1 817-793-8541; fax: +1 207-581-4990, email: jocelyn.runnebaum@maine.edu*

Keywords: Habitat Suitability Index models, spatio-temporal model-based abundance indices, data limited, cusk

Abstract

Habitat use and distribution is a critical aspect in the management and conservation of a species, particularly for those in decline. Habitat suitability indices (HSI) are a common method of habitat mapping dependent on empirical data that can easily lead to misunderstanding the spatio-temporal dynamics of marine species experiencing population decline and density-dependent catchability within surveys. This is especially true when only a single monitoring program with limited spatio-temporal coverage is used. A delta-GLMM was used to combine trawl and longline surveys to predict density estimates for Cusk (*Brosme brosme*) in un-sampled locations for use in HSIs. Catchability was estimated for longline and trawl gear without having an estimate of area fished for the longline survey. HSIs performed better using model-based density estimates from multiple surveys compared to sample-based abundance indices from a single survey. The increased spatial resolution can better inform the HSIs by providing information where the survey programs did not sample. This study provides a novel approach for integrating data from different monitoring programs for habitat modeling.

1 Introduction

Habitat use and distribution is a critical aspect in the management and conservation of a species, particularly for those in decline. Habitat suitability indices (HSI) are a method of assessing relative habitat quality for a species based on abundance at associated environmental conditions for a given location (Brooks 1997; Chen et al. 2009). The HSI can be projected spatially and temporally, providing valuable representation of changes in habitat quality over space and time and potential locations of a species' critical habitat (Chen et al. 2009). Such information is critical for implementing spatially explicit conservation management (Brooks 1997), evaluating shifts in habitat quality over time (Guan et al. 2017; Tanaka and Chen 2016), or understanding the impact of climate variability on suitable habitat distribution (Yu et al. 2016). Recent efforts have been made to improve the predictive capabilities of spatially projected HSIs (Tanaka and Chen 2015; Tanaka and Chen 2016). However, these efforts do not address two critical shortcomings of conventional HSIs: 1) the abundance indices from survey catch data typically incorporated in these models do not account for changes in catchability over a time series; and 2) the commonly used abundance indices, and therefore HSIs, are unable to incorporate surveys from multiple gear types which sample different segments of the population and likely cover different types of habitat. These issues need to be addressed in order to produce an unbiased evaluation of spatio-temporal changes in habitat quality for a species over its distributional range.

Conventional HSIs have been extensively applied to aquatic species by utilizing abundance indices derived from survey catch data (e.g., catch per unit effort, CPUE; Terrell 1984; Terrell and Carpenter 1997; Morris and Ball 2006). HSIs assume that high density of a species indicates

high quality habitat and that the absence or low density of a species indicates habitat of low value to the species. The use of catch data as a proxy for density assumes that sampled catches truly reflect the density or absence of a species at a given location and are not confounded by stock status, sampling inefficiency and bias. This assumption may be reasonable for species that have relatively constant and high survey catchability over space and time. However, for less-abundant species that are poorly sampled (e.g., low survey catchability or reside in habitat that is not well covered by the survey program), or for which survey catchability has changed over time, conventional HSIs may perform poorly or even produce biased results.

Conventional HSIs use available data from sampled locations, hereinafter referred to as sample-based HSIs, which are often restricted to the locations of occurrence and typically processed to assume that the samples are representative (i.e., the species is effectively sampled) and are comparable through time (i.e., no changes in sampling distribution and efficiency). Therefore, the sample-based HSIs might not be appropriate in at least the following two situations: 1) the survey misses a significant portion or type of the species' habitat; and 2) sampling efficiency (i.e., catchability) changes over space and/or through time due to density-dependent processes. Density-dependent habitat selection is a likely process for species in decline (MacCall 1990). When a species population is high, individuals move into previously marginal habitat because high quality habitat is saturated; thus, the overall suitability of all occupied habitat declines on average (MacCall 1990). Conversely, as populations decline, individuals retreat to the highest suitable habitat as it becomes less densely occupied and available (MacCall 1990; Hare et al. 2012).

Another limitation of sample-based HSIs arise when data from multiple surveys are available for a species. Attempts to combine data from multiple surveys face serious difficulties, including quantifying the relative differences of catchability among different sampling gear (i.e., trawl and longline). Such complications often result in discarding data by trimming the survey data to common surveyed areas and time periods with consistent survey methods, utilizing probability of presence (Grüss et al. 2017; Brotons et al. 2004) or utilizing only one data set when multiples are available (Tanaka and Chen 2016). This is often unsatisfactory due to losses in spatial coverage given that different surveys of different gear types usually sample different areas or habitats. For example, trawl surveys likely do not sample rocky habitat as well as longline surveys. If rocky bottom is one of a species' preferred habitat types, using only trawl surveys for developing HSIs could bias the results.

Cusk (*Brosme brosme*) in the Gulf of Maine is one species where assessment is difficult using conventional HSIs. It is a data-limited species, with low abundance and low catchability. Catchability of cusk is believed to have declined in the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) spring and fall bottom trawl surveys (BTS) presumably due to declines in stock abundance (Davies and Jonsen 2011; Hare et al. 2012), resulting in density-dependent catchability within the BTS. Additionally, changes to the survey protocols over the time series could influence the catchability of cusk in the BTS. In 2009, the BTS changed the sampling vessel, net type, and tow duration (Politis et al. 2014). The protocol changes in 2009 required the estimation of conversion coefficients for all species to allow for the data to be combined into a continuous time series (Miller et al. 2010). However, low catch numbers and low frequency of occurrence of cusk during the calibration study prevented conversion coefficients to be estimated

for cusk (Miller et al. 2010). An operational stock assessment review in 2009 rejected the proposed analytical assessment and determined that a more representative index of abundance is needed for cusk (NEFSC 2013).

Declines in catch of cusk, and similar groundfish species, within the BTS prompted the development of the NEFSC cooperative research bottom longline survey (LLS) in the Western Gulf of Maine to enhance monitoring efforts for data poor and depleted stocks residing in rocky habitat in order to develop a more representative index of abundance (Hoey et al. 2013). The Cusk population is now monitored by these two multispecies survey programs. These two survey programs differ in sampling efficiency, spatial coverage, and duration. Rocky, complex habitat, thought to be utilized by cusk (Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002; Hare et al. 2012), is not well sampled by the BTS. However, The LLS is designed to sample rocky, complex bottom types more effectively than the BTS covering the same region, due to the nature of the gear. Both survey programs are stratified by depth and overlap in the Western Gulf of Maine.

In the case of cusk, the BTS would likely not provide a realistic evaluation of habitat quality because of catch declines over the time series and poor sampling in rocky habitat. Conventional habitat modeling based on either BTS or LLS would likely produce biased results. This study proposes a modeling framework for use with data-limited species such as cusk by combining the bottom trawl survey and the bottom longline survey data to derive model-based density estimates to improve spatial resolution of data for use in HSIs. The results from the model-based HSI are contrasted with those derived from sample-based HSI to test the hypothesis that HSI

performance would improve with the use of higher resolution spatial information from combining multiple surveys and imputing values for un-sampled locations.

2 Methods

2.1 Survey and Environmental Data

Data on cusk abundance are available from the NEFSC spring and fall bottom trawl surveys (1980-2015) and the NEFSC spring and fall bottom longline surveys (2014-2015). The BTS is a demersal, multispecies, depth stratified random survey synoptic of the GOM and GB (Politis et al. 2014). The NEFSC developed a depth stratified random longline survey in the western and central GOM to better sample species that primarily reside in complex habitat (Hoey et al. 2013). Six survey strata were selected for the LLS from ten offshore and four inshore strata from the BTS. This survey also samples in the spring and fall to coincide with the BTS and randomly samples hard bottom sites within each stratum (Hoey et al. 2013). The LLS follows the tidal cycle, with gear deployed one hour before slack tide and fished for two hours. The longline gear is one nautical mile long, with 1000 semi-circle hooks baited with squid set within a three-nautical mile grid (Hoey et al. 2013).

Environmental variables known to impact cusk habitat are depth, temperature, and sediment type (Hare et al. 2012). Cusk have been documented between 18 m and 1000 m and are thought to tolerate temperatures between 0 °C and 14 °C, with the majority of cusk occurring between 6 °C and 10 °C in the GOM (Cohen et al. 1990; Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002). Cusk are hypothesized to prefer rock, gravel, or pebble sediment but are known to inhabit mud areas in the

GOM, excluding smooth sand (Cohen et al. 1990; Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002). These three environmental variables were used to develop HSIs for the GOM and GB regions.

Simulated bottom temperature data (1980-2013) were obtained from the Northeast Coastal Ocean Forecast System (NECOFS) integrated atmosphere-ocean model forecast system for the GOM, GB, and New England Shelf regions. The simulated temperature data were generated from an unstructured Finite-Volume Community Ocean Model (FVCOM) grid for these regions (Beardsley et al. 2013; NECOFS 2013) and averaged over the primary two months when the surveys were conducted.

For sample-based HSIs, depth data from the BTS were used. For model-based HSIs depth was extracted from the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO) 30 arc-second interval grid. Sediment data were extracted from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) East-Coast Sediment Texture Database (Poppe et al. 2014) using Geographic Information System (GIS). *In situ* temperature data are not available for the model-based density estimates used in the HSI since these come from model projections. To compare design-based and model-based HSIs the same temperature data were used in both analyses to not confound results by developing HSIs from different types of temperature data (i.e., observed versus simulated). Additionally, a seasonal average can represent the environmental conditions a species would encounter during a season relative to an instantaneous temperature.

The study area was divided into 5,710 cells ($0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$) for predicting grid-based densities, which were then used to develop model-based HSIs by season. Simulated environmental

variables were assigned to the beginning of the trawl survey location for sample-based HSIs and to the center of 0.05° x 0.05° grid cells for model-based HSIs.

2.2 Spatial-Temporal Model for Predicting Species Density

A spatio-temporal delta-generalized linear mixed model (delta-GLMM) initially developed by Thorson et al. (2015) was applied (using the *VAST* package in R; Thorson et al. 2017; Thorson and Barnett 2017) to data collected from both NEFSC BTS and LLS to estimate cusk density for each season (i.e., spring and fall) from 1980 – 2015, to match the timing of simulated temperature data. This is a two-stage model that ultimately infers population density throughout the study area. Survey data are fit in two stages by: (1) estimating the probability of encountering and catching cusk (i.e., presence/absence) then (2) estimating catches (*C*) when cusk are present (Thorson et al. 2015).

The first model component estimates the probability (*p*) of catching at least one of the target species:

$$\Pr [C > 0] = p \tag{1}$$

The second stage of the model approximates positive catches (*c*):

$$\Pr[C = c | C > 0] = \text{Gamma}(c, \sigma^{-2}, \lambda\sigma^2) \tag{2}$$

The probability density function Gamma (*c*, *x*, *y*) is evaluated at *c* given a gamma distribution, where λ is the expected catch if encountered, and σ is the coefficient of variation for positive catches (Thorson and Ward 2014; Thorson et al. 2015).

Spatial autocorrelation is incorporated into the model as a random effect to account for the spatial dependence of species density. Two Gaussian Markov random fields are two included in both stages of the model as a random effect to account for spatial (ω) and spatio-temporal (ε) autocorrelation (Thorson et al. 2015). The random fields are approximated at 250 pre-specified knots that are generated based on the proportional density of survey data over the defined domain (i.e., the $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ grid; Thorson et al. 2015). The spatial (ω) and spatio-temporal (ε) random effects were used in both spring and fall density estimates.

Encounter probability p and positive catch rates λ are approximated using linear predictors (Thorson et al. 2015):

$$p_i = \text{logit}^{-1} \left(d_{T(i)}^{(p)} + Q_i^{(p)} + \omega_{J(i)}^{(p)} + \varepsilon_{J(i),T(i)}^{(p)} \right) \quad (3)$$

$$\lambda_i = w_i \exp \left(d_{T(i)}^{(\lambda)} + Q_i^{(\lambda)} + \omega_{J(i)}^{(\lambda)} + \varepsilon_{J(i),T(i)}^{(\lambda)} \right) \quad (4)$$

where p_i and λ_i are the expected probabilities of an occupied habitat and positive catches given occupied habitat for sample i at a given location; $d_{T(i)}$ is the average reference density (encounters/positive catch rates) in year $T(i)$; Q_i is catchability for each survey; w_i is the area swept for sample i ; J_i is the nearest knot to sample i ; $\omega_{J(i)}$ is a random field accounting for spatially correlated variability at knot J_i that is persistent among years; $\varepsilon_{J(i),T(i)}$ is the random field accounting for spatio-temporal correlation at knot J_i in year $T(i)$ (Thorson et al. 2015). Spatial and spatial-temporal random fields were used in all models for both seasons.

A design matrix with indicator variables for each survey is used to estimate Q_i . This study assumes the need to estimate three catchability parameters due to the BTS protocol changes in

2009 and the inclusion of the LLS. A three-column design matrix was built using *ThorsonUtilities* with as many rows as observations and reduced to a two-column matrix for identifiability. The 2009 protocol changes cause the intercepts of Q_i and $d_{T(i)}$ to be collinear due to a lack of variance in Q_i in a given year as a result of two non-overlapping time-blocks in the BTS. To resolve this issue, year effect was modeled via a temporal autocorrelation structure:

$$\beta_1(t+1) \sim \text{Normal}(\rho * \beta_1(t), \sigma_{\beta_1}^2) \quad (5)$$

$$\beta_2(t+1) \sim \text{Normal}(\rho * \beta_2(t), \sigma_{\beta_2}^2) \quad (6)$$

where ρ_{β_1} and ρ_{β_2} are defined as a random walk as specified in the model (Thorson 2017).

Catchability is then removed from the model and the underlying species density is predicted at each knot. Grid cells are assigned the density of the nearest knot based on closest Euclidean distance calculated using the Voronoi tool in the *PBSmapping* package in R (Schnute et al. 2013). Density fields are then extracted for each grid cell to use within the HSIs.

Within the delta-GLMM, catch rate was estimated as catch number by area swept (Thorson et al. 2015). Area swept for the BTS tows in the GOM has been standardized as 0.024km^2 for the *Bigelow*, and 0.038km^2 for the *Albatross IV* and the *Delaware II* (NEFSC 2013). The area fished ($A_{i,y} \text{ km}^2$) for the LLS is calculated as the distance between the beginning location of the longline and the end of the longline set in km (L) times an estimated bait plume (b) along the length of the longline for each sample site (i) in a given year (y).

$$A_{i,y} = L_{i,y} b \quad (8)$$

The bait plume (b) is assumed to be a fixed constant (0.28 km) for all years and all locations. Evaluation of the impact of varying bait plume sizes on density estimates can be found in Appendix I.

2.3 Habitat Suitability Indices

HSIs quantify the overall habitat quality for a species by evaluating species density associated with each selected environmental variable. Suitability Indices (SI) quantify the relationship between an environmental variable and species abundance at a given location (Terrell 1984; Terrell and Carpenter 1997; Morris and Ball 2006). SIs are then combined either through a geometric mean (GMM) or an arithmetic mean (AMM) to derive an overall habitat suitability index to quantify habitat quality from relatively good (1) to relatively bad (0) (Chen et al. 2009; Tanaka and Chen 2016). HSIs assume that locations with the highest abundance have the highest quality habitat for that organism.

Season-specific HSIs were developed for 1980 - 2013 mean conditions using two different types of abundance indices to compare the performance of model-based HSIs relative to sample-based HSIs. CPUE (i.e., catch number per area swept) from the BTS was used as the abundance index for the sample-based HSIs. Model-based density estimates derived from both the BTS and LLS were extracted for each cell and used in the model-based HSIs. All abundance indices were calculated separately for spring (i.e., April - May) and fall (i.e., October - November). The time series for cusk used in this study is from 1980 to 2015, however simulated monthly mean temperature data were only available up to 2013 at the time of writing. All data (i.e., observed CPUE and model-based density) were trimmed to 1980-2013 and averaged for the entire time series. NECOFS simulated bottom temperatures (Chen et al. 2006) were averaged by season for the time series. Mean environmental data (i.e., bottom temperature, depth, and sediment type) were extracted for the beginning latitude and longitude for each trawl haul and for each grid center using GIS.

Fisher natural breaks were used to bin the continuous environmental variables of depth and bottom temperature (Bivand 2013; Tanaka and Chen 2016). Sensitivity analyses were conducted to determine both the most appropriate number of bins for each model and the minimum bin size (5-8 bins). Categorical sediment data were extracted from the USGS sediment layer and the nine defined sediment types were used as bins (Poppe et al. 2005).

For the sample-based HSIs, CPUE for cusk was calculated as catch number at station (i), in season (s), and year (y) per area swept for each vessel (v) (Chang et al. 2012; Tanaka and Chen 2015 and 2016).

$$CPUE_{i_{sy}} = \frac{\text{Catch Number}_{i_{sy}}}{\text{Area Swept}_v} \quad (9)$$

where catch number is the total number of cusk caught per tow and area swept is standardized for each of the three vessels used in the BTS (NEFSC, 2013). For model-based HSIs, mean abundances estimated from the spatio-temporal model were used for each $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ grid cell. The suitability index for bin (b) of environmental variable (k), $SI_{b,k}$, was calculated on a 0.0 to 1.0 scale (Chang et al. 2012; Tanaka and Chen 2015 and 2016):

$$SI_{b,k} = \frac{\overline{CPUE}_{b,k} - \overline{CPUE}_{k,min}}{\overline{CPUE}_{k,max} - \overline{CPUE}_{k,min}} \quad (10)$$

where $\overline{CPUE}_{b,k}$ is the average CPUE over all sampled stations within bin b for each environmental variable k (Tanaka and Chen, 2015 and 2016). These SI values were then averaged by an arithmetic mean (AMM) and a geometric mean (GMM).

$$HSI_{AMM} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n SI_{ik}}{n} \quad (11)$$

$$HSI_{GMM} = \prod_{i=1}^n SI_{ik}^{1/n} \quad (12)$$

where all SI_i represent equally weighted SI values for the k^{th} environmental variable and n is the number of environmental variables included.

The sample- and model-based HSIs were based on empirical data from the BTS survey and modeled density estimates, respectively. Due to the limitation of sample-based HSI, the CPUE used was restricted to only the spring and fall BTS survey. However, model-based HSIs incorporated density estimates derived from both the BTS and LLS. Density estimates are extrapolated over the grid cells based on the abundance estimates for the nearest knot. The $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ grid size was used to increase spatial resolution for environmental variables over the entire survey area.

3 Results

3.1 Spatial-Temporal Model for Predicting Species Density

Varying estimates of area fished for the LLS were also tested to evaluate the relative impact of bait plumes on abundance estimates. The tested values of b to estimate area fished (i.e., 0.28km, 0.56km, 1.12km) showed to have no impact on density estimates and annual indices of abundance because the catchability coefficient could account for differences in catch rate (Appendix I). This makes it possible to combine two different gear types without needing to know the size of the bait plume for the longline survey.

Density plots for annual species distribution indicate that the cusk population is densest in the central GOM, with annual variability (Figure 1). Cusk density has constricted over the time-period, with lower densities predicted inshore in both seasons later in the time series (Figure 1). From 1980 to 1993 cusk density is highest in the time series, with a slight decrease in density

particularly in the offshore (yellow and red regions, Figure 1). Cusk population density from 1994 to 2007 remains relatively constant in the spring and the fall. Starting in 2008 to the end of the time series shows low density levels particularly in the inshore regions. Over the time series density around Georges Bank (i.e., the southernmost extent of the plots) shows a steady decline in cusk abundance, predominately in the spring and somewhat in the fall, over the entire time series (Figure 1). Pearson residual plots suggest there is no significant spatio-temporal pattern in the residuals (Figure 1).

3.2 Habitat Suitability Index Models

3.2.1 Sample-Based HSI

Sample-based SIs were derived from observed CPUE from the BTS using simulated temperature and sediment data and observed average depths. Simulated seasonal mean bottom temperatures were compared to observed instantaneous bottom temperatures from the BTS when available (Figure 2). The instantaneous observed temperatures were more variable (spring: 1.35°C to 12.30 °C; fall: 4.47 °C to 19.20 °C) compared to simulated temperatures (spring: 4.29°C to 7.64 °C; fall: 6.66 °C to 14.09 °C; Figure 2). Observed mean depths were used to build sediment sample-based SIs. Observed depths were compared to simulated depths at the location of sampling and were more variable at deeper depths than at shallower depths but were well correlated (Figure 3).

Assuming the simulated temperature represents mean conditions that cusk would experience during each season, the preferred mean temperatures for cusk were between 7.05° to 7.63° C in the spring and 8.14 to 8.72° C in the fall (Figure 4). Cusk preferred depths between 189 m to 224 m in the spring and 192 m to 227 m in the fall (Figure 4). Bedrock was the most preferred

sediment type followed by a combination of sand, silt, and clay in the spring sample-based HSI (Figure 4) and combinations of clay, silt, and sand in the fall sample-based HSI (Figure 4).

HSIs assume that habitat quality increases with density. A simple linear regression between abundance and HSI was used to test this assumption. Sample-based HSIs for the spring and fall did not show a clear relationship between density and habitat quality (Table 1). Linear regressions between CPUE and sample-based HSIs in the spring showed a significant relationship ($p\text{-value} < 0.01$) but the models failed to fit the data well (e.g., spring AMM, CPUE $R^2 < 0.072$; fall AMM, CPUE $R^2 < 0.05$; Table 1).

3.2.2 Model-Based HSI

Model-based SIs were derived from density field estimates from the delta-GLMM (spring and fall, $b = 0.28$ km). Model-based bottom temperature SI curves found 6.87° to 7.25° C as the most suitable temperatures in the spring and 8.07° to 8.68° C in the fall (Figure 4). SI depth curves for abundance indices derived from both data sets, showed that 161 m to 208 m was the most preferred depth range in both the spring and fall. For all spring and fall model-based HSI models, the most preferred sediment type was a combination of sand, silt, and clay in both the spring and fall (Figure 4).

3.2.3 Comparison Between Sample- and Model-Based HSI

The model-based SIs and sample-based SIs have similar results in habitat use for both the spring and the fall, with the exception of sediment use. Both the model-based and sampled-based bottom temperature SI curves indicate cusk were caught in slightly warmer waters in the fall but

prefer temperatures around 7° C in the spring and 8° C in the fall (Figure 4). The model-based depth SI curves showed cusk were associated with depth ranges between 2 m and 877 m in the spring and fall compared to BTS observed depth ranges in the spring (22 to 368 m) and fall (20 to 412 m). Both model-based depth SI curves showed 161m to 208m as the most preferred depth ranges in the spring and fall (Figure 4). These preferred depth ranges are shallower than the preferred depth ranges estimated (189 m to 224 m in the spring and 192 m to 227 m in the fall) by the sample-based depth SI, but show the same pattern of preferring deeper depths in the spring and shallower depths in the fall (Figure 4). Pearson correlations (r) indicate temperature and depth were positively correlated in the spring for both model-based ($r = 0.61$) and sample-based ($r = 0.28$) HSIs and negatively correlated in the fall for model based ($r = -0.71$) and sample-based HSIs ($r = -0.31$).

The model-based GMM HSIs had higher coefficient of determination (R^2) and correlation coefficients for both seasons in all models except in the fall sample-based HSI (Table 1). Model-based HSIs derived only from the BTS were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) with an R^2 of 0.3836 (AMM) and 0.4366 (GMM) for the spring and 0.2927 (AMM) and 0.3041 (GMM) for the fall (Table 1, modeled BTS only). Model-based HSIs predicted habitat quality well relative to survey catch rates (Figure 8).

The preferred range of each environmental variable for sample-based HSIs is limited by the sampling locations. The model-based sediment SI histograms derived for both the spring and fall indicated a mixture of sand, silt, and clay to be the most preferred sediment (Figure 4). Most of the cusk catches in both the spring and fall BTS were in these sediment types (Figure 5). For

sample-based sediment, SI histograms indicated that bedrock was the most important sediment type in the spring and gravel the third most important for the fall (Figure 4). However, for the entire time series (1980 – 2013) one cusk was caught in bedrock and two in gravel in the spring, and in the fall zero were caught in bedrock and six were caught in gravel (Figure 5). Similarly, sample-based HSIs depicted a narrower depth range and preferred depth relative to model-based HSIs (Figure 4). The NEFSC trawl survey sampling locations were shallower (e.g., 22 m – 388 m in the spring and 20 m to 516 m in the fall; Figure 6) relative to simulated depths available to the model-based HSIs (i.e., 2 m to 877 m).

The SI for each variable was removed to determine the relative importance of that variable to the overall HSI, the bigger the decrease in R^2 the more important that variable is to habitat suitability. For sample-based HSIs, temperature was the biggest driver in habitat suitability in the spring while sediment was the biggest driver in the fall (Table 1). However, for the fall sample-based GMM HSI the R^2 increased when depth was removed indicating this variable is not important within that model potentially due to the negative correlation with temperature. For model-based HSIs, temperature was the biggest driver in the spring, and depth was the biggest driver in the fall (Table 1).

4 Discussion

Comparisons between model-based and sampled-based HSIs indicate that fully utilizing all available survey data changed the perception of depth and sediment preferences of cusk because of the imputed estimates for un-sampled locations. Thus, model-based density estimates that incorporated data from multiple gear types can overcome the sampling bias of trawl surveys for

species that associate with complex habitats. HSIs were better able to predict an increase in habitat quality with increasing density with the use of model-based abundance estimates (Table 1).

4.1 Spatial-Temporal Model for Predicting Species Density

Bottom trawl surveys are likely to produce biased estimates of abundance if the species' spatial distribution has changed over time and if gear performance varies by the habitat that the target species associates with over time (Thorson et al. 2013; Kotwicki et al. 2014). The decline in the cusk population likely reduced catchability in the BTS due to the population constricting to rocky habitat not accessible to the BTS (Davies and Jonsen 2011; Hare et al. 2012), resulting in a decreased probability of successful sampling. Annual density field estimates and subsequent abundance indices (Appendix I) based only on the BTS are therefore likely biased due to density-dependent and time-varying catchability.

The LLS was incorporated into the model-based abundance estimates to compensate for density-dependent processes within the BTS. Density-dependent processes cause systematic biases in BTS indices of abundance which can lead to large errors in estimating species' spatial distribution (Thorson et al. 2013; Kotwicki et al. 2014). Density fields derived from both surveys have similar patterns in spatial distribution (i.e., high density versus low density) as those derived from the BTS only (Appendix I). However, there are finer resolution changes throughout the time series when the LLS is incorporated, particularly in fall. This qualitatively supports the hypothesis that cusk catches in the BTS have experienced density-dependent catchability. The LLS is thought to be a better method of sampling groundfish species that are not well sampled by

mobile bottom tending gear (Hoey et al. 2013). Biases in predicting a species' spatial distribution can be addressed through the incorporation of data from surveys that sample habitats differently.

Accounting for differences in catchability has been shown to produce abundance estimates with reduced variability when multiple vessels are involved (Thorson and Ward 2014). The delta-GLMM (Thorson et al. 2015) estimated catchability for the LLS as well as before and after the 2009 protocol changes by considering these two time-blocks to be surveys with separate catchability parameters. To test the sensitivity of the model to catchability estimates for the LLS three different values b to estimate area fished (i.e., 0.28km, 0.56km, 1.12km; Appendix I). Varying values of area fished had no impact on the density estimates and estimated catchability in the model accounted for differences in area fished (Appendix I). Finer temporal changes in catchability (e.g., year-specific changes) were not considered but may be useful to incorporate in the future or for species with similar circumstances. However, a random year effect was included to account for time-varying catchability for the BTS before and after 2009 and for the LLS.

Including the longline survey when deriving density estimates changes the abundance estimates in the most recent years (Appendix I). As the LLS time-series increases, the perceived systematic bias in abundance estimates from the BTS can be tested and addressed. The LLS would need to be conducted at the same locations as the BTS tows to compare catch rates from the two surveys to fully understand the consequences of spatially varying catchability (Thorson et al. 2013). As species decline and are more likely distributed in areas with complex bottom, they become less accessible to trawl gear. Longline surveys can sample these areas to provide additional data complementary to the data derived in mobile trawl surveys. This study shows how data from

longline and trawl gear can be combined within a modeling framework and how the HSI benefits from doing so.

4.2 Habitat Suitability Index Models

Overall, the model-based HSIs could better capture variance in abundance at different levels of habitat quality compared to sample-based HSIs. The increased spatial resolution of density estimates (Figure 1) can provide information for a species' use of habitat without perfect sampling coverage or low catch rates. Utilizing model-based abundance indices changes the perception of habitat use through two mechanisms. First, inclusion of the LLS provides data for the model outside of where the BTS sampled. The use of two gear types within the model-based density estimates provides increased data on habitat use because of the ability to sample in different sediment types. By utilizing all available data, the subsequent HSIs were better informed than both the sample-based HSIs and model-based HSIs that only used the BTS to predict abundance. Second, the estimated density fields by grid provides information where the LLS and/or BTS did not sample. Increasing the spatial resolution of density estimates and the interaction with environmental variables is believed to be the primary driver in improving the HSIs.

Conventional sample-based HSIs are likely influenced by the availability of sampled data, as evidenced by the poor performance of sample-based HSIs relative to model-based HSIs (Table 1). The sampled depth ranges in spring (22 m - 368 m) and fall (20 m and 412 m) BTS limit what data are informing the HSI. Additionally, sampling frequency at various depths (Figure 6) and sediment types (Figure 5) influences the performance of HSIs. The limited data

available for sample-based HSIs prompted the need for improving the spatial resolution of species' density estimates and environmental variables over a study area. The improved spatial resolution of environmental variables (i.e., per grid cell) overcomes the limitations of empirical data availability at a sampled location by providing finer-scale resolution of a species' interaction with these environmental variables. The improvements in spatial resolution also provides the ability to compare the overlap in habitat distribution of two species using the same spatial grid, a critical aspect of bycatch mitigation and species conservation.

However, the frequency of observations at each range within the environmental variables is influential on the HSI outcome. This was most notable for evaluating sediment type SIs. Sediment SIs for sample-based HSIs indicated bedrock to be the most important sediment type in the spring and a mixture of sand, clay, and silt in the fall (Figure 4). A mixture of sand, silt, and clay was the most important sediment type for the spring and fall model-based HSIs and bedrock was among the lowest (Figure 4). The sample-based SI sediment curves are likely biased due to low catch rates in more complex sediment types (Figure 5). Few cusk were caught in bedrock in the BTS (1 in spring, 0 in fall) and in gravel (2 in spring and 6 in fall) between 1980-2013 (Figure 5). The model-based HSIs provide abundance estimates for areas not directly observed in the survey, allowing for a different understanding of how cusk might be utilizing different sediment types. Model-based abundance estimates associated cusk with bedrock (20 times in the spring, 21 in the fall) and gravel (95 times in the spring, and 88 times in the fall). Cusk are thought to predominately reside on hard bottom (i.e., bedrock and gravel; Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002), making the model-based abundance estimates associated with hard bottom more realistic with regard to presumed cusk behavior. The LLS could provide catch data for sediment

types that the BTS cannot provide consistent data for, which provides more data for spatially explicit density estimates over the time series (Figure 1). Model-based abundance estimates that incorporate the LLS are thought to improve data quality for use in habitat mapping by better informing the model in areas not well sampled by the BTS. However, the frequency of observations for both the sample-based and model-based HSIs are likely influencing the results.

This study includes the three most important variables for this species reported in the literature (Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002; Hare et al. 2012), reasonably capturing variability in habitat distribution with only three variables in the model-based HSIs. Temperature, depth, and sediment were equally weighted within the sample-based and model-based HSIs, preliminary analyses indicated that SI weighting did not improve the HSIs. However, the relative contribution of each variable is likely not equal (Table 1). For model-based HSIs, temperature was the most influential variable in defining habitat suitability the spring while depth was the most influential in fall (Table 1). Temperature is hypothesized to be a significant contributor to habitat suitability for cusk (Hare et al. 2012), but this evaluation indicates that variable importance may shift between seasons. However, mean seasonal temperatures and depth are positively correlated in the spring and negatively correlated in the fall, making it difficult to separate the relative influence of each variable. Even though depth and temperature are correlated, both variables contribute to defining habitat suitability (Table 1). Cusk spawn in the spring (Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002) and may be seeking preferred temperatures in shallower waters during spawning events while moving to deeper waters in the fall seeking colder temperatures.

4.3 Model Limitations

HSI models are a relative index traditionally built from empirical data. These models cannot account for uncertainty in their estimates. Using model-output as model-input can incorporate unaccounted uncertainty that can be magnified within the second model (Brooks and Deroba 2015). However, the HSI model used in this study is not able to account for uncertainty no matter if modeled or empirical data are used. Pearson residual plots indicate the incorporation of the LLS increased uncertainty due to the large differences in catch numbers between the two survey programs. HSIs assume that habitat suitability increases linearly with abundance. With limited data for sample-based HSIs, linear regressions were the most reliable method of testing model performance. Future research should focus on: 1) building model-based HSIs with part of the data and using the remaining data to develop HSIs (Tanka and Chen 2016); 1) using the delta-GLMM to evaluate habitat preference; and/or 2) using model-based abundance estimates that have an associated uncertainty in abundance to account for uncertainty within habitat modeling.

This study did not assume that Cusks' preferences for sediment, depth, and temperature change on an annual basis. The relationship between mean abundance and each of these variables was assumed to be constant during 1980 to 2013. HSI models are typically used for understanding a species' response to changes in habitat (Terrell and Carpenter 1997). Many HSI models assume that an organism's habitat preference does not change on an annual basis; distribution might, but the underlying relationship does not (Chen et al. 2011; Tanaka and Chen 2015; Guan et al. 2017). For the HSI models in this study to provide such insight, annual predictions would need to be made.

548

549 This study does not evaluate age or size dependent processes in habitat selection. Cusk caught in
550 the LLS (2014 – 2015) have a similar median size (57 cm) but narrower length range (30-84 cm)
551 compared to cusk caught in the spring and fall BTS, which had a much wider length range (11-
552 94 cm) but similar median size (58 cm). Cusk caught from 2014 to 2015 in the BTS have a
553 smaller median size (50 cm) than cusk caught over the included time series (1980 – 2015) and in
554 the longline survey (Figure 7). These size differences are expected given the two gear types have
555 different selectivities, however there are only sixty-nine cusk caught in the BTS in 2014 and
556 2015. The average size at maturity for cusk in the Scotian Shelf area is 50 cm for males and
557 females combined (COSEWIC 2003). These two gear types catch predominantly mature
558 individuals; a quarter of the catch is below 40 cm. Based on these size distributions, it is assumed
559 that the habitat suitability indices represent adult habitat.

560

561 Annual density estimates can be used to build annual HSI models to evaluate how habitat quality
562 has changed over a time series. The impacts of a changing climate can be better understood and
563 predicted for the future by understanding the ideal range of each environmental variable.
564 Currently, the delta-GLMM cannot predict potential or realized habitat (Grüss et al. 2017) as it
565 can be from the HSI. However, several environmental factors influence a species' habitat use
566 that might not be fully captured by the environmental variables used within an HSI. Even if all
567 known environmental drivers were incorporated there would likely be unaccounted for
568 stochasticity within habitat distribution and species abundance. The spatio-temporal delta-
569 GLMM captures spatial and spatial-temporal variability of species density through the random
570 effects in the model (Thorson et al. 2015). The stochasticity of species distribution, that is

unlikely to be captured by any given variable or set of variables in the HSI is presumed to be captured by first predicting species density within the delta-GLMM. Environmental covariates incorporated into the delta-GLMM to predict species density could be used to evaluate the suitable range of environmental variables to understand species' habitat preferences as this model progresses.

5 Conclusion

The delta-GLMM provided a means of generating modeled abundance that reflects spatial heterogeneity in species density and utilizes all available survey data. The incorporation of different gear types to estimate abundance can, in part, overcome systematic density-dependent sampling biases that are seen in trawl surveys when a species' abundance contracts to habitat that is not effectively sampled by the survey. Spatially explicit abundance estimates provide a means of evaluating the habitat suitability, by providing estimates in areas that were not directly sampled by the survey. The increased spatial resolution of abundance data improved the habitat suitability models in this study. A delta-GLMM offers a method of providing abundance information for areas not sampled by survey programs and for species caught in low numbers.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. James Thorson of the Northwest Fisheries Science Center for his reviews and help with the delta-GLMM. Thank you to the NEFSC internal reviewer for thoughtful comments for improving the second version of this manuscript. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for the first version of this manuscript. We are grateful for Dr. Dave McLeroy at the NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center for collecting the longline survey data. We also thank Nancy McHugh from the Ecosystems Surveys Branch, NOAA Fisheries for providing the NEFSC bottom trawl survey data. We appreciate Kisei Tanaka of the University of Maine for his advice on habitat mapping. The NECOFS simulated temperature data in this study were from NERACOOS, Massachusetts Fishery Institution, and MIT Sea Grant College programs. This research was funded by NOAA Saltonstall-Kennedy grant number NOAA NA14NMF4270029.

References

- Beardsley, R.C., Chen, C., and Xu, Q. 2013. Coastal flooding in Scituate (MA): A FVCOM study of the 27 December 2010 nor'easter. *Journal of Geophysical Research - Oceans*, 118: 6030–6045.
- Bivand, R. 2013. R Package “classInt”: choose univariate class interval (Ver 0.1-21). R-Project. Accessed October 23, 2014. Available at: <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/classInt/index.html>.
- Brooks, R. P. 1997. Improving Habitat Suitability Index Models. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 25(1): 163–167.
- Brooks, E.N., Deroba J.J. 2015. When “data” are not data: the pitfalls of post hoc analyses that use stock assessment model output. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 72(4): 634-641.
- Brotons, L., Thuiller, W., Araujo, M. B. and Hirzel, A. H. 2004. Presence-absence versus presence-only modelling methods for predicting bird habitat suitability. *Ecography* 27: 437-448.
- Chang, Y., Sun, C., Chen, Y., and Yeh, S. 2012. Habitat suitability analysis and identification of potential fishing grounds for swordfish, *Xiphias gladius*, in the South Atlantic Ocean. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*. 33(23): 7523–7541.
- Chen, C., Beardsley, R. C., and Cowles, G. 2006. An unstructured grid, finite-volume coastal ocean model (FVCOM) system. Special Issue entitled “Advance in Computational Oceanography”. *Oceanography*. 19: 78-89
- Chen, X.J., Li, G., Fend, B. and Tian, S.Q. 2009. Habitat suitability of chub mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*) in the East China Sea. *Journal of Oceanography*. 65: 93–102.

- 640 Chen, X., Tian, S., Liu, B., and Chen, Y. 2011. Modeling a habitat suitability index for the
641 eastern fall cohort of *Ommastrephes bartramii* in the central North Pacific Ocean.
642 *Chinese Journal of Oceanology and Limnology*. 29(3): 493–504.
- 643 Cohen, D.M., Inada, T., Iwamoto, T. and Scialabba, N. 1990. Gadiform fishes of the world.
644 *Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Species Catalogue*. Fir/S125.
645 Vol. 10.
- 646 Collette, B.B. and Klein-MacPhee, G. 2002. Bigelow and Schroeder's Fishes of the Gulf of
647 Maine. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution
- 648 Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC). 2003. Assessment and
649 Status Report on the Cusk (*Brosme brosme*) in Canada. May 2003.
- 650 Davies, T. D., and Jonsen, I. D. 2011. Identifying nonproportionality of fishery-independent
651 survey data to estimate population trends and assess recovery potential for cusk (*Brosme*
652 *brosme*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 68(3): 413–425.
- 653 General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO). 2014. The GEBCO_2014 Grid, version
654 20150318, <http://www.gebco.net>.
- 655 Grüss A, Sagarese SR, Karnauskas M, Walter III JF, Babcock EA, Drexler M. 2017. Ontogenetic
656 spatial distributions of red grouper (*Epinephelus morio*) and gag grouper (*Mycteroperca*
657 *microlepis*) in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. *Fisheries Research* 193: 129-142.
- 658 Guan, L., Chen, Y., and Wilson, J. A. 2017. Evaluating spatio-temporal variability in the habitat
659 quality of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in the Gulf of Maine. *Fisheries Oceanography*.
660 26(1): 83-96.
- 661 Hare, J. a., Manderson, J. P., Nye, J. A., Alexander, M. A., Auster, P. J., Borggaard, D. L., and
662 Biegel, S. T. 2012. Cusk (*Brosme brosme*) and climate change: assessing the threat to a

- 663 candidate marine fish species under the US Endangered Species Act. *ICES Journal of*
664 *Marine Science*. 69(10): 1753–1768.
- 665 Hoey, J., O'Brien, L., Natanson, L., McIlroy, D., Manderson, J., Borggaard, D., and Silva, R.
666 2013. Development of a bottom longline survey for stocks associated with complex rocky
667 habitat in the western and central Gulf of Maine, including several data poor stocks that
668 are ESA species of concern. NEFSC & NERO PROPOSAL 2013 Cooperative Research
669 Solicitation. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water Street,
670 Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026.
- 671 Kotwicki, S., Iannelli, J. N., and Punt, A. E. 2014. Correcting density dependent effects in
672 abundance estimates from bottom trawl surveys. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*. 71:
673 1107–1116.
- 674 Lokkeborg, S., B. L. Olla, W.H. Pearson, and M. W. D. 1995. Behavioural responses of
675 sablefish, *Anoplopoma fimbria*, to bait odour. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 46, 142–155.
- 676 MacCall, A.D. 1990. Dynamic geography of marine fish populations. University of Washington
677 Press. Seattle, WA, USA.
- 678 Miller TJ, Das C, Politis PJ, Miller AS, Lucey SM, Legault CM, Brown RW, and Rago, PJ.
679 2010. Estimation of Albatross IV to Henry B. Bigelow calibration factors. Northeast Fish
680 Sci Cent Ref Doc. 10-05; 233 p. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166
681 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026.
- 682 Morris, L., and Ball, D. 2006. Habitat suitability modelling of economically important fish
683 species with commercial fisheries data. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*. 63(9): 1590–
684 1603.

- 685 Northeast Coastal Ocean Forecasting System (NECOFS). 2013. Northeast Coastal Ocean
686 Forecasting System Main Portal.
687 http://fvcom.smast.umassd.edu/research_projects/NECOFS.
- 688 Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC). 2013. 55th Northeast Regional Stock Assessment
689 Workshop (55th SAW) Assessment Report. US Dept Commer, Northeast Fish Sci Cent
690 Ref Doc. 13-11; 845 p. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water
691 Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1026, or online at
692 <http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/nefsc/publications/>
- 693 Politis, P. J., Galbraith, J. K., Kostovick, P., and Brown, R. W. 2014. Northeast Fisheries Science
694 Center Bottom Trawl Survey Protocols for the NOAA Ship Henry B. Bigelow.
- 695 Poppe, L.J., McMullen, K.Y., Williams, S.J., and Paskevich, V.F., eds. 2014. USGS east-coast
696 sediment analysis: Procedures, database, and GIS data (ver. 3.0, November 2014): U.S.
697 Geological Survey Open-File Report 2005-1001, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1001/>.
- 698 Schnute, J.T., Boers, N., and Haigh, R. 2015. Mapping Fisheries Data and Spatial Analysis
699 Tools. R package. Fisheries and Oceans Canada.
- 700 Tanaka, K., and Chen, Y. 2015. Spatiotemporal variability of suitable habitat for American
701 lobster (*Homarus Americanus*) in Long Island Sound. *Journal of Shellfish Research*.
702 34(2): 531–543.
- 703 Tanaka, K., and Chen, Y. 2016. Modeling spatiotemporal variability of the bioclimate envelope
704 of (*Homarus americanus*) in the coastal waters of Maine and New Hampshire. *Fisheries*
705 *Research*. 177: 137–152.
- 706 Terrell, J.W. 1984. Proceedings of a workshop on fish habitat suitability index models.
707 *Biological Report*. 85: 393.

- 708 Terrell, J. W., and Carpenter, J. 1997. Selected Habitat Suitability Index Model Evaluations.
709 Information and Technology Report, USGS/BDR/IT -- 1997-0005.
- 710 Thorson, J.T., Clarke, M.E., Steward, I.J., and Punt, A.E. 2013. The implications of spatially
711 varying catchability on bottom trawl surveys of fish abundance: a proposed solution
712 involving underwater vehicles. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*. 7:
713 294-306.
- 714 Thorson, J. T., and Ward, E. J. 2014. Accounting for vessel effects when standardizing catch
715 rates from cooperative surveys. *Fisheries Research*. 155: 168–176.
- 716 Thorson, J.T., Shelton, A.O., Ward, E.J., and Skaug, H.J. 2015. Geostatistical delta-generalized
717 linear mixed models improve precision for estimated abundance indices for West Coast
718 groundfishes. *ICES Journal of Marine Sciences*. 72(5): 1297–1310.
- 719 Thorson, J.T. and Barnett, L.A.K. 2017. Comparing estimates of abundance trends and
720 distribution shifts using single- and multispecies models of fishes and biogenic habitat.
721 *ICES Journal of Marine Science*. 74(5): 1311–1321.
- 722 Thorson, J.T. 2017. VAST user manual. [https://github.com/James-](https://github.com/James-Thorson/VAST/blob/master/examples/VAST_user_manual.pdf)
723 [Thorson/VAST/blob/master/examples/VAST_user_manual.pdf](https://github.com/James-Thorson/VAST/blob/master/examples/VAST_user_manual.pdf). Accessed 5/19/2017.
- 724 Yu, W., Qian, Y., Chen, X., and Chen, Y. 2016. Modelling the effects of climate variability on
725 habitat suitability of jumbo flying squid, *Dosidicus gigas*, in the Southeast Pacific off
726 Peru. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*. 73(2): 239–24.
- 727 Zhou, S., Klaer, N. L., Daley, R. M., Zhu, Z., Fuller, M., and Smith, A. D. M. 2014. Modelling
728 multiple fishing gear efficiencies and abundance for aggregated populations using fishery
729 or survey data. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*. 71(9): 2436–2447.
- 730

731 Table 1. HSI model comparisons. Linear regression results between abundance and arithmetic
 732 mean (AMM) and geometric mean (GMM) HSI results and Pearson's correlation coefficient
 733 (estimated in R).

Model	R^2	Correlation Coefficient	p-value of t-test for slope coefficient
Spring AMM, model-based HSI	0.384	0.619	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.266	0.516	<0.01
w/o depth	0.362	0.602	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.359	0.599	<0.01
Spring GMM, model-based HSI	0.437	0.661	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.280	0.529	<0.01
w/o depth	0.419	0.647	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.406	0.637	<0.01
Spring AMM, sample-based HSI	0.073	0.270	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.054	0.232	<0.01
w/o depth	0.070	0.264	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.060	0.245	<0.01
Spring GMM, sample-based HSI	0.085	0.291	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.058	0.241	<0.01
w/o depth	0.083	0.288	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.067	0.259	<0.01
Fall AMM, model-based HSI	0.293	0.541	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.262	0.512	<0.01
w/o depth	0.219	0.468	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.280	0.529	<0.01
Fall GMM, model-based HSI	0.304	0.551	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.280	0.529	<0.01
w/o depth	0.222	0.471	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.293	0.542	<0.01
Fall AMM, sample-based HSI	0.044	0.211	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.041	0.204	<0.01
w/o depth	0.042	0.205	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.032	0.179	<0.01
Fall GMM, sample-based HSI	0.039	0.199	<0.01
w/o bottom temperature	0.038	0.194	<0.01
w/o depth	0.043	0.208	<0.01
w/o sediment	0.030	0.173	<0.01

734

Figure 1. Density field plots from the delta-generalized spatio-temporal model. Red indicates areas of higher abundance, blue indicates areas of lower abundance. Pearson residual plots of the density field estimates from the delta-generalized spatio-temporal model.

Figure 2. Linear regression of simulated and observed mean, seasonal bottom temperature. NECOFS simulated, seasonal mean temperatures (x-axis) compared to instantaneous observed bottom temperature from the NEFSC BTS (y-axis), when recorded on the survey.

756 Figure 3. Linear regression of simulated and observed mean depths. GEBCO simulated depths
757 (x-axis) compared to mean observed bottom depths from the NEFSC BTS (y-axis) recorded on
758 the survey.

759

760

Figure 4. Comparing model-based and sample-based suitability index curves for cusk. For these comparisons (a) all model-based abundance suitability indices (SIs) derived from both BTS and LLS; (b) sample-based abundance SIs derived from the BTS. Sediment types include: bedrock (br), gravel (gr), gravelly sediment (gr-sd), sand (sd), 33% sand, silt, and clay (sd/st/cl), 25% - 50% sand with clay and silt (sd-cl/st), > 75% sand with silt and clay (sd-st/clay), 50-75% clay with silt with sand (cl-st/sd), clay (cl) (Poppe et al. 2003).

Figure 5. Spring and fall BTS positive catches of cusk by sediment type. Low catch rates of cusk at complex sediment types is likely to lead to biased sediment suitability index (SI) estimates. Sediment histograms are ordered from coarsest sediment (bedrock) to the finest sediment (clay). Sediment types include: bedrock (br), gravel (gr), gravelly sediment (gr-sd), sand (sd), 33% sand, silt, and clay (sd-st/cl), 25% - 50% sand with clay and silt (sd-cl/st), > 75% sand with silt and clay (sd-st/clay), 50-75% clay with silt with sand (cl-st/sd), clay (cl) (Poppe et al. 2003).

788 Figure 6. Sampling frequency of depths in the NEFSC spring and fall bottom trawl surveys.

801 Figure 7. Size distribution of cusk caught in the NEFSC longline (2014 – 2015) and trawl
802 surveys (1980 – 2015), spring and fall combined.

Figure 8. Habitat Suitability Index maps for cusk. These HSI maps were derived from the model-based density estimates using data from both the bottom trawl and longline surveys. High habitat quality (red) is mostly offshore for both the spring and fall and lower habitat quality (dark blue) is mostly inshore and around Georges Bank. Positive catch rates from the BTS (circles) and the LLS (triangles) are used to validate model predictions of cusk habitat quality. The size of the circle or triangle indicate catch rates, with smaller circles/triangles indicating lower catch rates compared to the larger circle/triangle.

Appendix I. Developing density estimates and abundance indices utilizing multiple gear types

This study, in part, set out to determine if data from two different gear types could be combined to develop indices of abundance for data limited species using the delta-GLMM. Positive catch rates in the model are a function of area swept. However, this study combined two types of surveys with two different concepts of ‘area swept’. The bottom trawl survey area swept is considered a standardized volume that is a function of the width of the doors and trawl speed. Longline surveys do not have a standardized area fished.

The delta-GLMM first estimates the probability of presence then estimates positive catch rates in the second stage. The first and second stage of the model is fit using the survey data. The first stage of the model is fit as a function of annual average density, catchability, and spatial and spatial temporal random effects estimated from the nearest knot. The second stage of the model is fit given all of the same parameters as a function of area swept. Catchability is then removed, and the underlying species density is predicted at each knot. Total abundance across the domain is calculated as:

$$\hat{b}_t = \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} a_j \text{logit}^{-1} \left(d_{T(i)}^{(p)} + \omega_{J(i)}^{(p)} + \varepsilon_{J(i),T(i)}^{(p)} \right) \exp \left(d_{T(i)}^{(\lambda)} + \omega_{J(i)}^{(\lambda)} + \varepsilon_{J(i),T(i)}^{(\lambda)} \right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Full model details can be found in Thorson et al. (2015).

To test if catchability within the delta-GLMM was capable of accounting for differences of gear types, different estimates of area fished were evaluated for the LLS. The distance between the beginning and end of a longline set were known but the bait plume around the longline was not known. Bait plume is a function of current speed and direction, bait type, and soak duration,

which sets the range over which the bait can be detected, as well as factors influencing the range over which fish will respond to detected bait; the fish response factors include length of food deprivation (i.e., hunger), fish size, and swimming speed (Løkkeborg et al. 1995; Zhou et al. 2014). These specifics are not known in fisheries surveys, and feeding response to bait plumes has not been measured for cusk. Without knowing the details necessary to estimate the bait plume, three values of b were tested based on the estimates for moderate food deprivation in Løkkeborg et al. (1995). A minimum, medium, and maximum value of b (280m, 560m, 1121m respectively) were used to test the sensitivity of abundance estimates to longline area fished.

A total of six model-based density fields with different configurations of values for b were estimated for spring and fall. Each season had three models that incorporated both the BTS and LLS using the three values of b (i.e., 0.28km, 0.56km, and 1.12 km). The resulting estimates for area fished varied by an order of magnitude (less than 0.5 km² when $b = 0.28$ km and up to 2.0km² when $b = 1.121$ km). Three catchability parameters were estimated to account for the 2009 protocol changes in the BTS. The estimated abundance index for the three models in the spring and three in the fall were unchanged with changes in the value of b . AICs for all three values of b were unchanged for the different model runs in both the spring (3837) and the fall (3676).

Four model-based abundance indices were derived using only the spring and fall bottom trawl survey (BTS) then combining the BTS and the spring and fall longline survey (LLS). Two catchability coefficients were defined for before and after the 2009 protocol changes to the BTS, treating the survey as two surveys within each season with no temporal overlap. Therefore,

models with data from both survey programs estimated three catchability parameters and models that included only the BTS estimated two. The resulting abundance estimates do not vary in relative trend from the abundance estimates using the combined surveys (Figure A1). Abundance was high in 1980 – 1981 with a decline to persistent low levels since 2005 (Figure A1). However, there is a slight difference in trends for the two most recent years of the time series (2014-2015) when the longline survey is added (Figure A1). All model-based abundance indices show a decrease in cusk abundance over the time series (1980 – 2015) for both seasons. Pearson residual plots suggest there is no significant spatio-temporal pattern in the residuals (Figure A2).

When catchability was not estimated for the LLS, the annual abundance index was inconsistent and highly variable during the exploratory phase of this study (results not shown). The delta-GLMM could account for differences in catchability between the LLS and BTS, indicating this is an effective method of incorporating multiple surveys with different gear types to estimate abundance indices, even without accurate bait plume measures for a longline survey.

Figure A1. *Brosme brosme* model-based abundance indices. Derived from the both the NEFSC bottom trawl survey and longline survey combined and the NEFSC bottom trawl survey only. The spring and fall model-based abundance indices accounted for spatial and spatio-temporal randomness. Error bars are standard deviations from the annual mean.

Figure A2. Density field plots from the delta-generalized spatio-temporal model. Red indicates areas of higher abundance, blue indicates areas of lower abundance. Pearson residual plots of the density field estimates from the delta-generalized spatio-temporal model.

Draft