University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Master's Theses

2020

HOW MODIFIED TROPHIC INTERACTIONS CREATE SOCIO- ECOLOGICAL TRADEOFFS: A CASE STUDY OF NARRAGANSETT BAY FISHERIES

Anne A. Innes-Gold

University of Rhode Island, ainnesgold@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Innes-Gold, Anne A., "HOW MODIFIED TROPHIC INTERACTIONS CREATE SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL TRADEOFFS: A CASE STUDY OF NARRAGANSETT BAY FISHERIES" (2020). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1911.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1911>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

HOW MODIFIED TROPHIC INTERACTIONS CREATE
SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL TRADEOFFS: A CASE STUDY
OF NARRAGANSETT BAY FISHERIES

BY

ANNE A. INNES-GOLD

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2020

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

OF

ANNE A. INNES-GOLD

APPROVED:

Thesis Committee:

Major Professor Austin Humphries

Jeremy Collie

Tracey Dalton

Jason McNamee

Nasser H. Zawia

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2020

ABSTRACT

Marine fisheries represent a social-ecological system driven by both complex ecological processes and human interactions. Fisheries management requires an understanding of both the biological and social components, and management failure can occur when either are excluded. Despite the significance of both, most research has focused on characterizing biological uncertainty rather than on better understanding the impacts of human behavior. In this study, we use the fisheries in Narragansett Bay (Rhode Island, USA) as a case study to understand how fisher behavior influences food web dynamics. Narragansett Bay holds both a commercial fishery for forage fish (i.e. menhaden) and a recreational fishery for their predators (i.e. striped bass, bluefish). To explore tradeoffs that might exist between these two fisheries, we coupled a food-web model to a recreational fishers' behavior model, creating a dynamic social-ecological representation of the ecosystem. Fish biomass was projected until 2030 in both the stand-alone food web model and the coupled social-ecological model, with results highlighting how the incorporation of fisher behavior in modeling can lead to changes in the projected ecosystem. We tested model sensitivity to three attributes: 1) the forage fish commercial harvest scenario, 2) the predatory ("piscivorous") fish abundance-catch relationship in the recreational fishery, and 3) the rate at which recreational fishers become discouraged (termed "satisfaction loss"). Higher commercial harvest of forage fish led to significantly lower piscivorous fish biomass but had minimal effects on the number of piscivorous fish caught recreationally or recreational fisher satisfaction. Both the abundance-catch relationship and satisfaction loss rate had effects on the fish biomass, the number of fish caught

recreationally, and recreational fisher satisfaction. The number of piscivorous fish caught recreationally and recreational fisher satisfaction were positively correlated, but neither one was positively correlated with piscivorous fish biomass. Our results highlight that fisher behavior can significantly influence food web dynamics, including fish biomass and the number of fish caught. Social responses to changing ecosystems should be explicitly incorporated into ecosystem modeling to improve ecosystem-based management efforts. The methods we used to link the food web and fisher behavior models provide a framework of how human behavior can be incorporated into social-ecological modeling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor Austin Humphries, whose support and guidance over the past two years made for a great graduate school experience and led me to become an ecosystem modeler! A huge thank you to Maggie Heinichen, whose hard work and dedication made our Ecopath model possible; there is no one else I would rather balance a model with. I am very grateful to the rest of our Ecopath team: Jeremy Collie for the many meetings and population dynamics knowledge (and chats about hockey), and Kelvin Gorospe for his helpfulness and insight as I learned Ecopath. I would also like to thank Tyler Pavlovich, for taking our agent-based modeling idea from a dream to reality, as well as Conor McManus, Jason McNamee and Corinne Truesdale for their consultation on management needs throughout the whole process. Thank you to Tracey Dalton, Emi Uchida, and Todd Guilfoos for their ideas and feedback as I navigated the human dimension of ecosystem modeling. I am also grateful to everyone at RI C-AIM, particularly BJ Carangia, Shaun Kirby, and Lew Rothstein. I feel lucky to have been part of such an important project. And of course, thank you to the amazing past and present members of the Humphries Lab (Catie Alves, Celeste Venolia, Donna Dimarchopoulou, Elaine Shen, Elle Wibisono, Evans Arizi, Ivy Blackmore, Lauren Josephs, Nicky Roberts, Paul Carvalho, Rachel Cohn, Yashwant Meghare) for creating such a positive and welcoming lab environment. Finally, the biggest thank you to my parents, Howard Gold and Jennifer Innes, and my siblings, Sarah and Bobby Innes-Gold, for their love and support as I completed this degree.

PREFACE

The following thesis has been submitted in manuscript format following the formatting guidelines of the journal *Ecology and Society*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
PREFACE	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER 1	1
Abstract.....	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Methods.....	7
2.1 Study site and context.....	7
2.2 Food web model	9
2.3 Fisher behavior model	10
2.4 Model coupling.....	19
2.5 Sensitivity tests	21
2.5.1 Commercial harvest scenario	21
2.5.2 Abundance-catch relationship.....	21
2.5.3 Satisfaction loss rate	22
2.5.4 Analysis.....	23
3. Results	24
3.1 Sensitivity: Commercial harvest scenario	24
3.2 Sensitivity: Abundance-catch relationship	25
3.3 Sensitivity: Satisfaction loss rate	26
4. Discussion.....	26
4.1 Commercial harvest scenario.....	27

4.2	Abundance-catch relationship	29
4.3	Satisfaction loss rate	31
4.4	Management implications.....	32
5.	Acknowledgments	36
6.	References	37
7.	Tables.....	46
8.	Figures	48
SUPPORTING INFORMATION		54
Appendix 1. Supplementary Material		54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1. The four scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest, the resulting 2020 piscivorous fish biomass, and the starting number of fish for the fisher behavior model (converted from the piscivorous fish biomass and divided by a factor of 1000).....	46
Table 2. Results from linear regressions quantifying the relationships between the response variables when all forage fish scenarios were combined (degrees of freedom = 1, 118 for all).....	47

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
Figure 1. Conceptual diagram of our social-ecological model, consisting of the Ecopath with Ecosim food web model and the agent-based fisher behavior model...	48
Figure 2. The three types of abundance-catch relationships tested in Scenario 2, split by fish size (keeper or sublegal) and method of fishing (boat or shore).....	49
Figure 3. The Ecopath with Ecosim food web model biomass trajectories under four different scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest. Note that scenario forecasts for carnivorous benthos were similar, with forecasts overlaying each other.....	50
Figure 4. The mean and data spread (of each 8-year trial) of piscivorous fish biomass, the number of keepers caught, and fisher end of season satisfaction for the four harvest scenarios. Color indicates the type of fisher behavior model trial, where the top row (A) shows the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials, and the bottom row (B) shows the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials. Differing symbols within a scenario denote significant difference between those means	51
Figure 5. The mean and data spread (of each 8-year trial) of piscivorous fish biomass, the number of keepers caught, and recreational fisher end of season satisfaction across harvest scenarios, where the top row (A) shows the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials, and the bottom row (B) shows the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials. Color indicates the scenario of commercial forage fish harvest. Differing symbols within a trial type denote significant difference between those means	52
Figure 6. The relationship between the three response variables in (A) the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials and (B) the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials,	

where the points represent the results of a one year run in the social-ecological model

..... 53

CHAPTER 1

Exploring social-ecological tradeoffs in fisheries using a coupled food web and human behavior model

Anne Innes-Gold^{a*}, Tyler Pavlowich^b, Margaret Heinichen^c, M. Conor McManus^d, Jason McNamee^e, Jeremy Collie^c, Austin Humphries^{a,c}

Manuscript in preparation for submission to the journal *Ecology and Society*.

^aDepartment of Fisheries, Animal and Veterinary Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island

^bAIS Inc. in support of the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Narragansett, Rhode Island

^cGraduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, Rhode Island

^dRhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Division of Marine Fisheries, Jamestown, RI

^eRhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Bureau of Natural Resources, Providence, RI

* Corresponding Author.

Email Address: ainnesgold@uri.edu

Keywords

Agent-based model; Ecopath with Ecosim; estuary; ecosystem-based fisheries management; forage fish; social-ecological system

Abstract

Marine fisheries represent a social-ecological system driven by both complex ecological processes and human interactions. Fisheries management requires an understanding of both the biological and social components, and management failure can occur when either are excluded. Despite the significance of both, most research has focused on characterizing biological uncertainty rather than on better understanding the impacts of human behavior. In this study, we use the fisheries in Narragansett Bay (Rhode Island, USA) as a case study to understand how fisher behavior influences food web dynamics. Narragansett Bay holds both a commercial fishery for forage fish (i.e. menhaden) and a recreational fishery for their predators (i.e. striped bass, bluefish). To explore tradeoffs that might exist between these two fisheries, we coupled a food-web model to a recreational fishers' behavior model, creating a dynamic social-ecological representation of the ecosystem. Fish biomass was projected until 2030 in both the stand-alone food web model and the coupled social-ecological model, with results highlighting how the incorporation of fisher behavior in modeling can lead to changes in the projected ecosystem. We tested model sensitivity to three attributes: 1) the forage fish commercial harvest scenario, 2) the predatory ("piscivorous") fish abundance-catch relationship in the recreational fishery, and 3) the rate at which recreational fishers become discouraged (termed "satisfaction loss"). Higher commercial harvest of forage fish led to significantly lower piscivorous fish biomass but had minimal effects on the number of piscivorous fish caught recreationally or recreational fisher satisfaction. Both the abundance-catch relationship and satisfaction loss rate had effects on the fish biomass, the number of fish caught

recreationally, and recreational fisher satisfaction. The number of piscivorous fish caught recreationally and recreational fisher satisfaction were positively correlated, but neither one was positively correlated with piscivorous fish biomass. Our results highlight that fisher behavior can significantly influence food web dynamics, including fish biomass and the number of fish caught. Social responses to changing ecosystems should be explicitly incorporated into ecosystem modeling to improve ecosystem-based management efforts. The methods we used to link the food web and fisher behavior models provide a framework of how human behavior can be incorporated into social-ecological modeling.

1. Introduction

Natural resource managers and policy makers are faced with how to sustain resources used in a coupled social-ecological system (Schlüter et al. 2012, Guerrero et al. 2018). These linked systems provide a variety of ecosystem services through a combination of natural components and social, economic, political, and cultural factors (Boyd and Banzhaf 2007). Managing these social-ecological systems is difficult due to their adaptive, heterogeneous, multi-scaled, and time-varying nature (Liu et al. 2007). Marine fisheries are an important global industry representing the many qualities of a social-ecological system, which include complex environmental and ecological processes and a large human influence (Fulton et al. 2011). Achieving fisheries sustainability requires an understanding of the biological factors (i.e. fish stocks) as well as the social aspects, including coastal community livelihood and economic interest (Guerrero et al. 2018).

Fisheries science has strived to incorporate an understanding of the physical, biological, and ecological factors of an ecosystem, including the use of food web models that capture inter-species dynamics. Ecopath with Ecosim (EwE) is a food web model that simulates energy flow and biomass of organisms (Polovina 1984, Christensen and Pauly 1992). A guiding principle of EwE is energetic mass-balance, meaning that for each group in the model, the energy removed (i.e. predation or fishing) must be balanced by the energy consumed (Coll et al. 2009). The energy balance among groups is represented by two linear equations, corresponding to production and consumption (Coll et al. 2009). The static, energy-balanced food web snapshot of Ecopath is made temporally dynamic through Ecosim, which uses time

series data and re-expresses these linear equations as time-varying differential equations. Through Ecosim, users can simulate how the food web responds to variations in drivers such as fishing mortality or primary production (Coll et al. 2009, Heymans et al. 2016). EwE is widely used for evaluating the ecosystem impacts of fisheries (Pauly et al. 2000). For example, Buchheister et al. (2017) used EwE to simulate different Atlantic menhaden (*Brevoortia tyrannus*) harvest levels along the U.S. East Coast and found that of their predators, Atlantic striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) were the most sensitive to these changes. In fact, when menhaden were fished at maximum sustainable yield, striped bass yield and biomass were predicted to decline by ~60% (Buchheister et al. 2017). While EwE can simulate changes in fishing effort, it does not have a way to include feedbacks from dynamic fisher behavior.

Management failure often occurs when fisheries are managed solely based on single-species needs and the social context is ignored (Cooper and Jarre 2017). In particular, human behavior has been identified as a large source of uncertainty in fisheries science and management given that resource-users frequently behave differently than the expectations of managers and economic theory (Fulton et al. 2011). In a coupled social-ecological system, this uncertainty can compound through linkages between systems, creating an unreliable model (Cenek and Franklin 2017). A great deal of research continues to focus on increasing ecological knowledge despite the need to incorporate social and economic objectives. The push to account for human behavior in fisheries management has led to its inclusion in some recent modeling efforts (Ono et al. 2017, Matsumura et al. 2019, Kaemingk et al. 2020).

Agent-based modeling (ABM) is a promising method for representing human behavior and is well-suited for fisheries (Burgess et al. 2020). In ABMs, a set of rules governs how autonomous ‘agents’ (e.g., individual people or fishing boats) interact with each other and the modeled environment (Macal and North 2005). ABMs are especially useful in resource-extraction systems, like fisheries, where heterogeneity exists both in the agents and the environment itself (Nolan et al. 2009). Although a useful tool, the use of ABMs in fisheries science and economics is underutilized (Cooper and Jarre 2017).

The overall objective of this study was to develop a coupled social-ecological model to understand the extent to which changes in both fisher behavior and food web dynamics impact one another. Specifically, we test the sensitivity of our model projections to three factors that have the potential to affect social-ecological interactions: 1) changes in commercial fisheries harvest, 2) changes in the likelihood of catch in the recreational fishery, and 3) the rate at which recreational fishers become discouraged and change their behavior. Response variables include fish biomass, the number of fish caught by the recreational fishery, and recreational fisher satisfaction at the end of a season. To do this, we create an agent-based model (hereafter referred to as the “fisher behavior model”) and couple it with an EwE model (hereafter referred to as the “food web model”; Fig. 1). To our knowledge, this is the first attempt at linking these types of models despite each being established research tools. We run the coupled EwE-ABM model (hereafter referred to as the “social-ecological model”) under different scenarios and describe differences between model

runs, which demonstrates the importance of incorporating human behavior into fisheries models.

2. Methods

2.1 Study site and context

Narragansett Bay (Rhode Island, U.S.) has a long history of fishing as well as data collection. The first quantitative fisheries data in Narragansett Bay were collected in the late 1800s due to conflict between trap and hook-and-line fishers, who claimed that fish stocks were declining (Oviatt et al. 2003). These early records indicated that catch was dominated by anadromous species (alewife (*Alosa pseudoharengus*), American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*), rainbow smelt (*Osmerus mordax*)), boreal species such as winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*), and migratory species like Atlantic menhaden. These previously dominant species declined in the late 20th century (Oviatt et al. 2003), corresponding to shifts in environmental conditions and species community compositions, with warm-water species including scup (*Stenotomus chrysops*) and butterfish (*Peprilus triacanthus*) becoming common (Collie et al. 2008). Today, the fishing industry supports a significant portion of the Rhode Island economy. In 2016, the Rhode Island commercial seafood industry had a total economic output of \$419 million and supported over 4,000 jobs (Mercer and Sproul 2018). The recreational fishery also plays a large economic role, accounting for \$412 million in sales, \$176 million in income, and supporting over 4,000 jobs in 2016 (National Marine Fisheries Service 2018). Recreational boaters, including fishers, comprise close to two thirds of all users in upper Narragansett Bay (Dalton et al. 2010).

The fisheries of Narragansett Bay provide a case study to explore fisheries tradeoffs in a coupled social-ecological system. The commercial fishery that targets forage fish such as Atlantic menhaden operates primarily in the mid and upper Bay in areas of Greenwich Bay, Bristol Harbor, and Mount Hope Bay (Fig. A1.1). In addition to being a commercial fishing target, forage fish play an important role in the Narragansett Bay food web; they are the conduit of energy between the lower trophic level planktonic species and the upper trophic level predators, like piscivorous fishes, sea birds, and marine mammals (Innes-Gold et al. 2020). Because of this linkage, forage fish are important to the Narragansett Bay recreational fishery as a major food source for the targeted predator species. These predators, including striped bass and bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*), are economically and socially valuable as popular recreational fishing targets (data query from the National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Statistics Division). While forage fish abundance is highly variable due to recruitment dynamics, overfishing can exacerbate these fluctuations and result in overfished populations with widespread ecosystem effects, particularly on forage fish predators (Essington et al. 2015). Conversely, exploitation of predators through fishing has been shown to cascade down and affect forage fish population dynamics (Engelhard et al. 2014).

The trade-off between the role of forage fish as supporting a directed commercial fishery and providing the food base for recreationally targeted piscivorous fish poses a complex challenge for management, which is not unique to Narragansett Bay. Along the entire U.S. East Coast (Buchheister et al. 2017) and globally (Houle et al. 2013), the question of how harvesting prey and their predators affect one another,

and how overall harvest should be managed in this context, has been studied and debated at length (Kuffner 2017, Chase 2019). While this question has been explored for broader geographic ranges, Narragansett Bay has distinctly different dynamics given that it is an estuarine nursery ground for many fish species (Meng et al. 2002, Mateo et al. 2011). Additionally, these past studies have not explicitly incorporated how fisher behavior may change in response to shifts in the food web. Currently, fisheries managers in Narragansett Bay are faced with evaluating how forage fish harvest directly impacts the species' population dynamics and the recreational fisheries they support, without the proper tools to do so.

2.2 Food web model

The Narragansett Bay food web model was created using EwE (Innes-Gold et al. 2020). The mid and upper trophic level functional groups were piscivorous fish, forage fish, benthivorous fish, carnivorous benthos, squid, suspension feeding benthos, cultured shellfish, and seabirds. The lower trophic level functional groups were deposit feeding benthos, gelatinous zooplankton, zooplankton, phytoplankton, benthic algae, and detritus. The commercial and recreational fisheries were also represented. In this study, we were primarily interested in the forage fish (Atlantic menhaden, alewife, Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*), blueback herring (*Alosa aestivalis*), bay anchovy (*Anchoa mitchilli*), Atlantic moonfish (*Selene setapinnis*)) and the piscivorous fish (Striped bass, bluefish, summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*), weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*), spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*)) functional groups. Functional group biomass data for the food web model were primarily informed by the University of Rhode Island Graduate School of Oceanography or Rhode Island

Department of Environmental Management bottom trawl surveys. Production / Biomass (P/B) values were calculated as Z, total mortality, the sum of natural and fishing mortality. Consumption / Biomass (Q/B) values primarily came from Fishbase (Froese and Pauly 2019) and Thomas-Brey's invertebrate consumption equations (Brey 2001). Ecotrophic efficiency (EE) cannot be measured in the field and thus was solved for by Ecopath using a linear equation for all groups (Christensen et al. 2005). Recreational fishery landings came from the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service query tool (<https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/queries/>), and commercial landings were either estimated from a data request for NOAA Vessel Trip Reports or scaled down from Rhode Island state landings (<https://www.accsp.org/>). Diet data were sourced from a variety of literature and data collection methods. The forcing functions used in the food web model were phytoplankton biomass (g/m^2), cultured shellfish biomass (g/m^2), and fishing mortality (F; calculated as catch / biomass) for functional groups targeted by fisheries. See Innes-Gold et al. (2020) for further details on model inputs and data sources.

2.3 Fisher behavior model

We have created a fisher behavior ABM based on the piscivorous fish recreational fishery of Narragansett Bay using NetLogo (Wilensky 1999). In this section, we describe our fisher behavior ABM using the Overview, Design concept, and Details protocol (Grimm et al. 2006, 2010, 2020).

Purpose and patterns

The goal of this model is to create a dynamic representation of the Narragansett Bay recreational fishery which will be linked to the food web model. We will use this coupled social-ecological model to quantify how the commercial harvest of forage fish, the abundance-catch relationship, and fisher satisfaction loss rate influence the amount of piscivorous fish caught by recreational fishers and their satisfaction. To assess the impact of each of these aspects, we will compare patterns in three response variables - piscivorous fish biomass, the number of fish caught, and recreational fisher end of season satisfaction.

Entities, state variables and scales

The first type of agent is a fish. Fish agents were assigned several attributes. Attributes included age, length, reproductive status (all start as “ready to spawn” and after spawning change to “not ready to spawn” for the remainder of the year) and sex (assuming a 1:1 sex ratio; (Terceiro 2010, Sharov et al. 2013). Values were sourced from data on striped bass, bluefish, and summer flounder, the three most common recreational fishing targets included in the piscivorous fish functional group. Two types or “breeds” of recreational fisheries were represented in the fisher behavior model: shore fishers and boat fishers. Fishers can have varied satisfaction levels, ranging from 2-10 (Shafer 2007), which dictates their participation in the fishery. This model represented the entirety of Narragansett Bay, with no further spatial components.

Process overview

Each time step was one week. Weeks 1-26 were “open season”, representing May-October, and weeks 27-52 are “closed season”, representing the rest of the year.

This assumes that recreational fishing takes place in half the year. At each weekly time step, some fish agents first die due to natural mortality. Fish also reproduce, grow, and age. Shore and boat fishers decide if they will go fishing based on their satisfaction level. The active fishers then attempt to catch a fish. If they are successful at catching a fish, they decide whether to keep or release the fish. Fisher satisfaction increases if a fish is caught and decreases if an active fisher catches nothing, making them less likely to become active and fish the following week. The model then goes on to the next weekly time step. See “Submodels” section for details on each of these processes.

Design concepts

Emergence: Fish population dynamics are sustained over the course of a model run by having each individual fish age, grow, reproduce, and die due to natural mortality and fishing mortality at each weekly time step. This maintains the overall population structure.

Adaptation: A fisher adapts based on its fishing success of previous time steps. If successful, the fisher becomes more likely to fish again at the subsequent time step.

Stochasticity: We have represented the following processes as stochastic probabilities: fish natural mortality, release mortality, a fisher’s decision to fish, likelihood of catch, and likelihood of keeping a fish.

Observation: We observe the number of fish caught and kept, as well as the number remaining in the population at the end of a season. We also note the average fisher satisfaction at the end of each season.

Initialization & input data

Initial fish population sizes were calculated by converting the food web model-projected piscivorous fish biomass in 2019, which differed on the commercial harvest scenario (see “Sensitivity tests” section), to a count of fish (Table 1). To do this, the g/m² biomass was converted into a total biomass for the whole Bay by multiplying the value by the area of the Bay (380 km²; Narragansett Bay Estuary Program 2017). This total biomass was then divided into different portions representing the different fish size classes (Table A1.1, estimated using striped bass data from NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife 2010, Sharov et al. 2013). The average length of the fish in each size class was converted to a weight using a published striped bass length-weight equation (Kimmerer et al. 2005). The total biomass of fish in each size class was divided by the weight of an individual in that size class to get an approximate number of fish in that size class that are in the Bay. These size class count totals were summed to get an overall total number of fish and transformed by scaling values down by a factor of 1000 for runs in NetLogo.

Individual fish’s lengths (inches) were set using a random draw from a Poisson distribution. 40% of the fish population was drawn from a Poisson distribution with a mean of five inches, 30% from a mean of 10 inches, and 30% from a mean of 25 inches, done to approximately resemble published length distributions (NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife 2010, Sharov et al. 2013). The fish age attribute was calculated from their assigned length using the Von Bertalanffy equation (Equation 1), where k is a growth coefficient that represents the rate at which L_{∞} , or the asymptotic maximum length (hereafter L_{inf}), is approached (Froese and Pauly 2019). For our fish agents, k was set to 0.2 and L_{inf} to 50 inches (see “Model calibration” section).

$$Age = \frac{-52}{K} \ln \left(1 - \frac{inches}{L.inf} \right) \quad (1)$$

Each fisher's satisfaction was assigned by randomly drawing from a normal distribution with a mean of five (SD = 1). Initial participant total for each breed of fisher was based on the number of annual recreational fishing trips in Rhode Island from 2018 converted to weekly participation assuming all fishing took place in six months of the year (data query from the National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Statistics Division). The resulting numbers were 35,000 shore and 9,000 boat fishing trips per week, scaled down by a factor of 1000 to 35 and nine, respectively. The same starting number of fish and fishers were used for each model run.

Submodels

- (i) Natural mortality: There is age-dependent natural mortality. As a fish ages, the probability of dying due to natural mortality decreases. The weekly natural mortality estimates used were: 0.041 (age zero), 0.022 (age one), 0.004 (age two), 0.003 (age three), 0.001 (age four and up). Fish have a maximum lifespan of 21 years (see “Model calibration” section).
- (ii) Somatic growth and maturation: Fish grow according to the Von Bertalanffy growth equation (Equation 2). L_{inf} was set to 50 inches, and k was set to 0.2 (see “Model calibration” section). Fish age + 1 week at each time step.

$$Inches = L.inf \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{K}{52} age \right) \right) \quad (2)$$

- (iii) Reproduction: An age 5+ female fish can spawn once per season (NOAA Fisheries 2020a, 2020b, 2020c). To allow for some density

dependence, a female fish spawns 12 recruits if the fish population is $< 5,000$, seven recruits if the population is $5,000 - 15,000$, and three recruits if the population is $> 15,000$.

- (iv) Fishing activity: If a random number generated between 1 and 10 is less than a fisher's satisfaction level, then they become "active" and will go fishing. Since the minimum satisfaction value is two, there is always a chance a fisher will become active, but a lower satisfaction level means less likely to fish.
- (v) Deciding to keep or release a fish: If a fisher catches a keeper size fish, known as a keeper, (28 - 35 inches, current striped bass regulations in RI; Rhode Island DEM 2020), a 0.85 probability was set for the fisher to retain the fish, and a 0.15 probability that they will release it. If they catch a sublegal fish, they release it.
- (vi) Release mortality: Released keepers and sublegal fish have a 7% and 10% chance of dying upon release, respectively (in range of species-specific studies: Lucy 1970, Malchoff 1970, Diodati and Richards 1996, Nelson 1998, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission 2015b).
- (vii) Abundance-catch relationship: The likelihood of a fisher catching a fish varied depending on the abundance of fish. In this study, we ran versions of the fisher behavior model with three different types of catch-abundance relationship: 1) a power function, 2) a linear relationship, 3) a static percentage (Fig. 2). The relationship between

the probability of capturing a fish from shore or land is defined first as a power function (Equation 3, from Gaertner and Dreyfus-Leon 2004). We created four separate power functions for the probability of a fisher catching a sublegal fish from a boat, a sublegal fish from shore, a keeper from a boat, and a keeper from shore (Table A1.2).

$$U_t = qA^b \quad (3)$$

Where U_t is catch per unit effort (CPUE) at time t , q is catchability, A is abundance, and b is the shape parameter. b was solved for after other parameters were entered. For U_t , we used Marine Recreational Information Program data for recreational fishing trips, selecting “Inland Rhode Island” as our area of interest

(https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/recreational/MRIP_Survey_Data/).

The number of shore or boat trips that caught one or more piscivorous fish (striped bass, bluefish, summer flounder) was divided by the total number of trips in the year to calculate a percent of trips that were successful in catching a keeper. The number of shore or boat trips that released one or more of these piscivorous fish was divided by the total number of trips in the year to calculate a percent of trips that were successful in catching a sublegal fish, assuming all released fish were of sublegal size. For keepers and sublegal fish caught from boats, data from the year 2017 was used. For keepers and sublegal fish caught from shore, recent years had very low success rates, creating a function that plateaued at a very low rate, and therefore an average of the

success rates in the past 25 years was used. For keepers, catchability (q) was set at 0.04 for boats and 0.02 from shore. For sublegal fish, q was set at 0.08 for boats and 0.04 for shore. These values were derived from catchability work on the smallmouth and largemouth bass in hook and line recreational fishery, which were the best available data for hook and line fishing (Hangsleben et al. 2013, Wildenhain 2016, Hansen 2018). Abundance was calculated by converting a piscivorous fish biomass (taken from the food web model time series) in 2017 to legal and sublegal fish counts using the methods described above for calculating the starting number of fish. We then solved for the shape parameter. We chose to run trials with a power functions as they are regularly used to understand how observed catch relates to species abundances (Hilborn 1984, Gaertner and Dreyfus-Leon 2004).

Linear relationships have also been used to relate abundance and catch (Paloheimo and Dickie 1964, Campbell 2004). Four variations of the linear functions were created for catching sublegal fish and keepers from boat or shore methods (Table A1.2). The linear abundance-catch relationships for catching keepers and sublegal fish were created by defining a slope between the origin and the point of high fish abundance where the power curve began to plateau (5000 keepers, 10,000 sublegal fish). Finally, the static percentage abundance-catch relationship was set at the average percent of trips that were successful over the past 25 years, calculated from the MRIP data

(Table A1.2). A trip was classified as successful using the method described in the power function section.

- (viii) Satisfaction loss rate: The rate at which fishers become discouraged if they have an unsuccessful fishing trip (i.e. zero catch), which we have termed “satisfaction loss”, directly determines how likely the fisher is to continue fishing. We ran three different versions of the fisher behavior model to test how sensitive model results are to the rate of satisfaction loss. The three levels of satisfaction loss were one, half, and zero points lost at each week an active fisher catches nothing. In all trials, satisfaction increases by 0.1 points if a sublegal fish is caught and increases by one point when a keeper size fish is caught because recreational fishers have been shown to have increased satisfaction when they catch more fish (Pitman et al. 2019).

Model calibration

We set several model parameters so that the population would remain stable in the absence of fishing. When available, we started with parameter values from previous studies, then made incremental adjustments until the population neither declined to zero nor increased to infinity and matched the observed size distribution (NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife 2010, Sharov et al. 2013) as well as possible. Martino and Houde (2012) estimated age-zero mortality to be 0.068, which we lowered to 0.041 to reproduce the approximate observed number of age-1 fish. Other age-specific mortalities were calculated by converting instantaneous mortality (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission 2015b) to annual mortality using Equation A1.1

(Gulland 1969) and then to weekly mortality using Equation A1.2 (Krebs 2017). The initial weekly mortality rates for ages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6+ were 0.022, 0.013, 0.009, 0.005, 0.004, and 0.003, respectively (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission 2015b). These were lowered (see “Submodels”) to maintain a stable population over the long term. Other adjustments including raising the lifespan from 18.6 (the average lifespan of striped bass, bluefish, and summer flounder; Froese and Pauly 2019) to 21 years (the average of striped bass and bluefish), raising the L_{inf} of 40 inches (the average of the three species; Froese and Pauly 2019) to 50 inches, and increasing the K of 0.18 (the average of the three species; Froese and Pauly 2019) to 0.2.

In our model, the number of recruits per spawner ranged from 3-12, depending on the abundance of fish. This spawner range was calculated by dividing a number of striped bass recruits by a number of spawners (Sharov et al. 2013), converting metric tons of spawner to number of spawners using an average spawner weight of 2000g, which is in the range of published spawner weights (Morse 1981, Kimmerer et al. 2005, Robillard et al. 2008). While we initiated the model based on an unweighted average, these adjustments fall within the range for these species combined, and it is, in fact, the case that the populations of these species in Narragansett Bay are not equal, so changing the initial unweighted estimate is not unreasonable. With these adjusted values, the model was run for 200 years with no fishing and determined to be stable, represented as no increasing or decreasing trend in the population or size distribution.

2.4 Model coupling

This section describes the two-way linkage of the food web and fisher behavior models, which together we have termed the “social-ecological model” (Fig.1). First, a

given F value from each of the commercial harvest scenarios was added to the time series used as a forcing function in the food web model (1994-2018) in the year 2019. All other forcing functions were held constant at their 2018 values. The model was then run until 2020, outputting predicted piscivorous fish biomass in 2020, which was converted to number of fish to start the fisher behavior model (Table 1), based on a striped bass length distribution (Table A1.1). The fisher behavior model was run for one season (26 weeks), and the number of removals (kept fish + dead discards) was converted to a piscivorous fish fishing mortality rate (F). The F value was calculated by first converting the number of dead fish into a caught biomass (g/m^2), using the reverse of the methods described to convert the g/m^2 biomass into a count of fish. The caught biomass (g/m^2) was then divided by the biomass used as the input to the fisher behavior model to calculate an F value. Since the original piscivorous fish F value used in the food web model was the summation of commercial and recreational F, the new F value calculated from the fisher behavior model was added to a commercial F value, which was assumed to be constant from the 2018 value (~ 0.03). This combined F value was then put back into the forcing function time series as the piscivorous fish F in the following year (2020). The food web model was then run again for an additional year, through 2021, where the resulting piscivorous fish biomass was recorded and converted into a number of fish. This was used as the starting number for the next run of the fisher behavior model, which was run for another season and the number of removals was converted to an F value and put back into the forcing function time series at the year 2021. This iterative process was applied through 2030.

2.5 Sensitivity Tests

2.5.1 *Commercial harvest scenario*

The commercial harvest scenario sensitivity test was done solely in the food web model. We simulated four scenarios to explore how different amounts of commercial forage fish harvest affect piscivorous fish and other functional groups. Forage fish fishing mortality is a forcing function time series used in the food web model, calculated as catch/biomass, and is applied to the forage fish functional group. The scenarios of forage fish fishing mortality that we used were the following: a closed fishery with zero harvest ($F=0$), status quo (an average from the 2014-18 F values in the food web model time series, $F=0.202$), an intermediate scenario (the average of the status quo and extreme scenarios, $F=1.68$), and an extreme scenario (the highest F value in the food web model time series, which was from the year 2000, $F=3.167$). In separate trials, each F value was entered starting in the year 2019 and held constant for the next 10 years (example: $F = 0$ for 2019-2029). In each of the food web model forecasts, the other forcing functions (F for other functional groups, phytoplankton biomass, cultured shellfish biomass) were held constant at their 2018 value for the next 10 years. The response variable studied in this test were the biomasses of the mid and upper trophic level functional groups.

2.5.2 *Abundance-catch relationship*

The abundance-catch relationship sensitivity test was conducted in the coupled social-ecological model. One source of uncertainty in this model is the relationship between fish abundance and the probability of a fisher successfully catching a fish, as this relationship has not been defined for Narragansett Bay. The three types of

functions described above (see “Submodels” section) were used in separate fisher behavior model trials to predict whether or not a given fishing trip will be successful in catching a sublegal or keeper size fish based on the number of sublegal or keeper size fish available (Fig. 2). All trials in this sensitivity test used a satisfaction loss rate of 0.5. Each of the three types of trials (power, linear, static) was conducted in each of the four commercial forage fish harvest scenarios. In each specific trial type (i.e. power), a trial was run in the coupled social-ecological model for 10 years (until 2030). Testing these different abundance-catch relationships allowed for assessing how sensitive the response variables of piscivorous fish biomass, the number of fish caught, and fisher end of season satisfaction were to the assumed relationship.

2.5.3 Satisfaction loss rate

The satisfaction loss rate sensitivity test was also conducted in the coupled social-ecological model. The satisfaction loss rate of recreational fishers is also a source of uncertainty in the model. Such uncertainty can be consequential given satisfaction rate decreases directly determines future participation and effort in the fishery. This sensitivity test was done by running three types of trials where fishers lose one, half, or zero satisfaction points after an unsuccessful trip (i.e. zero fish are caught). During these trials, the abundance-catch relationship was always defined using the power function, as that was the null model. Each of the three types of trials (one, half, zero) was conducted in each of the four commercial forage fish harvest scenarios. In each specific trial type (i.e. one), a trial was run in the coupled social-ecological model for 10 years (until 2030). In this test, the three response variables

were also piscivorous fish biomass, number of fish caught, and fisher end of season satisfaction.

2.5.4 Analysis

Analyses were conducted in R version 4.0.2 (R Development Core Team 2020). In the first sensitivity test, commercial harvest scenario, we report and describe differences in the organism biomass forecasted by the food web model at the year 2030. In the second sensitivity test, we quantified the effect of the abundance-catch relationship on three response variables: piscivorous fish biomass, the number of fish caught and kept (i.e. “keepers”), and end of season satisfaction. To do this, we used a generalized least squares (GLS) regression (“nlme” package), which can be used to account for the first order temporal autocorrelation of residuals. Since the points that we used were from a forecasted time series, this allowed us to control for any trends in the response variables that may have been due to the fact that each point depends, to an extent, on the previous point. The overall effect of abundance-catch relationship type was assessed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test on the results of the GLS regression. To further explore which relationship types (i.e. linear, static, power) were significantly different from one another, the coefficient standard error was multiplied by two and simultaneously subtracted from the higher coefficient value and added to the lower coefficient value. If they overlapped, they were deemed to not be statistically different from one another. In each GLS regression, we removed the first three points in the time series (years 2020-2022), as the system had not yet stabilized (Fig. A1.2-A1.3). Since these three trial types were conducted in each of the four commercial harvest scenarios, we again used GLS to quantify the effect that

commercial harvest scenario had on the same three response variables. For the third sensitivity test, satisfaction loss rate, we used the same statistical methods as described for the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials. Additionally, we explored correlations between the three response variables using linear regression analysis with least squares in both the second and third sensitivity tests. In this analysis, there were no temporal patterns in the residuals, so it was not necessary to include year in the model. There were also no significant interactions between harvest scenario and/or trial type with the response variables of interest, so we were able to group all scenarios and trial types together.

3. Results

3.1 Sensitivity: Commercial harvest scenario

In the stand-alone food web model forecasts, the highest biomasses of all fish groups occurred when forage fish harvest was prohibited (Fig. 3). In the year 2030, the extreme, intermediate, and status quo harvest scenarios yielded forage fish biomasses that were 44.9%, 64.1%, and 94.7% of the biomass under zero harvest, respectively (Table A1.3). Piscivorous fish indicated a similar pattern to their prey (forage fish), albeit of smaller magnitude (Fig. 3). The extreme, intermediate, and status quo harvest scenarios yielded piscivorous fish biomasses that were 75.4%, 81.7%, and 96.8% of the predicted biomass under zero harvest, respectively (Table A1.3). The other mid- and upper-trophic level groups showed a range of responses to these various forage fish harvest scenarios; carnivorous benthos biomass was largely unaffected, while benthivorous fish biomass decreased slightly with increasing forage fish harvest. Both large and small squid also responded in the same pattern, with increasing forage fish

harvest leading to lower projected squid biomass (Fig. 3). The sharpest initial declines in biomass were seen in forage fish and both groups of squid in the intermediate and extreme harvest scenarios (Fig. 3).

3.2 Sensitivity: Abundance-catch relationship

The abundance-catch relationship caused significant differences in all three response variables (Table A1.4). Our model trials using a power function to define the abundance-catch relationship predicted a higher number of fish caught, higher fisher satisfaction, and lower fish biomass (Fig. 4a, A1.2). Trials with a linear or static relationship predicted fewer fish caught, lower fisher satisfaction, and a higher subsequent biomass (Fig. 4a). In some scenarios (i.e. zero commercial harvest), the linear and static trials did not product significant differences in response variables, while in other scenarios (i.e. intermediate commercial harvest), they did (Fig. 4a). The power function trials generally produced fish biomass and a number of fish caught that significantly differed from the static or linear trial results. For end of season satisfaction, this distinction was less present (Fig. 4a). The different commercial forage fish harvest scenarios led to significant differences in piscivorous fish biomass, with higher harvest leading to lower forecasted biomass (Table A1.5, Fig. 5a). The zero harvest and status quo scenarios did not produce statistically different fish biomass. Notably, the harvest scenarios caused few significant differences in number of keepers caught and in fisher end of season satisfaction (Fig. 5a). There was a significant positive correlation ($R^2 = 0.80$) between the number of keepers caught and fisher end of season satisfaction (Table 2; Fig. 6a). The pattern was much less defined between piscivorous fish biomass and the number of keepers caught ($R^2 = 0.07$), or

between piscivorous fish biomass and end of season satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.04$), which both had negative slopes.

3.3 Sensitivity: Satisfaction loss rate

The satisfaction loss rate produced significantly different outcomes in the number of fish caught and fisher end of season satisfaction but had fewer distinguishable patterns on piscivorous fish biomass (Table A1.4, Fig. 4b). The satisfaction loss rate of zero led to a higher number of fish caught, higher fisher satisfaction, and lower projected fish biomass, while the satisfaction loss rate of one led to a lower number of fish caught, lower fisher satisfaction, and higher projected piscivorous fish biomass (Fig. 4, A1.3). As before, the higher commercial forage fish harvest led to significantly lower piscivorous fish biomass (Table A1.5, Fig. 5b). The harvest scenarios caused few significant differences in number of keepers caught and fisher end of season satisfaction (Fig. 5b). In these trials, we again found a significant positive correlation ($R^2 = 0.85$) between the number of keepers caught and fisher end of season satisfaction (Table 2; Fig. 6b). Similar to the previous trials, the pattern was less clear in the relationships between the other response variables. The relationship between piscivorous fish biomass and the number of keepers caught had a negative slope ($R^2 = 0.07$), as did the relationship between piscivorous fish biomass and end of season satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.04$).

4. Discussion

By linking a food web model with a fisher behavior model, we have demonstrated a social-ecological method that could be useful for testing social responses to environmental and anthropogenic perturbations. Previous EwE models

have employed a value chain extension (Christensen et al. 2011) or simulated fisheries management strategies within EwE (Martell et al. 2002, Chagaris et al. 2015), but to our knowledge, EwE has not been linked to an ABM. Creating a two-way coupling between an EwE model and a temporally dynamic model of fisher behavior (i.e., an ABM) has allowed for a more complete understanding of the social-ecological system, and allows users to elucidate important mechanisms that can lead to different responses of the system. Such a framework presents the possibility of exploring social-ecological scenarios using models, including not only exploring human impacts on the ecosystem but also how resource users respond to changes in the ecosystem. Since managers regulate the actions of humans, research and modeling efforts aiming to inform management must consider the social domain as part of the ecosystem.

4.1 Commercial harvest scenario

The food web model indicated that the current (status quo) fishing pressure on forage fish is not having a dramatic impact on forage or piscivorous fish biomass in Narragansett Bay. If there is higher fishing pressure (i.e. the extreme scenario from the year 2000), the model projected that there would be a decrease in all three groups of fish and squid, but that this had fairly minimal impacts on the number of fish caught by the recreational fishery. Both size classes of squid showed fairly large decreases between the different forage fish harvest scenarios, as forage fish made up a sizable proportion (27% for small squid, 50% for large squid) of squid diet in this Narragansett Bay model (Innes-Gold et al. 2020). It is worth noting that this food web model had less precise fits for both groups of squid compared to the three fish groups which may lead to less reliable projections (Innes-Gold et al. 2020). In the food web

model, predators switched prey if their preferred prey source was diminished which buffered some of the food web impacts from the harvest of forage fish. Allowing prey switching is ecologically justified, as estuarine predators have repeatedly been shown to switch their diet based on varying prey availability in changing environments (M. Heinichen unpublished manuscript, Pihl et al. 1992, Nobriga and Feyrer 2008, Szczepanski 2013). Overall, the forage fish harvest scenario did not appear to be a main driver in the number of piscivorous fish caught recreationally or recreational fisher satisfaction.

While these results suggest that current forage fishing pressure within Narragansett Bay is not having large social or ecological impacts, this may not be generalizable to forage fish harvest elsewhere. Forage fish harvest has been found to have impact predator biomass on larger scales, depending on the species of interest (Buchheister et al. 2017). There are several reasons why our scale of impact on predator biomass might have been smaller. By grouping multiple species together in our forage and piscivorous fish functional groups, we were unable to determine which species had the strongest responses. Buchheister et al. (2017) found that striped bass responded strongly to changes in menhaden harvest, while other predators did not respond as strongly. Since this EwE model was designed for broad, ecosystem-level questions and grouped striped bass in with other piscivorous fish (i.e. bluefish, summer flounder), it cannot be used to isolate changes in specific species. Additionally, Narragansett Bay is not the most heavily commercially fished estuary along the U.S. East Coast. The Chesapeake Bay, for example, has much higher harvest

levels of forage fish and a strict management system in place meant to account for the ecosystem services of menhaden (SEDAR 2015).

It is also important to note that in the forecasts we performed, other forcing functions (phytoplankton biomass, cultured shellfish biomass, fishing mortality for other fished groups) were held constant at their 2018 levels. This was done to isolate the effects of forage fish harvest and explore specifically how forage fish fishing pressure impacts the ecosystem. Given the importance of phytoplankton as a driver in the EwE model (Innes-Gold et al. 2020) and history of nutrient inputs into Narragansett Bay (Nixon et al. 2008), future simulations could explore the combined effects of varying fishing pressure and phytoplankton (as a proxy for nutrient inputs). For example, reduced primary production could lead to decreased forage fish because of the strong link between plankton and forage fish (Cury 2000). Given that the relationship between nutrient reductions and primary producers is non-linear (Oviatt et al. 2017), this is an area warranting future work.

4.2 Abundance-catch relationship

We chose to test the abundance-catch relationship because higher abundance of fish has led to higher catch in other recreational fisheries (Pitman et al. 2019), however there is no consensus on the best method to approximate this relationship. For certain species, abundance and catch per unit effort (CPUE) can have a proportional relationship, but for other single or grouped species, CPUE has been found to be a poor abundance index (Richards and Schnute 1986, Haggarty and King 2006). Historically, the linear method to relate abundance and catch was commonly used for stock assessments (Cooke and Beddington 1984). While the linear method

has since been questioned as an oversimplification of this relationship (Peterman and Steer 1981, Bannerot and Austin 1983), it has also been found to perform better than a power curve in some cases (Tsuboi and Endou 2008). The power function is another common method and has been suggested as a more appropriate alternative to a linear function (Hilborn 1984, Harley et al. 2001, Gaertner and Dreyfus-Leon 2004). We chose to include an additional, static relationship, because there may be no relationship between abundance and catch (Tsuboi and Endou 2008). The lack of consensus on a defined abundance-catch relationship may be due to differences in species vulnerabilities to fishing gear (Tsuboi and Endou 2008). Other factors can also influence CPUE, such as fish maturity, fish density, area swept, year, season, fishing gear, and fisher behavior (Richards and Schnute 1986, Large 1992).

Our work shows the importance of testing multiple abundance-catch relationships when there is uncertainty. In our model, the three different abundance-catch relationships led to very different model outcomes because of their underlying functional form. When using the power function, the predicted number of fish caught at times was double the number predicted in the linear or static trials. This difference led to discrepancies in fisher's end of season satisfaction, which then affected their likelihood to continue fishing. In comparison, the commercial harvest scenario of forage fish had fewer impacts on the number of piscivorous fish caught or recreational fisher satisfaction. These results showed that the abundance-catch relationship needs to be clearly defined to have confidence in model projections. We have, therefore, highlighted another area for future research: quantifying the abundance-catch relationship for recreational fishers in Narragansett Bay. The nature of this

relationship varies depending on the location and species (Gaertner and Dreyfus-Leon 2004, Tsuboi and Endou 2008), making it difficult to transfer the relationship derived from one fishery to another. The factors that play into this relationship are both social (i.e. fishing gear, behavior) and ecological (i.e. fish abundance, density, population dynamics). It is particularly challenging to account for behavioral changes that affect catch rates, affirming the need for future research to focus on decreasing uncertainty outside of a purely ecological setting (Fulton et al. 2011).

4.3 Satisfaction loss rate

Our satisfaction variable is a proxy for the many factors that go into a fisher's decision-making process on if they will fish at a given time, with satisfaction increasing upon catching a fish (Pitman et al. 2019). In our model, when fishers became discouraged quickly and went fishing less frequently, it led to projections of fewer fish being caught and higher fish biomass. On the other hand, when the failure of a previous trip did not cause fishers to become discouraged, projections of the number of fish caught doubled. Similar to the abundance-catch relationship, the satisfaction loss rate led to changes in all response variables, while commercial harvest scenario mainly affected fish biomass. Because of this impact, quantifying the rate at which fishers exit the fishery is also important in order to have reliable model projections.

Key data gaps to fill include discovering the extent to which a previous trip influences a fisher's decision to fish and if a successful trip increases satisfaction more than an unsuccessful trip decreases it, which has been suggested by an ABM of a coral reef recreational fishery (Shafer 2007). Ideally, these data would be collected from

surveys of the recreational fishing community in Narragansett Bay, as this could differ between locations due to diverse behavior among recreational fishers (Mackay et al. 2020). Some useful survey questions comprise how likely they would be to keep or release a keeper, as well as how much their interest in fishing would change depending on their previous fishing success. In other locations, there has been high heterogeneity in fishers' willingness to leave the fishery, with many continuing to fish even when they were unsuccessful (Cinner et al. 2009, Muallil et al. 2011). In particular, less skilled fishers seem to be more inclined to leave the fishery as stocks decline (van Poorten et al. 2016). While success on previous trips may be an important part of a fisher's decision to fish, the model could also benefit from the incorporation of other factors, such as fisher economic status, fisher skill level, weather, and fuel price (Cinner et al. 2009, Daw et al. 2012, Cooper and Jarre 2017). Even though Narragansett Bay has a plethora of long-term environmental datasets, there is a definitive lack of social data describing fishery attributes that is needed to give nuance into fisher decision making. Understanding the behavior of recreational fishers is essential to promote the sustainability and resilience of recreational fisheries (Arlinghaus and Cooke 2009, Arlinghaus et al. 2013)

4.4 Management implications

Because of the lack of impact that the commercial harvest scenario had on the number of fish caught recreationally, as well as the absence of a positive correlation between biomass and the number of fish caught, it is clear that there are other factors driving the success of recreational fishers. These findings add to the growing amount of literature pinpointing the need for human behavior to be incorporated into

environmental, and specifically fisheries, management (i.e. Fulton et al. 2011, Asah et al. 2014, Hornborg et al. 2019). The relatively few papers that take steps in incorporating fisher behavior into management often focus on economic indicators (Hornborg et al. 2019). In a recreational fishery, economic indicators may not be the main driver of fishing. For example, studies of fisher behavior have shown that in addition to economic gain, factors like the desire to conform to social norms, uphold identity, and experience esteem are also important drivers (Hall-Arber et al. 2009). In fact, it is common for fishers to be willing to pay for the opportunity to fish (Cantrell et al. 2004, Johnston et al. 2006). For many fishers who continue to fish despite economic loss, fishing can be a form of recreation and a way to preserve self-image (Wijermans et al. 2020). Satisfaction was chosen as our model variable as it is flexible enough to capture these non-economic behavioral motivators. In this study, we have shown that incorporating the dynamics of a recreational fishery not solely driven by economic gain can lead to different forecasts of fish biomass and the number of fish caught, thus affecting the food web. The model coupling framework we have demonstrated could be particularly useful for management strategy evaluations (MSE), where there is the need to assess and balance conflicting objectives of different stakeholders (Smith et al. 1999). Going forward, it is imperative for scientists and managers to work with stakeholders to define the required metrics for assessing performance prior to conducting this research.

We did not incorporate spatial dynamics into the food web or fisher behavior models due to a lack of fish and fisher distribution data in Narragansett Bay. The spatial distribution of forage fish may be particularly important to include as their

distribution has the potential to impact their piscivorous predators more than their abundance does (Hilborn et al. 2017) Were these data available, adding a spatial component would allow for increased realism and the exploration of additional social-ecological questions, such as how fishing success varies over time at different locations throughout the Bay. Spatial distribution would also allow for the inclusion of additional behavioral elements, such as competition and collaboration between fishers, which have shown to be important particularly in small-scale fisheries (Pollnac and Poggie 1991, Basurto et al. 2016). Given the limitations of available data, drawing concrete conclusions from our fisher behavior model on how the Narragansett Bay recreational fishery will change over time should not be inferred from this work. We aimed to create a reproducible yet flexible methodology for incorporating human behavior in a coupled social-ecological model built using established modeling platforms. We have also demonstrated that including these dynamics yields significantly different projections of important metrics such as fish biomass, catch, and fisher satisfaction. This model focuses on realism and generality as a goal, and accuracy can be further improved by filling the data gaps mentioned previously (Levins 1966).

Consideration of the entire ecosystem has become a high priority in fisheries management as rapid environmental and human change becomes the new normal; ecosystem-based fisheries management (EBFM) has been an ultimate goal for fisheries management agencies globally, with limited implementation success to date. Perhaps one of the most significant applications to-date, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission adopted the use of Ecological References Points for the

management of Atlantic menhaden along the U.S. Atlantic coast, moving away from a single-species approach and now having quota specification informed by managing menhaden harvest in the context of itself and predators (Knight 2020). However, for full EBFM implementation, these ecosystem approaches must formally include the human dimensions via simulation models. We have shown that incorporating fisher behavior into models can change fish biomass projections and thus should be a priority for future EBFM efforts. Furthermore, we have provided a methodology for the creation of such a coupled model. Perhaps the main barrier to the successful inclusion of human behavior in models, at this point, is the lack of data on these human dimensions. In order to understand how ecosystems will change over time, researchers need to collect and incorporate data on the behavior of resource users. While the absence of data on spatial distribution of fish and fishers, as well as region-specific fisher behavior, limits the predictive use of our social-ecological model, it is a useful tool for three main reasons. First, it has allowed us to explore general patterns of the linkage between the commercial and recreational fisheries of Narragansett Bay. Knowing the extent to which these two fishing sectors are linked is important when deciding if and how they should be considered in the management of one another. Second, our social-ecological model provides a base model to which new data can be added to expand the accuracy of the model's representation of the Narragansett Bay recreational fishery. Finally, there are no examples of coupled EwE and agent-based models that we are aware of, making this method novel and providing a framework of how to incorporate human behavior for other fisheries to follow.

5. Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Rhode Island National Science Foundation Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research Grant #OIA-165522. We thank Kelvin Gorospe, Tracey Dalton, Emi Uchida, and Todd Guilfoos for their input during the conceptualizing and building of the model. We also thank the National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) for hosting an agent-based modeling workshop. This research is a contribution of the Rhode Island Marine Fisheries Institute. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of their agencies.

6. References

- Arlinghaus, R., and S. J. Cooke. 2009. Recreational Fisheries: Socioeconomic Importance, Conservation Issues and Management Challenges. Pages 39–58 *Recreational hunting, conservation and rural livelihoods: science and practice*.
- Arlinghaus, R., S. J. Cooke, and W. Potts. 2013. Towards resilient recreational fisheries on a global scale through improved understanding of fish and fisher behaviour. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* 20(2–3):91–98.
- Asah, S. T., A. D. Guerry, D. J. Blahna, and J. J. Lawler. 2014. Perception, acquisition and use of ecosystem services: Human behavior, and ecosystem management and policy implications. *Ecosystem Services* 10:180–186.
- Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. 2015a. ASMFC Stock Assessment Overview: Bluefish.
- Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. 2015b. 2015 Atlantic Striped Bass Stock Assessment Update.
- Bannerot, S. P., and C. B. Austin. 1983. Using frequency distributions of catch per unit effort to measure fish-stock abundance. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 112(5):608–617.
- Basurto, X., E. Blanco, M. Nenadovic, and B. Vollan. 2016. Integrating simultaneous prosocial and antisocial behavior into theories of collective action. *Science Advances* 2(3):e1501220.
- Boyd, J., and S. Banzhaf. 2007. What are ecosystem services? The need for standardized environmental accounting units. *Ecological Economics* 63(2–3):616–626.
- Brey, T. 2001. Population dynamics in benthic invertebrates. A virtual handbook. Version 01.2. <http://www.thomas-brey.de/science/virtualhandbook/navlog/index.html>.
- Buchheister, A., T. J. Miller, and E. D. Houde. 2017. Evaluating ecosystem-based reference points for Atlantic menhaden. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 9(1):457–478.
- Burgess, M. G., E. Carrella, M. Drexler, R. L. Axtell, R. M. Bailey, J. R. Watson, R. B. Cabral, M. Clemence, C. Costello, C. Dorsett, S. D. Gaines, E. S. Klein, P. Koralus, G. Leonard, S. A. Levin, L. R. Little, J. Lynham, J. K. Madsen, A. Merkl, B. Owashi, S. E. Saul, I. E. van Putten, and S. Wilcox. 2020. Opportunities for agent-based modelling in human dimensions of fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries* 21(3):570–587.

Campbell, R. A. 2004. CPUE standardisation and the construction of indices of stock abundance in a spatially varying fishery using general linear models. *Fisheries Research* 70(2–3):209–227.

Cantrell, R. N., M. Garcia, P. Leung, and D. Ziemann. 2004. Recreational anglers' willingness to pay for increased catch rates of Pacific threadfin (*Polydactylus sexfilis*) in Hawaii. *Fisheries Research* 68(1):149–158.

Cenek, M., and M. Franklin. 2017. An adaptable agent-based model for guiding multi-species Pacific salmon fisheries management within a SES framework. *Ecological Modelling* 360:132–149.

Chagaris, D. D., B. Mahmoudi, C. J. Walters, and M. S. Allen. 2015. Simulating the trophic impacts of fishery policy options on the West Florida shelf using Ecopath with Ecosim. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 7(1):44–58.

Chase, C. 2019, March 29. Recreational fishing groups formally object to menhaden's MSC nod. *SeafoodSource News*.

Christensen, V., and D. Pauly. 1992. ECOPATH II — a software for balancing steady-state ecosystem models and calculating network characteristics. *Ecological Modelling* 61(3–4):169–185.

Christensen, V., J. Steenbeek, and P. Failler. 2011. A combined ecosystem and value chain modeling approach for evaluating societal cost and benefit of fishing. *Ecological Modelling* 222(3):857–864.

Christensen, V., C. Walters, and D. Pauly. 2005. Ecopath with Ecosim: A User's Guide. *Fisheries Centre, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada and ICLARM, Penang, Malaysia* 12.

Cinner, J. E., T. Daw, and T. R. McCLANAHAN. 2009. Socioeconomic factors that affect artisanal fishers' readiness to exit a declining fishery. *Conservation Biology* 23(1):124–130.

Coll, M., A. Bundy, and L. J. Shannon. 2009. Ecosystem Modelling Using the Ecopath with Ecosim Approach. Pages 225–291 in B. A. Megrey and E. Moksness, editors. *Computers in Fisheries Research*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

Collie, J. S., A. D. Wood, and H. P. Jeffries. 2008. Long-term shifts in species composition of a coastal fish community. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 65:1352–1365.

Cooke, J. G., and J. R. Beddington. 1984. The Relationship between catch rates and abundance in fisheries. *Mathematical Medicine and Biology* 1(4):391–405.

- Cooper, R., and A. Jarre. 2017. An Agent-based model of the South African offshore hake trawl industry: Part I model description and validation. *Ecological Economics* 142:268–281.
- Cury, P. 2000. Small pelagics in upwelling systems: patterns of interaction and structural changes in “wasp-waist” ecosystems. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 57(3):603–618.
- Dalton, T., R. Thompson, and D. Jin. 2010. Mapping human dimensions in marine spatial planning and management: An example from Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island. *Marine Policy* 34(2):309–319.
- Daw, T. M., J. E. Cinner, T. R. McClanahan, K. Brown, S. M. Stead, N. A. J. Graham, and J. Maina. 2012. To Fish or not to fish: Factors at multiple scales affecting artisanal fishers’ readiness to exit a declining fishery. *PLOS ONE* 7(2):e31460.
- Diodati, P. J., and R. A. Richards. 1996. Mortality of striped bass hooked and released in salt water. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 125(2):300–307.
- Engelhard, G. H., M. A. Peck, A. Rindorf, S. C. Smout, M. van Deurs, K. Raab, K. H. Andersen, S. Garthe, R. A. M. Lauerburg, F. Scott, T. Brunel, G. Aarts, T. van Kooten, and M. Dickey-Collas. 2014. Forage fish, their fisheries, and their predators: who drives whom? *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 71(1):90–104.
- Essington, T. E., P. E. Moriarty, H. E. Froehlich, E. E. Hodgson, L. E. Koehn, K. L. Oken, M. C. Siple, and C. C. Stawitz. 2015. Fishing amplifies forage fish population collapses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112(21):6648–6652.
- Froese, R., and D. Pauly. 2019. FishBase. <https://www.fishbase.org>.
- Fulton, E. A., A. D. M. Smith, D. C. Smith, and I. E. van Putten. 2011. Human behaviour: the key source of uncertainty in fisheries management. *Fish and Fisheries* 12(1):2–17.
- Gaertner, D., and M. Dreyfus-Leon. 2004. Analysis of non-linear relationships between catch per unit effort and abundance in a tuna purse-seine fishery simulated with artificial neural networks. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 61(5):812–820.
- Grimm, V., U. Berger, F. Bastiansen, S. Eliassen, V. Ginot, J. Giske, J. Goss-Custard, T. Grand, S. K. Heinz, G. Huse, A. Huth, J. U. Jepsen, C. Jørgensen, W. M. Mooij, B. Müller, G. Pe’er, C. Piou, S. F. Railsback, A. M. Robbins, M. M. Robbins, E. Rossmanith, N. Rüger, E. Strand, S. Souissi, R. A. Stillman, R. Vabø, U. Visser, and D. L. DeAngelis. 2006. A standard protocol for describing individual-based and agent-based models. *Ecological Modelling* 198(1):115–126.

- Grimm, V., U. Berger, D. L. DeAngelis, J. G. Polhill, J. Giske, and S. F. Railsback. 2010. The ODD protocol: A review and first update. *Ecological Modelling* 221(23):2760–2768.
- Grimm, V., S. F. Railsback, C. E. Vincenot, U. Berger, C. Gallagher, D. L. DeAngelis, B. Edmonds, J. Ge, J. Giske, J. Groeneveld, A. S. A. Johnston, A. Milles, J. Nabe-Nielsen, J. G. Polhill, V. Radchuk, M.-S. Rohwäder, R. A. Stillman, J. C. Thiele, and D. Ayllón. 2020. The ODD protocol for describing agent-based and other simulation models: A Second update to improve clarity, replication, and structural realism. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 23(2):7.
- Guerrero, A. M., N. J. Bennett, K. A. Wilson, N. Carter, D. Gill, M. Mills, C. D. Ives, M. J. Selinske, C. Larrosa, S. Bekessy, F. A. Januchowski-Hartley, H. Travers, C. A. Wyborn, and A. Nuno. 2018. Achieving the promise of integration in social-ecological research: a review and prospectus. *Ecology and Society* 23(3).
- Gulland, J. A. 1969. SECTION 5. MORTALITIES. Manual of Methods for Fish Stock Assessment - Part 1. Fish Population Analysis. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- Haggarty, D. R., and J. R. King. 2006. CPUE as an index of relative abundance for nearshore reef fishes. *Fisheries Research* 81(1):89–93.
- Hall-Arber, M., C. Pomeroy, and F. Conway. 2009. Figuring out the human dimensions of fisheries: Illuminating models. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 1(1):300–314.
- Hangsleben, M. A., M. S. Allen, and D. Gwinn. 2013. Evaluation of electrofishing catch per unit effort for indexing fish abundance in Florida lakes. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 142(1):247–256.
- Hansen, A. G. 2018. *Coldwater Lake and Reservoir Research Projects*. Annual Report, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Fort Collins, CO.
- Harley, S. J., R. A. Myers, and A. Dunn. 2001. Is catch-per-unit-effort proportional to abundance? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 58(9):1760–1772.
- Heymans, J. J., M. Coll, J. S. Link, S. Mackinson, J. Steenbeek, C. Walters, and V. Christensen. 2016. Best practice in Ecopath with Ecosim food-web models for ecosystem-based management. *Ecological Modelling* 331:173–184.
- Hilborn, R. 1984. Fleet dynamics and individual variation: Why some people catch more fish than others. *Canadian Journal of Aquatic Sciences* 42(1): 2-13.

- Hilborn, R., R. O. Amoroso, E. Bogazzi, O. P. Jensen, A. M. Parma, C. Szuwalski, and C. J. Walters. 2017. When does fishing forage species affect their predators? *Fisheries Research* 191:211–221.
- Hornborg, S., I. van Putten, C. Novaglio, E. A. Fulton, J. L. Blanchard, É. Plagányi, C. Bulman, and K. Sainsbury. 2019. Ecosystem-based fisheries management requires broader performance indicators for the human dimension. *Marine Policy* 108:103639.
- Houle, J. E., K. H. Andersen, K. D. Farnsworth, and D. G. Reid. 2013. Emerging asymmetric interactions between forage and predator fisheries impose management trade-offs. *Journal of Fish Biology* 83(4):890–904.
- Innes-Gold, A., M. Heinichen, K. Gorospe, C. Truesdale, J. Collie, and A. Humphries. 2020. Modeling 25 years of food web changes in Narragansett Bay as a tool for ecosystem-based management. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 654:17–33.
- Johnston, R., M. Randson, E. Besedin, and E. Helm. 2006. What determines willingness to pay per fish? A Meta-analysis of recreational fishing values. *Marine Resource Economics* 21(1):1–32.
- Kaemingk, M. A., K. L. Hurley, C. J. Chizinski, and K. L. Pope. 2020. Harvest–release decisions in recreational fisheries. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 77(1):194–201.
- Kimmerer, W., S. R. Avent, S. M. Bollens, F. Feyrer, L. F. Grimaldo, P. B. Moyle, M. Nobriga, and T. Visintainer. 2005. Variability in length–weight relationships used to estimate biomass of estuarine fish from survey data. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134(2):481–495.
- Knight, E. 2020, August 5. Funding the research to jumpstart ecosystem approaches in fisheries management. *Lenfest Ocean Program*.
- Krebs, C. J. 2017. Estimation of Survival Rates. Pages 655–701. Second edition.
- Kuffner, A. 2017, October 5. New approach urged for managing menhaden fishery. *Providence Journal*. Providence, RI.
- Large, P. A. 1992. Use of a multiplicative model to estimate relative abundance from commercial CPUE data. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 49(3):253–262.
- Levins, R. 1966. The strategy of model building in population biology. *American Scientist* 54(4):421–431.
- Liu, J., T. Dietz, S. R. Carpenter, M. Alberti, C. Folke, E. Moran, A. N. Pell, P. Deadman, T. Kratz, J. Lubchenco, E. Ostrom, Z. Ouyang, W. Provencher, C. L.

Redman, S. H. Schneider, and W. W. Taylor. 2007. Complexity of coupled human and natural systems. *Science* 317(5844):1513–1516.

Lucy, J. 1970. Release mortality in Virginia's recreational fishery for summer flounder, *Paralichthys Dentatus*. Marine Resource Report No. 97-8; VSG-97-09. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary.

Macal, C. M., and M. J. North. 2005. Tutorial on agent-based modeling and simulation. Page 14 pp.- *Proceedings of the Winter Simulation Conference, 2005*.

Mackay, M., S. Yamazaki, J. M. Lyle, and E. M. Ogier. 2020. Determining management preferences in a multimethod consumptive recreational fishery. *Ecology and Society* 25(2):art22.

Malchoff, M. 1970. Short-term hooking mortality of summer flounder in New York and Virginia. Marine Resource Report No. 98-7. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary.

Mateo, I., E. G. Durbin, D. A. Bengtson, and D. Durant. 2011. Variations in growth of tautog in nursery areas in Narragansett Bay and Rhode Island coastal ponds. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 3(1):271–278.

Matsumura, S., B. Beardmore, W. Haider, U. Dieckmann, and R. Arlinghaus. 2019. Ecological, angler, and spatial heterogeneity drive social and ecological outcomes in an integrated landscape model of freshwater recreational fisheries. *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture* 27(2):170–197.

Meng, L., C. D. Orphanides, and J. C. Powell. 2002. Use of a fish index to assess habitat quality in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 131(4):731–742.

Mercer, A., and T. Sproul. 2018. The Economic impact of Rhode Island's fisheries and seafood. Commercial Fisheries Research Foundation.

Morse, W. W. 1981. Reproduction of the summer flounder, *Paralichthys dentatus*. *Journal of Fish Biology* 19(2):189–203.

Muallil, R. N., R. C. Geronimo, D. Cleland, R. B. Cabral, M. V. Doctor, A. Cruz-Trinidad, and P. M. Aliño. 2011. Willingness to exit the artisanal fishery as a response to scenarios of declining catch or increasing monetary incentives. *Fisheries Research* 111(1):74–81.

Narragansett Bay Estuary Program. 2017. *The state of Narragansett Bay and its watershed*. Technical Report, Providence, RI.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2018. Fisheries economics of the United States report, 2016. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-187:243.

Nelson, K. L. 1998. Catch-and-release mortality of striped bass in the Roanoke River, North Carolina. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 18(1):25–30.

Nixon, S. W., B. A. Buckley, S. L. Granger, L. A. Harris, A. J. Oczkowski, R. W. Fulweiler, and L. W. Cole. 2008. Nitrogen and phosphorus inputs to Narragansett Bay: Past, present, and future. Pages 101–175 in A. Desbonnet and B. A. Costa-Pierce, editors. *Science for Ecosystem-based Management: Narragansett Bay in the 21st Century*. Springer, New York, NY.

NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife. 2010. Striped Bass Length/Age Frequency Data. https://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/artstrpbass10_pbsample.htm.

NOAA Fisheries. 2020a, July 22. Summer Flounder | NOAA Fisheries. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/summer-flounder>.

NOAA Fisheries. 2020b, July 22. Bluefish | NOAA Fisheries. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/bluefish>.

NOAA Fisheries. 2020c, July 30. Atlantic Striped Bass | NOAA Fisheries. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/atlantic-striped-bass>.

Nobriga, M. L., and F. Feyrer. 2008. Diet composition in San Francisco Estuary striped bass: does trophic adaptability have its limits? *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 83(4):495–503.

Nolan, J., D. Parker, G. C. van Kooten, and T. Berger. 2009. An Overview of computational modeling in agricultural and resource economics. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 57(4):417–429.

Ono, K., A. Haynie, A. Hollowed, J. Ianelli, C. McGilliard, and A. Punt. 2017. Management strategy analysis for multispecies fisheries including technical interactions and human behavior in modeling management decisions and fishing. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 75(8):1185–1202.

Oviatt, C., S. Olsen, M. Andrews, J. Collie, T. Lynch, and K. Raposa. 2003. A Century of fishing and fish fluctuations in Narragansett Bay. *Reviews in Fisheries Science* 11(3):221–242.

Oviatt, C., L. Smith, J. Krumholz, C. Coupland, H. Stoffel, A. Keller, M. C. McManus, and L. Reed. 2017. Managed nutrient reduction impacts on nutrient concentrations, water clarity, primary production, and hypoxia in a north temperate estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 199:25–34.

Paloheimo, J. E., and L. M. Dickie. 1964. Abundance and fishing success. *Rapports et Procès-verbaux des Réunions du Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer* 155:152–163.

Pauly, D., V. Christensen, and C. Walters. 2000. Ecopath, Ecosim, and Ecospace as tools for evaluating ecosystem impact of fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 57(3):697–706.

Peterman, R. M., and G. J. Steer. 1981. Relation between sport-fishing catchability coefficients and salmon abundance. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 110(5):585–593.

Pihl, L., S. P. Baden, R. J. Diaz, and L. C. Schaffner. 1992. Hypoxia-induced structural changes in the diet of bottom-feeding fish and Crustacea. *Marine Biology* 112(3):349–361.

Pitman, K. J., S. M. Wilson, E. Sweeney-Bergen, P. Hirshfield, M. C. Beere, and J. W. Moore. 2019. Linking anglers, fish, and management in a catch-and-release steelhead trout fishery. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 76(7):1060–1072.

Pollnac, R. B., and J. J. Poggie. 1991. Psychocultural adaptation and development policy for small-scale fishermen's cooperatives in Ecuador. *Human Organization* 50(1):43–49.

Polovina, J. J. 1984. Model of a coral reef ecosystem. *Coral Reefs* 3(1):1–11.

van Poorten, B. T., C. J. Walters, and H. G. M. Ward. 2016. Predicting changes in the catchability coefficient through effort sorting as less skilled fishers exit the fishery during stock declines. *Fisheries Research* 183:379–384.

R Development Core Team. 2020. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing. <https://www.r-project.org/>.

Rhode Island DEM. 2020, October 30. Marine fisheries minimum sizes & possession limits. <http://www.dem.ri.gov/programs/marine-fisheries/mfsizes.php>.

Richards, L. J., and J. T. Schnute. 1986. An Experimental and statistical approach to the question: Is CPUE an index of abundance? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*.

Robillard, E., C. S. Reiss, and C. M. Jones. 2008. Reproductive biology of bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) along the East Coast of the United States. *Fisheries Research* 90(1):198–208.

Schlüter, M., R. R. J. Mcallister, R. Arlinghaus, N. Bunnefeld, K. Eisenack, F. Hölker, E. J. Milner-Gulland, B. Müller, E. Nicholson, M. Quaas, and M. Stöven. 2012. New

horizons for managing the environment: A Review of coupled social-ecological systems modeling. *Natural Resource Modeling* 25(1):219–272.

SEDAR. 2015. *SEDAR 40 – Atlantic Menhaden Stock Assessment Report*. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. Pp. 643. Available online at: http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/Sedar_Workshops.jsp?WorkshopNum=40.

Shafer, J. L. 2007. Agent-based simulation of a recreational coral reef fishery: Linking social and ecological dynamics. PhD Dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Sharov, A., G. Nelson, H. Corbett, G. Wippelhauser, K. Sullivan, G. Shepherd, N. Lengyel, K. Gottschall, A. Kahnle, K. Hattala, K. McShane, and C. Hoffman. 2013. *Striped Bass Stock Assessment for 2013*. Pp. 492–967. 57th SAW Assessment Report, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Smith, A. D. M., K. J. Sainsbury, and R. A. Stevens. 1999. Implementing effective fisheries-management systems – management strategy evaluation and the Australian partnership approach. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 56(6):967–979.

Steven J.D. Martell, Alasdair I. Beattie, Carl J. Walters, Taryn Nayar, and Robyn Briese. 2002. Simulating fisheries management strategies in the Strait of Georgia ecosystem using Ecopath and Ecosim. *Fisheries Centre Research Reports* 10(2):16–23.

Szczepanski, J. 2013. Feeding ecology of skates and rays in Delaware and Narragansett Bays. University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.

Terceiro, M. 2010. *Stock Assessment of Summer Flounder for 2010*. NOAA Fisheries, Northeast Fisheries Science Center.

Tsuboi, J., and S. Endou. 2008. Relationships between catch per unit effort, catchability, and abundance based on actual measurements of salmonids in a mountain stream. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 137(2):496–502.

Wijermans, N., W. J. Boonstra, K. Orach, J. Hentati-Sundberg, and M. Schlüter. 2020. Behavioural diversity in fishing—Towards a next generation of fishery models. *Fish and Fisheries* 21(5):872–890.

Wildenhain, E. 2016. Catchability of largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) on coarse woody habitat in a Northern USA temperate lake. University of Notre Dame, Land O'Lakes, WI.

Wilensky, U. 1999. *NetLogo*. Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

7. Tables

Table 1. The four scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest, the resulting 2020 piscivorous fish biomass, and the starting number of fish for the fisher behavior model (converted from the piscivorous fish biomass and divided by a factor of 1000).

Commercial Harvest Scenario	2020 Piscivorous fish biomass (g/m ²)	Starting number of fish for the fisher behavior model
Zero (F=0)	9.39	15100
Status Quo (F=0.202)	9.26	15000
Intermediate (F=1.68)	8.50	13700
Extreme (F=3.167)	8.01	12900

Table 2. Results from linear regressions quantifying the relationships between the response variables when all forage fish harvest scenarios were combined (degrees of freedom = 1, 118 for all).

Sensitivity Test	Predictor Variable	Response Variable	F	R²	P-Value
Abundance-Catch	Biomass	End Satisfaction	470.6	0.80	<0.001
	Biomass	Keepers Caught	5.3	0.04	0.024
	Keepers Caught	End Satisfaction	8.5	0.07	0.004
Satisfaction Loss	Biomass	End Satisfaction	675.3	0.853	<0.001
	Biomass	Keepers Caught	37.9	0.24	<0.001
	Keepers Caught	End Satisfaction	10.1	0.07	0.002

8. Figures

Fig. 1. Conceptual diagram of our social-ecological model, consisting of the Ecopath with Ecosim food web model and the agent-based fisher behavior model.

Fig. 2. The three types of abundance-catch relationships tested, split by fish size (keeper or sublegal) and method of fishing (boat or shore).

Fig. 3. The Ecopath with Ecosim food web model biomass trajectories under four different scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest. Note that scenario forecasts for carnivorous benthos were similar, with forecasts overlaying each other.

Fig. 4. The mean and data spread (of each 8-year trial) of piscivorous fish biomass, the number of keepers caught, and fisher end of season satisfaction for the four harvest scenarios. Color indicates the type of fisher behavior model trial, where the top row (A) shows the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials, and the bottom row (B) shows the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials. Differing symbols within a scenario denote significant difference between those means.

Fig. 5. The mean and data spread (of each 8-year trial) of piscivorous fish biomass, the number of keepers caught, and recreational fisher end of season satisfaction across harvest scenarios, where the top row (A) shows the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials, and the bottom row (B) shows the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials. Color indicates the scenario of commercial forage fish harvest. Differing symbols within a trial denote significant difference between those means.

Fig. 6. The relationship between the three response variables in (A) the abundance-catch relationship sensitivity trials and (B) the satisfaction loss rate sensitivity trials, where the points represent the results of a one year run in the social-ecological model.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Appendix 1. Supplementary material.

The equation used to convert instantaneous mortality to annual mortality:

$$S = e^{-Z} \quad [A1.1]$$

Where S is the annual survival and Z is the instantaneous mortality (Gulland 1969).

The equation to convert annual mortality to weekly mortality:

$$S_w = S^{\frac{1}{52}} \quad [A1.2]$$

Where S_w is the weekly survival rate (Krebs 2017).

Table A1.1. The age and size distribution used to convert piscivorous fish biomass (g/m²) to a number of fish (estimated from NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife 2010, Sharov et al. 2013). Weight was estimated using a striped bass length-weight equation (Kimmerer et al. 2005).

Age (years)	Length (inches)	Weight (g)	Proportion of population
1	7.07	71.23	0.25
2	12.86	460.46	0.22
3	17.60	1225.58	0.18
4	21.48	2282.08	0.15
5	24.48	3509.48	0.1
6	27.25	4798.87	0.05
7	29.38	6068.37	0.025
8	31.13	7263.93	0.015
9	32.55	8354.56	0.002
10	33.72	9326.35	0.002
11	34.68	10177.01	0.002
12	35.46	10911.55	0.002
13+	36.10	11539.12	0.002

Table A1.2. The power, linear, and static abundance-catch relationships used to represent the likelihood of catching a keeper or sublegal fish from shore or boat fishing methods, where A represents abundance.

Relationship	Keeper/Boat	Keeper/Shore	Sublegal/Boat	Sublegal/Shore
Power	$0.04A^{0.40}$	$0.02A^{0.23}$	$0.08A^{0.26}$	$0.04A^{0.25}$
Linear	$0.0002A$	$0.00003A$	$0.00008A$	$0.00009A$
Static	0.40	0.07	0.67	0.34

Table A1.3. Forecasted biomasses (g/m²) for the six mid and upper trophic level functional groups at the year 2030 under the four scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest.

Functional Group	Zero (F=0)	Status Quo (F=0.202)	Intermediate (F=1.68)	Extreme (F=3.167)
Forage Fish	20.16	19.09	12.93	9.06
Piscivorous Fish	9.92	9.60	8.10	7.48
Benthivorous Fish	14.14	13.93	12.88	12.34
Carnivorous Benthos	12.74	12.75	12.73	12.63
Large Squid	1.15	1.12	0.93	0.80
Small Squid	0.96	0.91	0.64	0.52

Table A1.4. The results of the generalized least squares (GLS) regression on the effect of trial type on piscivorous fish biomass, number of keepers caught, and end of season satisfaction (degrees of freedom = 2 for all). A-C Relationship refers to the abundance-catch relationship. Bold text denotes statistical significance.

Response Variable	Scenario	Factor	F	P-value
Piscivorous Fish Biomass	Zero	A-C Relationship	53.31	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	108.00	<0.001
	Status Quo	A-C Relationship	377.45	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	0.00	1.00
	Intermediate	A-C Relationship	74.77	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	0.00	1.00
	Extreme	A-C Relationship	4.17	0.031
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	58.4	<0.001
Keepers Caught	Zero	A-C Relationship	35.87	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	61.11	<0.001
	Status Quo	A-C Relationship	108.78	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	93.01	<0.001
	Intermediate	A-C Relationship	33.43	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	53.89	<0.001
	Extreme	A-C Relationship	33.37	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	49.59	<0.001
End Satisfaction	Zero	A-C Relationship	24.5	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	326.12	<0.001
	Status Quo	A-C Relationship	50.09	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	464.5	<0.001
	Intermediate	A-C Relationship	10.59	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	110.52	<0.001
	Extreme	A-C Relationship	23.36	<0.001
		Satisfaction Loss Rate	254.28	<0.001

Table A1.5. The results of the generalized least squares (GLS) regression on the effect of harvest scenario on piscivorous fish biomass, number of keepers caught, and end of season satisfaction (degrees of freedom = 3 for all). A-C Relationship refers to the abundance-catch relationship. Bold text denotes statistical significance.

Response Variable	Sensitivity Test	Trial Type	Factor	F	P-value
Piscivorous Fish Biomass	A-C Relationship	Power	Scenario	107.5	<0.001
		Linear	Scenario	195.3	<0.001
		Static	Scenario	108.7	<0.001
	Satisfaction Loss	1	Scenario	268.82	<0.001
		0.5	Scenario	107.5	<0.001
		0	Scenario	161.0	<0.001
Keepers Caught	A-C Relationship	Power	Scenario	2.41	0.09
		Linear	Scenario	4.05	0.02
		Static	Scenario	1.5	0.23
	Satisfaction Loss	1	Scenario	1.52	0.23
		0.5	Scenario	2.41	0.09
		0	Scenario	32.71	<0.001
End Satisfaction	A-C Relationship	Power	Scenario	1.25	0.31
		Linear	Scenario	2.51	0.08
		Static	Scenario	2.97	0.05
	Satisfaction Loss	1	Scenario	0.35	0.79
		0.5	Scenario	1.25	0.31
		0	Scenario	5.53	0.004

Fig. A1.1. The location of forage fish commercial fishing in Narragansett Bay, RI.

Fig. A1.2. Piscivorous fish biomass forecasts of the coupled social-ecological model for the four scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest compared to the food web (EwE) forecast. The different color lines represent the three variations of abundance-catch relationship in the social-ecological model, and the black line represents the stand-alone food web forecast.

Fig. A1.3. Piscivorous fish biomass forecasts of the coupled social-ecological model for the four scenarios of commercial forage fish harvest compared to the EwE forecast. The three different color lines are the variations of satisfaction loss rate in the social-ecological model, and the black line represents the stand-alone food web forecast.

Literature Cited

Gulland, J. A. 1969. SECTION 5. MORTALITIES. Page *Manual of Methods for Fish Stock Assessment - Part 1. Fish Population Analysis*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

Kimmerer, W., S. R. Avent, S. M. Bollens, F. Feyrer, L. F. Grimaldo, P. B. Moyle, M. Nobriga, and T. Visintainer. 2005. Variability in Length–Weight Relationships Used to Estimate Biomass of Estuarine Fish from Survey Data. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134(2):481–495.

Krebs, C. J. 2017. Estimation of Survival Rates. Pages 655–701. Second edition. NJ Division of Fish & Wildlife. 2010. Striped Bass Length/Age Frequency Data. https://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/artstrpbass10_pbsample.htm.

Sharov, A., G. Nelson, H. Corbett, G. Wippelhauser, K. Sullivan, G. Shepherd, N. Lengyel, K. Gottschall, A. Kahnle, K. Hattala, K. McShane, and C. Hoffman. 2013. *Striped Bass Stock Assessment for 2013*. Pages 492–967. 57th SAW Assessment Report, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.