Cultivation-Depensation Model – Q2 Management and Hysteresis

1. Ecosystems often can exhibit multiple stable states, aquatic ecosystems have provided classic examples of this
2. The transition between these states is often non-linear and may come with little warning
3. Because of this, keeping ecosystems in a safe operating space is crucial to buffering against disturbances and preventing regime shifts to undesirable states
   1. Regime shifts (i.e., abrupt and persistent changes in ecosystem state) are likely to have major influences on aquatic systems.
4. Ecosystems transition between stable states resulting from changes in community dynamics. This can occur either through slow moving changes to underlying abiotic factors that favor some species over others (nod to Hansen climate change work) or through direct impacts by humans on the species themselves.
   1. Current research to incorporate ecosystem-based management has focused on ecosystem change, such as climate change and cultural eutrophication, and management strategies to maintain stable states of a system in light of ecosystem change (Liu et al. 2015). Management of ecologically driven regime shifts tend to focus on identifying the underlying cause of change, and, in many cases, adapting to those changes **(citation)** or mitigating the effects of those changes through increased systemic resilience **(Carpenter et al. 2017citation)**.
   2. Fisheries are a prime example of this kind of system where humans impact the system directly through fishing and indirectly through climate change
      1. Indirect ways example (climate change Hansen work) – these are hard to manage
   3. Talk about how both the ways in which humans directly alter species interactions can play a role in reinforcing or changing the stable state.
      1. Harvest, catch and release – (thinking these are the things the average person controls)
         1. This is more of an emergent thing – people do not really think about the stable state when they do this, they are thinking about catch rate, etc.
         2. Harvest driven regime shifts have been studied in commercial and marine fisheries when ecosystem-based management has been implemented (Oken and Essington 2016; Essington et al. 2015). The recognition of the role of inter-specific and trophic interactions between species, and the hysteretic behavior that may follow, has helped foster the adoption of ecosystem-based management (Walters and Kitchell 2001; Blackwood, Hastings, and Mumby 2012). Crowder et al. (2008) has also explored the simultaneous influences of multiple fished species on marine systems. This stands in contrast to more traditional management decisions which take a linear view of the system (e.g., fish population is overexploited, so managers attempt reduce mortality rates through regulations or stock in response) (Sass et al. 2017). Instances where these simple solutions have had no effect, or even a negative effect, are abundant and demonstrate a need to consider alternative stable states and the hysteretic behavior that is often present in complex aquatic communities (Pine et al. 2009).
      2. Stocking, limiting harvest – (these are the things managers can control
         1. This is where managers can influence stable state
            1. A central theme of these management strategies is a holistic view of the ecosystem and the rejection of single species management strategies applied broadly in favor of flexibility that allows managers to consider the full context of the systems they work in and tailor their actions appropriately (Collie et al. 2016; Camp and van Poorten 2019?).
         2. Also where managers can change/maintain a stable state as a direct result of harvest/catch (basically, this is where you can deal with whatever people did, which may not have been ideal)
            1. Here, I am thinking we could talk about how managers have control over changing undesirable states created through human impacts
5. Here we explore this second pathway, direct human influence on an ecosystem, through a modeled recreational fishery to show why understanding the complex interactions between species is necessary to either maintain or rehabilitate an ecosystem.
   1. To better understand the dynamics and interactions of multi-species recreational fisheries, we expand on the model presented in Biggs et al. (2009) and present a two species, stage-structured fisheries model. In keeping with the tenets of ecosystem-based management, our model moves away from a single harvested species management scenario and towards a more realistic system where multiple harvested sportfish species compete with each other. The outcome of this trophic interaction affects and is affected by the effects of humans on the ecosystem through fishing *activities*. Adults and juveniles of both species trophically interact with each other and are simultaneously harvested, but to different degrees. We parameterized our model to represent largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) or a generalized centrarchid complex (bluegill *Lepomis macrochirus*, black crappie *Pomoxis nigromaculatus*) and walleye (*Sander vitreus*) trophic interactions in north temperate lakes. Our model is unique in that it examines hysteresis and management in: (1) a freshwater ecosystem; and (2) a multi-species system where both species and/or species complex are sport fish targeted by anglers. The goals of our modeling exercises were to: (1) better understand the role hysteresis plays in the type and magnitude of management responses necessary to maintain a system in a desired state; and (2) to investigate the role management responses can play in reverting to an alternative configuration. We accomplish this by modeling species-specific responses to regulations and stocking in a system where hysteresis is present or absent. We perform our modeling experiments in systems where a manager’s goal is to either maintain a desired stable state or push the system to a desired stable state from an undesired one.