Managing & Modeling Fisheries at Small Spatial Scales:
A Case Study Using Giant Clams



Annie Ji-Yih Yau
annie.yau@noaa.gov
anniejyau@gmail.com

Knauss Sea Grant Fellow
Office of the Assistant Administrator
Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, NOAA
17 May 2012

Small-scale, artisanal fisheries

Lack of funding, institutions, personnel, central organization, biological information

Small-scale in terms of:

- **Spatial scale of harvest**
- **Capital**
- **Technology and manpower**
- **Consumption and sale**

Giant clam fisheries

- Tropical/sub-tropical
- Sessile
- Hermaphrodites
- Pelagic larval duration ~7-11 days
- Form a symbiosis with photosynthesizing *Symbiodinium*

Giant clam fisheries exist throughout the Indo-Pacific



Range of *Tridacna maxima*, the small giant clam.

Managing at small-scales:

- Spatial scale of ~10s – 100s of km
- Island or reef scale
- A mix of self-recruitment and external recruitment

Recruitment is critical to managing fisheries

Recruitment: The addition of new individuals to a population

Conventional fisheries management often assumes a single stock, 100% self-recruitment



Small-scale artisanal fisheries: <100% self-recruitment.

- Only self-recruitment depends on the # of adults

Research Questions

Under uncertainty in the level of self-recruitment,

1. How do you model a population and its fishery, to determine trends in abundance?

2. How do you set a size limit that maximizes harvest while sustaining population abundance?

Mo’orea, French Polynesia

minimum size limit: 120 mm

Research Questions

Under uncertainty in the level of self-recruitment,

1. How do you model a population and its fishery, to determine trends in abundance?

   Approach:

   - Modify an Integral Projection Model to account for uncertainty in self-recruitment
   - Measure demographic data on giant clams and use it to create an IPM for giant clams

2. How do you set a size limit that maximizes harvest while sustaining population abundance?

Integral Projection Models
(and ways they are better than matrix models)

(Easterling et al. 2000, Ellner & Rees 2006)

- IPMs describe individuals as continuous in size (or age), instead of binning them into size (or age) classes
  - This eliminates the need to artificially define size classes, and eliminates size-specific sensitivities
- IPMs require less data than matrix models
  - IPMs use regression methods
- IPMs can be used to calculate all analyses used by managers from matrix models – e.g. population growth rate, sensitivity and elasticity analyses

General model of population at small spatial scales
(with a mix of self-recruitment and external recruitment)

$$Abundance_{t+1} = Growth\ Rate * Abundance_t + External\ Recruitment$$

Where *Growth Rate* combines survival (from natural and fishing sources of mortality), growth, and self-recruitment

Integral Projection Model modified to account for a mix of recruitment:

$$n(y,t+1) = \int_L^U (P(x,y) + F(x,y))n(x,t)dx + R(y,t+1)$$

METHODS: Gather data on demographic processes

Mark and recapture study: 99% recapture rate

- 12 sites, 44 permanent transects
- Surveyed Jun-Aug 2006-2010 (5 years)
- Clams tagged with unique 3-letter code
- n = 1,949 clams surveyed
- 2,340 m^2 covered

~4000 hours or 168 days underwater

growth

survival:
includes fishing and natural mortality

fecundity

recruitment

RESULTS: Integral Projection Model

At 0% self-recruitment,
Equilibrium abundance = 93%
of present abundance



At 100% self-recruitment,
Exponential growth (rate = 1.07)



From 0% to 52.85% self-recruitment:	**Equilibrium abundance**
From 52.85% to 100% self-recruitment:	**Exponential growth**

Harvest of giant clams on Mo'orea is sustainable.
i.e. The population of giant clams can support the present-day fishing rate.

Research Questions

Under uncertainty in the level of self-recruitment,

1. How do you model a population and its fishery, to determine trends in abundance?

2. How do you set a size limit that maximizes harvest while sustaining population abundance?

   Approach:

   - Simulate future harvest of giant clams for a range of minimum size limits across the range of possible self-recruitment

METHODS: Simulate future harvest

$$Abundance_{t+1} = Growth\ Rate * Abundance_t + External\ Recruitment$$

- For all combinations of:
  - Self-recruitment from 0-100% of total recruitment, in 5% increments
  - Minimum size limits from 60-180 mm, in 5 mm increments
- Simulate the harvest of 50% of the legal-sized clams each year, stopping the simulations at year 30
- Calculate biomass of harvest and population abundance at year 30

RESULTS: Annual harvest at year 30



RESULTS: A near-optimal size limit



A single, near-optimal size limit can maximize harvest even when there is uncertainty regarding the amount of self-recruitment.

RESULTS: Near-optimal size limits can be set for many different life histories

Life history characteristic	Values tested	Near-optimal size limit (mm)
asymptotic size	121.4 mm, 60.7 % of max size	N/A
	161.9 mm, 80.9 % of max size	135
	178.1 mm, 89.0 % of max size	150
time to asymptotic size	10 years	160
	38 years	135
	50 years	130
asymptotic size and time to asymptotic size‡	121.4 mm, 60.7 % of max size, 28 years	115
	161.9 mm, 80.9 % of max size, 38 years	135
	178.1 mm, 89.0 % of max size, 42 years	145
magnitude of variation in growth	51.3 mm	135
	68.5 mm	135
	85.6 mm	140
minimum reproductive size	33.1 mm, 16.5 % of max size	115
	66.1 mm, 33.1 % of max size	135
	99.2 mm, 49.6 % of max size	N/A
fecundity at asymptotic size	3.0 self-recruits	140
	4.0 self-recruits	135
	5.0 self-recruits	135
survival rate at asymptotic size	66.7 %	N/A
	88.6 %	135
	96.9 %	140

‡asymptotic size changed, time to asymptotic size re-calculated accordingly

CONCLUSIONS

- The population of giant clams on Mo'orea can support the present-day level of fishing mortality,
  - The population would decline by 7% in the worst case scenario (if the population has 0% self-recruitment).

- A single, near-optimal size limit will maximize (or nearly maximize) annual harvest of giant clams on Mo'orea across all levels of self-recruitment.

- This near-optimal size limit is 135 mm, which is larger than the current minimum size limit of 120 mm.

- A near-optimal size limit can be applied to organisms with a wide variety of life history characteristics under uncertainty in the level of self-recruitment at small spatial scales.

Policy Implications

- Integral Projection Models are a good alternative to matrix population models
  - Require less data to parameterize
  - Eliminate model sensitivities to size classes, and arbitrary size classes
  - Provide the same outputs and analyses as matrix models

- Even though we don’t know how much self-recruitment is occurring at a small spatial scale, we can still:
  - Model populations (using IPMs)
  - Set a single minimize size limit to maximize (or nearly maximize) harvest

Acknowledgements

Committee: Hunter Lenihan, Bruce Kendall, Roger Nisbet

Field work: L. Albertson, J. Creason, T. Minter, A. Rivera, S.Shaffiy

The Mo'orea Coral Reef LTER

Gump station staff

The Brando Trust, Conservation Tetiaroa

The Lenihan and Kendall labs

My family and friends

Funding and support:

- Mo'orea Coral Reef Long Term Ecological Research Site
- Gump Research Station Pacific Education and Research Laboratories (PEARL) Award
- PADI Foundation
- Bren School of Environmental Science & Management
- Luce Environmental Science to Solutions Fellowship
- UCSB

CONTACT: annie.yau@noaa.gov

anniejyau@gmail.com

PADI FOUNDATION

Richard B. Gump South Pacific Research Station

LTER

Gordon and Betty MOORE FOUNDATION



Unusually high densities in Tatakoto (Photo Y. Chancerelle) (Gilbert et al 2006)

Minimum size limits & giant clam fisheries

- Sets a minimum size for harvest
- A commonly used fisheries management tool
- Designed to allow individuals to reproduce before being harvested
- Result in sustainable fisheries when the limit is set correctly!



How do you set a size limit under self-recruitment uncertainty?



Integral Projection Models
(and ways they're better than matrix models)

(Easterling et al. 2000, Ellner & Rees 2006)

- IPMs require less data to parameterize



Matrix model:
1 parameter for
each size class

IPM:
2 parameters,
no size classes,
N = 24

Mo'orea, Society Islands, French Polynesia



minimum size limit:

120 mm


min reproductive size
min size limit
x 10^-3
Relative frequency
Size (mm)
Mo'orea
n = 1688


x 10^-3
Relative frequency
Size (mm)
Tetiaroa – relatively unharvested
n = 88


x 10^-3
Relative frequency
Size (mm)
Harvest on Mo'orea
n = 782

RESULTS: Size-dependent functions for giant clam IPM



RESULTS: Transitions & Elasticities

Transition values: likelihood of transition from one size to another



Elasticities: Proportional changes in the population growth rate for a given change in a transition value



Model the extremes of self-recruitment for a local population

$$n(y,t+1) = \int_L^U (P(x,y) + F(x,y))n(x,t)dx + R(y,t+1)$$

λ

open

closed

0% **self-recruitment / total recruitment** **100%**

Equilibrium abundance
(remains constant through time)

Exponential growth or decline
(from low initial abundance)





METHODS: Simulate annual harvest

Sample simulation:
20% self-recruitment, 120 mm size limit
population abundance over time



size distribution at year 30



	Tested values	Optimum size limit (mm)	Range of self-recruitment where setting optimum size limit results in harvest within 10% of max harvest	Maximum annual harvest (g)†	Maximum potential loss of harvest*
Current annual fishing mortality	25%	135	25 – 100 %	3,205	30.8 %
	50%	**135**	**0 – 100 %**	**15,151**	**8.7 %**
	75%	140	0 – 100 %	77,938	3.0 %
Future annual fishing mortality	25%	130	5 – 100 %	22,317	12.1 %
	50%	**135**	**0 – 100 %**	**15,151**	**8.7 %**
	75%	140	5 – 100 %	7,577	12.2 %
Time horizon	20 years	130	0 – 100 %	3,965	3.9 %
	30 years	**135**	**0 – 100 %**	**15,151**	**8.7 %**
	50 years	145	5 – 100 %	298,388	23.9 %

†occurs at 100% self-recruitment *generally occurs at 0% self-recruitment