

Simple rules for establishment of effective marine protected areas in the age-structured metapopulation dynamics

by
Nao Takashina

*Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences,
Kyushu University, 6-10-1, Hakozaki, Fukuoka, 812-8581, Japan*
nao.takashina@gmail.com

Abstract

The implementation of effective no-take marine reserves or marine protected areas (MPAs) is a central goal of modern fisheries science. Accordingly, a number of studies have been conducted to understand broad rules for the creation of MPAs and have tested the effects of marine reserves for specific regions of interest. However, there still exist many challenges for implementing effective MPAs. Deducing theoretical conditions guaranteeing that the introduction of MPAs will increase fishing yields in age-structured population dynamics is one such challenge. To derive such conditions, a simple mathematical model is developed that follows the metapopulation dynamics of a sedentary species. The obtained results suggest that moderate recruitment success of an individual's eggs is a necessary condition for an MPA plan to increase biomass yields. Furthermore, numerical simulations of the optimal fishing regime with MPAs aiming at maximizing the fishing yields suggest that biomass yields monotonically decrease with the fraction of the MPAs. The optimal fishing mortality rate suddenly jumps to a very high value, leading to a sudden decline in the population biomass, to a lower level than in a fishing regime with a constant fishing mortality rate. The decline in the population biomass is never observed in the fishing regime with a constant fishing mortality.

Introduction

In line with global targets agreed upon under the Convention on Biological Diversity [1], a central goal of modern fisheries science is the introduction of effective no-take marine reserves or marine protected areas (MPAs) [2]. Accordingly, a number of studies have been conducted to understand generic rules for the creation of MPAs from theoretical perspectives [3–11] and tested the effect of marine reserves in specific regions [12–14]. However, there still remain many challenges for implementing effective MPAs [15]. Deducing theoretical conditions that can guarantee that the introduction of MPAs will increase fishing yields in an age-structured population dynamics is one such challenge, and deducing these conditions has potential to improve our insight of MPA management significantly. Age-structured models often play a central role in the study of marine reserves (e.g., [3,4,6,16]) because many marine species show critically different life history aspect depending on their age (e.g., egg, larva, and juvenile), but the question about theoretical conditions mentioned above remains unanswered, possibly because of the difficulty in treating an age and spatial structure at the same time.

Here, keeping the abovementioned primary goal of deducing theoretical conditions in mind, I develop a simplest possible mathematical model that follows the metapopulation dynamics of a sedentary species, which are often the focus of planned marine reserves (e.g., [17]). Using the same framework of the model, I also conduct numerical simulations to explore the optimal fishing with MPAs that is also one of the main interests of management with marine reserves [7,18,19].

In the following sections, I derive a theoretical condition that indicates that moderate recruitment success of an individual's eggs is necessary to cause the introduction of MPAs to lead to increased population biomass. The optimal fishing regime with MPAs aiming at maximizing the biomass yields suggests that biomass yields monotonically decrease with the fraction of the MPAs, and that the optimal fishing mortality rate suddenly jumps to a very high value, leading to a sudden decline in the population biomass, to a lower level than in a fishing regime with a constant mortality rate.

Models

Population dynamics and fisheries with MPAs

I consider the situation where fishing activities take place in the patchy environments in which a larval dispersal of the sedentary species creates metapopulation dynamics, containing N ($\gg 1$) patches (Fig. 1a). Managers introduce MPAs with the aim of increasing the biomass yield in the concerned region. Larval dispersal of the target species connects patches, but the species does not migrate between patches after larval settlement. In an age-structured metapopulation model, individuals experience a natural mortality rate M , and, for individuals older than the legal age, a_{leg} , the fishing mortality rate F_i (Fig. 1b). The fishing mortality rate in patch i , F_i , is 0 if MPAs cover the patch, and larger than 0 if it is fishing ground. Individuals continue to grow in length until reaching the maximum age a_{max} , and die after producing eggs when they reach this age. Population dynamics after the larval settlement in the patch i , age a , and year t is then described by

$$X_{i,a,t} = \begin{cases} X_{i,a-1,t-1} e^{-M}, & 1 \leq a \leq a_{leg} \\ X_{i,a-1,t-1} e^{-(M+F_i)}, & a_{leg} < a \leq a_{max} \end{cases} \quad (1a)$$

Eq. (1a) can be rewritten in the following form, suggesting that the numbers of all age classes are calculated from the number of individuals at age 0:

$$X_{i,a,t} = \begin{cases} X_{i,0,t} e^{-aM}, & 1 \leq a \leq a_{leg} \\ X_{i,0,t} e^{alegF_i} e^{-a(M+F_i)}, & a_{leg} < a \leq a_{max} \end{cases} \quad (1b)$$

Mature individuals with age older than a_{mat} produce eggs at the end of year with fecundity rate $f(L_a)$, which is a function of length of an individual at age a , L_a [i.e., the number of eggs produced from the age class a ($\geq a_{leg}$) is $X_{i,0,t} e^{alegF_i} e^{-a(F_i+M)} f(L_a)$]. The von Bertalanffy growth equation calculates the length for each age a , L_a , given the maximum length L_∞ , the age at 0 cm a_0 , and growth rate k : $L_a = L_\infty (1 - e^{-k(a-a_0)})$. One can also obtain the weight of an individual with age a , W_a using an allometric relationship with constants b_1 and b_2 , $W_a = b_1 L_a^{b_2}$. Total biomass in the system in year t , B_t , is therefore the sum of the biomass over all age classes and patches, $B_t = \sum_{i,a} W_a X_{i,a,t}$.




Figure 1 Schematic descriptions of the model. (a) Larval dispersal generates metapopulation dynamics. Circles (vertexes) represent the habitat of the species. Lines and self-connecting curves represent connections made in the dispersal: in this example, the number of connections is 3. (b) Age-structured population dynamics occur in each habitat. The species experiences this density effect in only the larval settlement period. After settlement, the species experiences natural mortality rate M for individuals with age lower than a_{leg} and both the natural mortality rate, M , and fishing mortality rates, F_i , for individuals with age larger than a_{leg} . Individuals begin producing eggs after reaching the age of maturity a_{mat} .

I assume that the density dependent effect only takes place in the period of the larval settlement, with the Beverton-Holt egg-recruitment relationship [20]. Therefore, given the number of larval arrivals at patch i at the end of year $t-1$, $\hat{S}_{i,t-1}$, the maximum settler survival rate α and the inverse of the carrying capacity $\beta = K^{-1}$, the number of recruitments at year t is

$$X_{i,0,t} = \frac{\alpha \hat{S}_{i,t-1}}{1 + \beta \hat{S}_{i,t-1}}. \quad (2)$$

The number of larvae arriving at the patch i , $\hat{S}_{i,t}$, depends on the metapopulation structure.

Here, for the purpose of analytical tractability, I assume that all patches of the system have identical properties such as carrying capacity and number of links connecting with other patches (i.e., mean-field approximation; see e.g., [21]). Therefore, given the number of eggs produced in patch j in the end of year t , $S_{j,t}$, the survival rate of larvae during the dispersal duration, σ , and the proportion of the number of links connecting with other patches to the total number of patches, p , the number of larvae the patch i receives in year t is

$$\hat{S}_{i,t} = (\sigma/pN) \sum_{j \in \nu(i)} S_{j,t}, \quad (3)$$

where $j \in \nu(i)$ represents the patch j connecting to the patch i . I assume that patch i connects with itself. pN is the actual number of the links of each patch, and the equation suggests that larvae disperse evenly to the connected patches due to the assumption of identical properties of each patch (i.e., larval pool assumption [22,23]). Given the fraction of the MPAs, r , in the system, (therefore, $0 \leq r \leq 1$) and from Eq. (1b) and (2), one can further extend Eq. (3) to the situation considering management with MPAs

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_{i,t} &= \frac{\sigma}{pN} \frac{\alpha \hat{S}_{i,t-1}}{1 + \beta \hat{S}_{i,t-1}} \sum_{j \in \nu(i)} \left(\sum_{amat+1}^{aleg} e^{-aM} f(L_a) + e^{alegF_i} \sum_{aleg+1}^{amax} e^{-a(M+F_i)} f(L_a) \right), \\ &= \frac{\sigma \alpha \hat{S}_{i,t-1}}{1 + \beta \hat{S}_{i,t-1}} \left[\underbrace{r \sum_{amat+1}^{amax} e^{-aM} f(L_a)}_{\text{from reserve}} + (1-r) \underbrace{\left(\sum_{amat+1}^{aleg} e^{-aM} f(L_a) + e^{alegF_i} \sum_{aleg+1}^{amax} e^{-a(M+F_i)} f(L_a) \right)}_{\text{from fishing ground}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Only the fraction of fishing ground, $1-r$, of all patches N contributes to the biomass yields, and one derives the biomass yields in year t

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= \frac{F_i}{F_i + M} N(1-r) \sum_{aleg}^{amax-1} X_a (1 - e^{alegF_i} e^{-(M+F_i)}) W_a, \\ &= \frac{F_i}{F_i + M} N(1-r) e^{alegF_i} (1 - e^{-(M+F_i)}) \frac{\alpha \hat{S}_{i,t-1}}{1 + \beta \hat{S}_{i,t-1}} \sum_{aleg}^{amax-1} e^{-a(M+F_i)} W_a. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Equilibrium biomass yield and population biomass

At equilibrium, the number of larvae arriving each year becomes constant over sequential years, and thus $\hat{S}_{i,t} = \hat{S}_{i,t-1} = \hat{S}_i^*$ is satisfied. By solving Eq. (4) about \hat{S}_i^* , one obtains the

equilibrium number of larvae arrivals at each patch:

$$\hat{S}_i^* = \frac{1}{\beta} \left[\sigma \alpha \left[r \sum_{amat+1}^{amax} e^{-aM} f(L_a) + (1-r) \left(\sum_{amat+1}^{aleg} e^{-aM} f(L_a) + e^{alegF} \sum_{aleg+1}^{amax} e^{-a(M+F_i)} f(L_a) \right) \right] - 1 \right]. \quad (6)$$

By substituting Eq. (6) into Eq. (5), the equilibrium biomass yield is thus

$$Y^* = (1-r)A_1 \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sigma \alpha \{r(A_2 - A_3) + A_3\}} \right], \quad (7)$$

where $A_1 = F_i N (F_i + M)^{-1} e^{alegF_i} (1 - e^{-(M+F_i)}) \alpha \beta^{-1} \sum_{aleg}^{amax-1} e^{-a(M+F_i)} W_a$, $A_2 = \sum_{amat+1}^{amax} e^{-aM} f(L_a)$, and

$A_3 = \sum_{amat+1}^{aleg} e^{-aM} f(L_a) + e^{alegF_i} \sum_{aleg+1}^{amax} e^{-a(M+F_i)} f(L_a)$. A_2 and A_3 reflect the fecundity of the

species in an MPA and fishing ground, respectively.

Results

Analytical conditions that MPAs increase the biomass yields

Given the equilibrium biomass yield (7), one can analyze the conditions for which introducing MPAs will increase the biomass yields. Necessary and sufficiently conditions are that Eq. (7) is (i) a concave function of the MPAs fraction r in $0 \leq r \leq 1$, as well as (ii) that the peak of this function lies in this range of r . The second derivative of Eq. (7), $d^2Y^*/dr^2 = -2A_1A_2(A_2 - A_3)(\sigma\alpha)^{-1} \{r(A_2 - A_3) + A_3\}^{-3}$ is negative if $A_2 > A_3$, which is condition (i). Clearly condition (i) is always satisfied. One can easily derive the condition (ii) as $A_3 < (\alpha\sigma)^{-1/2} A_2^{1/2} < A_2$. By combining both conditions, one concludes that the introduction of the MPAs increases if the parameters satisfy $A_3 < (\alpha\sigma)^{-1/2} A_2^{1/2} < A_2$. It is worth noting that this condition does not include the number of patches, N (but $\gg 1$) or the inverse of the carrying capacity β . In that case, the optimal fraction of the MPAs, which maximizes the biomass yields, is $(-A_3 + \sqrt{A_2/(\alpha\sigma)}) / (A_2 - A_3)$. This suggests that the optimal

fraction of the MPAs increases as $\alpha\sigma$ increases, and the values for this situation reflect the likelihood of an egg successfully settling in a given patch. In the case where a species produces the large number of eggs and the likelihood of an egg successfully settling in one

patch is not very small ($\alpha\sigma\{r(A_2 - A_3) + A_3\} \gg 1$ for any r), Eq. (7) has the approximated form: $Y^* \approx (1-r)A_1$. Thus, one can immediately conclude that the equilibrium yields is linearly decreasing with the fraction of MPAs, r .

Simulation with parameter values for red abalone *Haliotis rufescens*

Here, I plot specific values of the population biomass with MPAs using the equations derived above. As an example, I use the parameter values for red abalone *Haliotis rufescens*, which demonstrate typical characteristics of sessile species, and thus it may be suitable for testing the model's ability to predict the effects of MPAs. In addition, the species is often a target of fisheries and considered in MPA planning (e.g., Marine Life Protection Act in California [17]). Thus, there are relatively rich sources of the estimated parameter values to be used (Table 1). Specifically, I simulate the situation where the parameters α and σ meet the condition derived above for some fishing mortality rates: namely, the introduction of MPAs will increase the biomass yields. Specifically, I use the parameter values $\alpha = 3.0 \times 10^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$ in the simulation results shown in the following figures. However, qualitatively similar results are obtained with $(\alpha, \sigma) = (3.0 \times 10^{-2}, 10^{-5})$ and $(3.0 \times 10^{-3}, 10^{-4})$; data not shown).

Table 1 Parameters for red abalone *Haliotis rufescens*. The parameter values are largely borrowed from White et al. [24].

Parameter	Description	Value	Source
L_∞	Maximum size	19.24 cm	[25]
k	Growth rate	0.2174 cm/year	[25]
a_0	Age at 0 cm	0 year	[25]

b_1	Coefficient in length-to-weight relationship	1.69×10^{-4}	[26]
b_2	Exponent in length-to-weight relationship	3.02	[26]
E_a	Fecundity-at-length	$15.32L_a^{4.518}$ eggs	[27]
a_{\max}	Maximum age	30 years	[28]
a_{mat}	Age at maturity	3 years	[29]
a_{catch}	Age available to fishing	8 years (17.8 cm)	[24]
M	Natural mortality rate	0.15/year	[30]
α	Maximum settler survival rate	$3.0 \times 10^{-3} \sim 3.0 \times 10^{-1}$ /year	
β	Inverse of the carrying capacity	10^{-4}	
σ	Survival rate of larvae during the dispersal duration	$10^{-6} \sim 10^{-4}$	

Figure 2a shows the effect of MPAs on the relative biomass yields. MPAs with a fraction up to about 0.2 increases the biomass yields when fishing mortality is high, and this effect becomes significant as fishing mortality increases. Similarly, the population biomass increases with the fraction of MPAs r and this effect is more significant when fishing mortality is high (Fig. 2b). Absolute values are shown in Fig. S1.




Figure 2 Effect of MPAs on the relative biomass yield and population biomass. (a) Biomass yields relative to those without MPAs, and (b) population biomass relative to that without MPAs in red abalone fisheries. Each line for both panels shows results with a different fishing mortality rate (0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0). Fishing mortality rates between the lines increase or decrease monotonically. Plot is for the parameters values $\alpha = 3.0 \times 10^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$.

Given a certain fraction of MPAs r one can simulate the optimal fishing mortality rate that maximizes biomass yields (Fig. 3). No increase in biomass yield would occur for a regime comprising optimal fisheries and MPAs. In this regime of fisheries management, however, the optimal fishing mortality shows a remarkable feature: it suddenly jumps to very high values around the MPAs fraction of 0.2 (Fig. 3, blue curve), causing a sudden decline in biomass yield. This decline is never observed in fisheries with constant fishing mortality (Fig. 2b).




Figure 3 Optimal fisheries with MPAs. Biomass yields relative to those without MPAs (red), population biomass relative to that without MPAs (green), and optimal fishing mortality rate (blue) of red abalone fisheries. Plot is for the parameters values $\alpha = 3.0 \times 10^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$.

Discussion

Here, I derived a theoretical condition for which an establishment of MPAs will increase fishery biomass yields, in an age-structured metapopulation model in a simple setting where all patches are assumed to have identical properties (e.g., connections with other patches and carrying capacity). For meeting this condition, the likelihood of an individual's eggs successfully settling in one patch $\alpha\sigma$ should not be very large and very small, suggesting an intermediate recruitment success is required. The optimal fraction of the MPAs increases as $\alpha\sigma$ decreases, and vice versa. Typically, a relatively high fishing

mortality rate is required to increase the population biomass (Fig. 2a), and this result is consistent with [4]. However, in the case where each patch receives a sufficient number of settlers per year, introduction of MPAs decreases biomass yields at a rate proportional to the fraction of fishing grounds $1-r$. Similarly, the introduction of MPAs improves the population biomass to a greater extent if the given fishing mortality rate is larger (Fig. 2b). It is intuitive result because the species receives greater benefit from MPAs if the fishing mortality rate is higher. The number of patches, N , the inverse of the carrying capacity, β , and the proportion of the number of links connecting with other patches to the total number, p , do not affect conditions (however, I assume $N \gg 1$). In addition to biological parameters, geographic parameters may also affect both the values of N , β , and p , but the results suggest that geographic conditions are less important than the life history parameters of the species for achieving effective MPAs given identical patches.

I also found, using the parameters of red abalone, that MPA management with an optimal fishing mortality rate to achieve maximum biomass yields monotonically decreases the biomass yield. This management regime shows a sudden jump to a very high fishing mortality rate when a certain fraction of the MPAs is reached, causing a discrete decline in the population biomass. This is not observed in MPA management with a constant fishing mortality rate (Fig. 3). In particular, the optimal fishing regime holds a relatively abundant population biomass before the jump, but after the jump, the population biomass is lower than the fishing regime with a constant fishing mortality rate (Fig. S1). This jump in the fishing mortality rate may occur because of a source effect from the existing MPAs, which has been observed in a previous study of optimal fisheries using source–sink population dynamics [31]. The trend that introducing a larger fraction of the MPAs requires a higher fishing mortality rate to maximize fishing yields is consistent with previous research [3].

In the analysis, I focused on biomass yield as a main concern of the MPAs management. However, MPAs management is often also aimed at improving economic benefits [18], and typically the objective function in such management has the form $\text{price} \times Y_i - \text{cost} \times F_i$ (e.g., [32]). Even with consideration of such costs, the qualitative results derived in this research may still hold in situations where the cost of fishing is small or the price of the species is high.

While I assume a regular graph for a metapopulation network in which the degree (number of connections) of each patch is same among patches, to maintain analytical tractability, larval dispersal often creates more complex metapopulation networks (e.g., small-world network [33]) in marine ecosystems [34–36]. In such situations, some patches have a larger degree of connectedness than others, which may cause uneven effects of introducing an MPA in one patch, breaking the assumption of identical patches. While exploring the MPA effect in more complex metapopulation structures is beyond the scope of this paper, this observation may enrich our understanding of MPAs management. However, the mean-field approach I applied in the analyses may fit a situation where larvae are well mixed during their dispersal period and dispersed close to evenly in their connected patches.

In this paper, using an age-structured metapopulation model, I obtained simple theoretical conditions that guarantee the introduction of the MPAs will increase the biomass yields of fisheries. I also showed that the optimal fishery strategy may cause a sudden jump to a high fishing mortality rate, thereby suddenly lowering the population biomass at a certain fraction of the MPAs. Although this paper intended to deduce generic rules for the creation of MPAs, future exploration of more realistic situations will be necessary for enhancing our insight of MPAs management.

Acknowledgement

I thank Koji Noshita and Yuuya Tachiki for their thoughtful comments. I am also grateful to KN for providing a beautiful picture of a shell.

References

1. CBD [Convention on Biological Diversity] COP10 Decision X2, Target 11 (2010). Available: <http://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=12268>. Accessed 2 September 2014.
2. Edgar GJ, Stuart-Smith RD, Willis TJ, Kininmonth S, Baker SC, et al. (2014) Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas

with five key features. *Nature* 506: 216–220. Available:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24499817>. Accessed 19 March 2014.

3. Nowlis JS, Roberts CM (1999) Fisheries benefits and optimal design of marine reserves. *Fish Bull* 97: 604–616.
4. Guénette S (1999) An age-structured model showing the benefits of marine reserves in controlling overexploitation. *Fish Res* 39: 295–303. Available:
<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0165783698001738>.
5. Mangel M (2000) Trade-offs between fish habitat and fishing mortality and the role of reserves. *Bull Mar Sci* 66: 663–674. Available:
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/umrsmas/bullmar/2000/00000066/00000003/art00012>.
6. Apostolaki P, Milner-Gulland EJ, McAllister MK, Kirkwood GP (2002) Modelling the effects of establishing a marine reserve for mobile fish species. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 59: 405–415. doi:10.1139/f02-018.
7. Neubert M (2003) Marine reserves and optimal harvesting. *Ecol Lett* 6: 843–849. Available:
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00493.x/pdf>.
8. Baskett M, Yoklavich M (2006) Predation, competition, and the recovery of overexploited fish stocks in marine reserves. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 63: 1214–1229. Available:
<http://article.pubs.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/ppv/RPViewDoc?issn=1205-7533&volume=63&issue=6&startPage=1214&ab=y>.

9. Kellner J, Tetreault I, Gaines S (2007) Fishing the line near marine reserves in single and multispecies fisheries. *Ecol Appl* 17: 1039–1054. Available: <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1890/05-1845>.
10. Takashina N, Mougi A, Iwasa Y (2012) Paradox of marine protected areas: suppression of fishing may cause species loss. *Popul Ecol* 54: 475–485. Available: <papers2://publication/doi/10.1007/s10144-012-0323-8>.
11. Takashina N, Mougi A (2014) Effects of marine protected areas on overfished fishing stocks with multiple stable states. *J Theor Biol* 341: 64–70. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2013.09.027>.
12. Roberts C, Bohnsack J, Gell F, Hawkins J (2001) Effects of marine reserves on adjacent fisheries. *Science* (80-) 294: 1920–1923. Available: <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/294/5548/1920.short>.
13. Mumby P, Harborne A (2007) Trophic cascade facilitates coral recruitment in a marine reserve. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 104: 8362–8367. Available: <http://www.pnas.org/content/104/20/8362.short>.
14. Aburto-Oropeza O, Erisman B, Galland G (2011) Large Recovery of Fish Biomass in a No-Take Marine Reserve. *PLoS One* 6: e23601. Available: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023601>.
15. Cressey D (2011) Plans for marine protection highlight science gap. *Nature* 469: 146. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21228848>.
16. Kaplan DM, Botsford LW, Jorgensen S (2006) Dispersal per recruit: an efficient method for assessing sustainability in marine reserve networks. *Ecol Appl* 16: 2248–2263. Available:

papers2://publication/uuid/A9B6C4AB-B7B2-459A-B308-6A95AD61BA68.

17. [CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife (n.d.) Marine Life Protection Act: Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas. Available: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/mpa/masterplan.asp>. Accessed 4 February 2015.
18. Rassweiler A, Costello C, Siegel D a (2012) Marine protected areas and the value of spatially optimized fishery management. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109: 11884–11889. Available: <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3406815&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>. Accessed 20 March 2014.
19. Kellner J, Sanchirico JN, Hastings A, Mumby PJ (2011) Optimizing for multiple species and multiple values: tradeoffs inherent in ecosystem-based fisheries management. *Conserv Lett* 4: 21–30. Available: <papers2://publication/doi/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00132.x>.
20. Beverton RJ, Holt SJ (1957) On the dynamics of exploited fish populations. London, UK: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (Series 2, Fishery investigations 19).
21. Barrat A, Barthélemy M, Vespignani A (2008) Dynamical Processes on Complex Networks. Available: <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1521587>.
22. Roughgarden Jonathan, Iwasa Y (1986) Dynamics of a metapopulation with space-limited subpopulations. *Theor Popul Biol* 29: 235–261.
23. Micheli F, Amarasekare P, Bascompte J (2004) Including species interactions in the design and evaluation of marine reserves: some

insights from a predator-prey model. *Bull Mar Sci* 74: 653–669.

Available:

<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/umrsmas/bullmar/2004/00000074/00000003/art00012>.

24. White JW, Botsford LW, Moffitt EA, Fischer DT (2010) Decision analysis for designing marine protected areas for multiple species with uncertain fishery status. *Ecol Appl* 20: 1523–1541. Available: <http://eutils.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/eutils/elink.fcgi?dbfrom=pubmed&id=20945757&retmode=ref&cmd=prlinks>.
25. Tegner MJ, DeMartini JD, Karpov KA (1992) The California red abalone: a case study in complexity. In: Shepherd SA, Tegner MJ, Guzman del Proo SA, editors. *Abalone of the world: biology, fisheries, and culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Science. pp. 370–383.
26. Ault JS (1982) Aspects of laboratory reproduction and growth of the red abalone, *Haliotis rufescens* Swainson (Doctoral dissertation, Humboldt State University).
27. Hobday A, Tegner M (2002) The warm and the cold: influence of temperature and fishing on local population dynamics of red abalone. *Reports Calif Coop Ocean Fish Investig* 43: 74–96. Available: http://www.calcofi.ucsd.edu/newhome/publications/CalCOFI_Reports/v43/pdfs/Vol_43_Hobday___Tegner.pdf.
28. Leaf RT (2005) Biology of the red abalone, *Haliotis rufescens*, in Northern California (Doctoral dissertation, San Jose State University). doi:10.3354/meps327107.
29. Rogers-Bennett L, Allen BL, Davis GE (2004) Measuring abalone (*Haliotis* Spp.) recruitment in California to examine recruitment

overfishing and recovery criteria. *J Shellfish Res* 23. Available:
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3kc705w1#page-1>.

30. Tegner MJ, Breen PA, Lennert CE (1989) Population biology of red abalones, *Haliotis rufescens*, in southern California and management of the red and pink, *H. corrugata*, abalone fisheries. *Fish Bull* 87: 313–339. Available:
<http://www.csa.com/partners/viewrecord.php?requester=gs&collection=ENV&recid=2100749>.
31. Lundberg P, Jonzén N (1999) Optimal population harvesting in a source-sink environment. *Evol Ecol Res* 1: 719–729.
32. Clark CW (1990) *Mathematical Bioeconomics*. New York: Wiley.
33. Watts DJ, Strogatz SH (1998) Collective dynamics of “small-world” networks. *Nature* 393: 440–442. doi:10.1038/30918.
34. Kininmonth SJ, De’ath G, Possingham HP (2009) Graph theoretic topology of the Great but small Barrier Reef world. *Theor Ecol* 3: 75–88. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12080-009-0055-3>.
35. Kininmonth S, Beger M, Bode M, Peterson E, Adams VM, et al. (2011) Dispersal connectivity and reserve selection for marine conservation. *Ecol Modell* 222: 1272–1282. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.01.012.
36. Watson JR, Siegel DA, Kendall BE, Mitarai S, Rassweiler A, et al. (2011) PNAS Plus: Identifying critical regions in small-world marine metapopulations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 108: E907–E913. Available: [papers2://publication/doi/10.1073/pnas.1111461108](http://publication/doi/10.1073/pnas.1111461108).

Supporting Information




Figure S1 Biomass yields and population biomass in red abalone fisheries. (a) Biomass yields, and (b) population biomass in red abalone fisheries with MPAs. Each line for both panels shows the result with a different fishing mortality rate (0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0; red line), and optimal fishing mortality (green line). Fishing mortality rates between the lines increase or decrease monotonically. The plot is for the parameters values $\alpha = 3.0 \times 10^{-1}$ and $\sigma = 10^{-6}$.