2 DR. ROBERT P. DUNN (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-6356-4458) 3 DR. MARISSA LEANNE BASKETT (Orcid ID: 0000-0001-6102-1110) 4 5 6 Article type : Articles 7 8 Journal: Ecological Applications 9 10 Manuscript type: Article 11 12 Running head: Transient behavior after fishery closure 13 14 15 Transient dynamics during kelp forest recovery from fishing across multiple trophic levels 16 17 Robert P. Dunn^{1,2,4}, Jameal F. Samhouri³, Marissa L. Baskett² 18 19 20 ¹Coastal and Marine Institute & Department of Biology, San Diego State University, San Diego 21 CA 22 ²Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California Davis, Davis CA 23 ³Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries 24 Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Seattle WA This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has

not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the <u>Version of Record</u>. Please cite this article as <u>doi:</u> <u>10.1002/EAP.2367</u>

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

1

25

⁴Corresponding Author. Present address: North Inlet-Winyah Bay National Estuarine Research
 Reserve, Baruch Marine Field Laboratory, University of South Carolina, Georgetown SC. E mail: robert@baruch.sc.edu

- 29
- 30

Manuscript received 26 June 2020; revised 19 December 2020; accepted 4 February 2021; final
version received 21 April 2021.

33

Abstract: Outcomes of management efforts to recover or restore populations of harvested 34 35 species can be highly dependent on environmental and community context. Predator-prey 36 interactions can alter recovery trajectories, and the timing of management actions within multi-37 trophic level harvest scenarios may influence the dynamics of recovery and lead to management 38 trade-offs. Recent work using a generalist predator-prey model suggests that management 39 promoting synchronized recovery of predators and prey leads to faster and less variable recovery 40 trajectories than sequential recovery (predator- or prey-first). However, more complex 41 communities may require different management actions to minimize recovery time and 42 variability. Here, we use a tri-trophic level rocky reef community dynamics model with size-43 structure and fisheries at multiple trophic levels to investigate the importance of three ecological 44 processes to recovery of fished communities: 1) size-structured predation, 2) non-consumptive 45 effects of predators on prey behavior, and 3) varying levels of recruitment. We also test the 46 effects of initiating recovery from community states associated with varying degrees of fishery-47 induced degradation and develop a simulation in which the basal resource (kelp) is harvested. In this system, a predator-first closure generally leads to the least volatile and quickest recovery, 48 49 whether from a kelp forest, urchin barren, or intermediate community state. The benefits gained 50 by selecting this strategy are magnified when recovering from the degraded community, the 51 urchin barren, because initial conditions in the degraded state lead to lengthy recovery times. 52 However, the shape of the size-structured predation relationship can strongly affect recovery 53 volatility, where the differences between alternate management strategies are negated with size-54 independent predation. External recruitment reduces return times by bolstering the predatory 55 lobster population. These results show that in a tightly-linked tri-trophic level food web with top56 down control, a predator-first fishery closure can be the most effective strategy to reduce

57 volatility and shorten recovery, particularly when the system is starting from the degraded

58 community state. Given the ubiquity of top predator loss across many ecosystems, we highlight

- 59 the value of incorporating insights from community ecology into ecosystem management.
- 60

Keywords: ecosystem-based management, fishery closure, non-consumptive effects, recruitment
 facilitation, size-structured predation

63

64 Introduction

65 Restoration often involves reversing human impacts that have affected multiple species in 66 a community, with ecosystem-level goals of restoring system structure and function (Bradshaw 67 1996). However, many restoration and recovery interventions, such as harvest moratoria or 68 species reintroductions, target one species at a time. How interventions targeted at single species 69 interact to drive the rate and success of overall system recovery, up to and including top 70 predators, inevitably will depend on species interactions, as increasingly recognized across 71 ecosystems (marshes: Silliman et al., 2015; corals: Ladd et al., 2018; grasslands: Young et al., 72 2017). Nevertheless, examples of jointly recovering species offer relatively few generalities for 73 managers beyond the need to recognize trade-offs as predator populations recover. For example, 74 a growing population of bald eagles hindered population growth of ospreys and herons via 75 reduced nesting success (Cruz et al. 2019), and protected white sharks may be contributing to 76 slowed recovery of sea otters due to naïve juvenile sharks mis-targeting sea otters as a prey item 77 (Moxley et al. 2019). Similarly, accounting for species interactions is integral to an ecosystem-78 based approach to fisheries management (EBFM; Larkin 1996). For example, in the case of 79 Baltic Sea cod and their forage fish prey, modelling suggests that incorporating environmental 80 conditions and trophic interactions into adaptive management decisions would lead to improved 81 biological and economic outcomes compared with traditional management (Lindegren et al. 82 2009). In some cases, where declines in fished species have occurred, protection from fishing 83 alone does not ensure recovery due to fishery-induced alterations in predator-prey or competitive 84 interactions (Mangel and Levin 2005, Baskett et al. 2006). Thus, biotic interactions among

recovering species can play key roles in the trajectory and likelihood of success of system
rehabilitation (Perring et al. 2015, Marshall et al. 2016, Stier et al. 2016).

87 The importance of accounting for these community interactions is well illustrated by 88 marine ecosystems, where serial depletion of living marine resources (e.g., harvested fish and 89 invertebrates) has led to calls for rebuilding harvested stocks (NOAA 1996), often without 90 guidance on how rebuilding should be implemented. Closing a fishery or heavily restricting 91 harvest rates are species-specific management measures aimed at recovery of the target 92 population. An alternative is the establishment of a spatial closure, or no-take marine reserve (hereafter, "reserve"), in which harvest of all species is prohibited within a defined geographic 93 94 area. Establishing reserves and closing single-species fisheries thus lead to inherently different 95 recovery scenarios, as entire communities (and potentially multiple fished species) are protected 96 inside reserves while fishery closures typically act on a single species. While many species 97 increase following reserve establishment (Lester et al. 2009), recovery is not a given and there 98 are notable cases of both single species closures (Hutchings 2000) and reserves (Micheli et al. 99 2004) in which population increases do not immediately occur. Trophic interactions are one 100 mechanism which can drive these population responses. For example, predator-prey role 101 reversals, in which small pelagic fish feed on the eggs of their predators, can maintain low levels 102 of predator recruitment even following fishery closure (Minto and Worm 2012). The potential 103 for delayed or impeded recovery due to species interactions raises the question of whether 104 managing fishery closures sequentially (versus independently or simultaneously) might more 105 effectively achieve community-level recovery goals.

106 The path that a population or community follows through time after harvest stops, or its 107 recovery trajectory, can be fundamentally different from its long-term, equilibrium outcome 108 (White et al. 2013, Hastings et al. 2018). Understanding system behavior during the transient 109 period following a perturbation (in this case, cessation of harvest) is necessary to inform 110 monitoring expectations for adaptive management (White et al. 2011) and to determine what 111 management strategies lead to the most rapid recovery. To this end, recent work focused on the 112 transient period following fishery closure (or reserve establishment) has demonstrated that 113 intensity of harvest mortality relative to natural mortality can determine the distance from the 114 unharvested equilibrium and therefore sets the time scale for the lag in reaching that equilibrium 115 (White et al. 2013). In addition, oscillatory behavior can occur as part of the deterministic return to equilibrium, and can depend on a species' life history, in particular the age at maturity (White
et al. 2013). Meanwhile, fishery benefits via enhanced larval export from reserves may take
decades to be achieved as a result of the time lag between reserve establishment and biomass
build-up of adult individuals (Hopf et al. 2016). Thus, recognizing that protected populations
might not immediately increase and that initial trends may not be indicative of long-term
outcomes due to the transient period following fishery closure can help to inform the time-scale
for judging the efficacy of management actions (Hastings 2016).

123 In addition to monitoring time frames, transient dynamics inherent to species interactions 124 might alter optimal management approaches to community recovery. Analysis of a simple model 125 of a generalist predator and one dynamical prey shows the importance of the timing of 126 management actions within multi-trophic level harvest scenarios, with "synchronous" closure of 127 predator and prey fisheries (as opposed to predator-first or prey-first closures, hereafter 128 "sequential") producing a faster return to the unexploited equilibrium and reduced volatility 129 during the transient period (Samhouri et al., 2017). However, numerous additional ecological 130 processes could affect the transient behavior of multi-species communities. For example, within 131 marine reserves where predators are larger and more abundant than in fished areas, herbivores 132 typically alter their behavior to be more cryptic (Spyksma et al. 2017). Predators thereby non-133 consumptively reduce prey interaction strengths with basal resources, in some cases driving a 134 behaviorally-mediated trophic cascade (Peckarsky et al. 2008), the strength of which can depend 135 on prey size (Freeman 2006). Similarly, recruitment facilitation of juveniles by conspecific 136 adults is a positive feedback that can affect recovery through size-structured, depensatory 137 cultivation effects (Walters and Kitchell 2001). Thus, the sequence of recovery for predators and 138 prey, respectively, could determine the outcome of management actions in a multi-trophic level 139 context (Stier et al. 2016). Nonetheless, resolving the context-dependence and relative efficacy 140 of stock recovery trajectories following sequential versus simultaneous fishery closures will 141 require consideration of an array of under-explored species interactions.

Our primary aim in this study is to quantify the effect of sequential versus simultaneous fisheries closures on the recovery of exploited species which are linked through trophic interactions. Secondarily, we explore the dependency of that management outcome on an array of ecological dynamics occurring within the recovering community. These include sizestructured interactions between predators and prey, non-consumptive effects of predators on prey

147 behavior, and various recruitment scenarios (e.g., recruitment facilitation, open versus closed 148 populations). We also investigate the effect of initiating recovery from community states at 149 varying degrees of degradation. In most cases we examine recovering from simultaneous harvest 150 of predators and prey, but in one case we also explore the effect of an additional fishery for the 151 basal resource, thereby creating a tri-trophic level harvest scenario. To achieve these aims, we 152 analyse the recovery from fishing of a rocky reef community using a size-structured, tri-trophic 153 level model (Fig. 1), with fisheries for predators, prey, and the basal resource. Finally, we 154 provide a case-study of potential recovery expectations using the predator-first closure strategy 155 while incorporating uncertainty in parameter values. Quantifying the transient response of 156 complex communities to various recovery strategies, as we do here, can help to set expectations 157 for the time scale and trajectory of recovery in an ecosystem-based management framework.

158 Methods

159 Model system

160 Rocky reefs are a common habitat on temperate coasts globally and can be observed in a 161 range of community states, from kelp forests dominated by foundational macroalgae to urchin 162 barrens with high densities of sea urchins and covered in crustose coralline algae with low kelp 163 cover (Filbee-Dexter and Scheibling 2014). Predators may control the abundance and 164 distribution of the kelp forest state by consuming urchins (Shears and Babcock 2002, Ling et al. 165 2009, Hamilton and Caselle 2015), although physical factors can also determine the distribution 166 of macroalgae (Schiel and Foster 2015), and predators do not provide top-down control in all 167 contexts (Dunn and Hovel 2019). In southern California, red sea urchins (Mesocentrotus 168 franciscanus) and one of their predators, the California spiny lobster (Panulirus interruptus), are 169 subject to simultaneous harvest from rocky reefs. Our model tracks the dynamics of macroalgae 170 (also referred to as kelp) on these reefs, as well as three size compartments of herbivorous sea 171 urchins (encompassing purple sea urchins *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* as well as red urchins), 172 and predatory spiny lobsters (Fig. 1). Within the model, kelp grows logistically and is eaten by urchins at size-specific rates. Small urchins are produced by medium and large urchins, and large 173 174 urchins also facilitate recruitment of small urchins via protection under their spine canopy. 175 Urchins grow into subsequent size classes and die at a background mortality rate. Predatory 176 lobsters consume urchins at size-specific rates with a saturating, type II functional response. 177 Lobsters then convert urchins into population growth and die at a background mortality rate.

178 Large urchins, lobsters, and the basal resource, kelp, can be harvested in individual fisheries. We 179 include size-structure for urchins because predation, recruitment facilitation, and harvest (and 180 therefore their interactive effects on the rocky reef community) all depend on urchin size. For 181 complete model details, including equations and parameter values, see Appendix S1 and Dunn et 182 al. (2017).

183 Previous analysis of this model, focusing on of the interactive effects of harvesting 184 predators (lobsters) and prey (urchins) showed that fishing for predators drove a trophic cascade, 185 while fishing for prey altered the likelihood of shifting from one alternative community state to 186 another. Specifically, increasing harvest of urchins increases the resilience of the system by 187 reducing the range of predator fishery mortality rates at which alternative stable states are 188 possible; size-structured predation on sea urchins is the feedback maintaining the kelp forest or 189 urchin barren state, respectively. Global sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the harvest rate of 190 lobsters and the predatory attack rate on the smallest size-class of urchins are the two most 191 important parameters driving long-term equilibrium community structure. Without any harvest, 192 the kelp forest is the only locally stable state, such that cessation of all harvest will, eventually, 193 lead to recovery of the kelp-dominated state regardless of initial conditions (Dunn et al. 2017). In 194 comparison to that equilibrium analysis, we focus here on the dynamics of the system during the 195 transient period following cessation of fishing to better understand the effect of sequential versus 196 synchronous protection on the time-scale and path to long-term equilibria and how these depend 197 on ecological processes.

198 Simulation & analysis

199 We simulated the recovery of this community from harvest under synchronous and 200 sequential recovery scenarios, given five different assumptions about ecological processes or 201 fishery dynamics occurring within it. To characterize the degree of variability and duration of the 202 transient period following fishery closure, we quantified the community volatility and return 203 time of the fished compartments in the rocky reef model (Fig. 1B). These two metrics measure 204 the time scale of recovery (return time) and the degree of variability in the recovery path 205 (volatility), where increased return time and increased volatility indicate longer times to and 206 larger departures from the target ecosystem structure (Samhouri et al. 2017). These two metrics 207 are roughly analogous to the metrics of transient duration and amplitude of oscillations in single-208 species models of recovery from fishing (White et al. 2013). We focused on the previously

209 fished compartments (generally, lobsters and large urchins, but in one case kelp as well) because 210 of their importance to managers and resource users. Other unharvested compartments tended to 211 have large responses to management actions that were not ultimately reflected in the fished 212 compartments, and thus in some cases obscured the effects of interest. In addition, recovery of 213 red urchins is a specific fisheries management goal. Most urchins within high density barrens are 214 smaller purple urchins which are not harvested, thus, re-building populations of large red urchins 215 (which are harvested and long-lived), does not necessarily lead to the degraded urchin barren 216 community state.

217 For each community ecology scenario (described below), we first ran the model to 218 harvested equilibrium (specifically, we simulated for 200 y to ensure that equilibrium was 219 always reached and then determined the actual time to reach equilibration within that period) to 220 determine the initial conditions at which to begin recovery. Next, we initiated recovery by setting 221 fishing mortality (F_U , F_L , F_K or multiple) equal to zero, depending on the focal recovery 222 scenario, and allowed that simulation to run to equilibrium (again simulating to 200 y to ensure 223 equilibrium was reached and then determining the time to equilibration within that period). For 224 synchronous recovery, that was the end of model simulations. For sequential recovery, we used 225 these partial-recovery equilibrium values as initial conditions when closing the next fishery 226 (setting F_U , F_L or F_K , whichever was not already manipulated, equal to zero), and we again ran 227 the system to equilibrium (see Appendix S1: Fig. S1), continuing until all fisheries were closed. 228 We used this analytical framework to assess recovery trajectories for simultaneous, 229 predator-first, and prev-first closures, focusing on fished species volatility and return time. 230 Following Samhouri et al. (2017), we calculated fished species volatility as the proportional 231 difference (i.e., the ratio) between the maximum summed biomass of previously harvested 232 species that was achieved during the transient phase following fishery closure and their summed 233 unexploited equilibrium biomass. For return time, we measured the length of time (y) from when 234 recovery began (i.e., when fishing mortality was set to zero for at least one trophic level) to when 235 summed biomass for all previously harvested species remained within 10% of its long-term 236 equilibrium. We calculated return time under the assumption that a manager implements the next 237 step in sequential recovery as soon as the system equilibrates following the previous 238 management action. That is, although we ran each simulation for 200 y, we determined the time 239 point when summed harvested species biomass remained within 10% of its long-term

equilibrium, disregarding the remaining years. We also report the time point at which the

241 maximum fished community volatility occurred as well as the portion of the return time

attributed to predator and prey recovery, respectively, for sequential closure scenarios. Because

simulations are deterministic, once harvest is stopped the system always returns to the

244 unexploited state (upon reaching equilibrium), but with different levels of volatility and return

times.

246 Size-structured predation

247 We used four alternate parameterizations of the size-specific lobster attack rate on urchins (δ_L) to represent varying shapes of size-structured predation (Appendix S1: Table S1), 248 249 simulating synchronous and sequential fishery closures for each type of predation. Our baseline 250 parameterization is a decreasing monotonic function whereby small urchins are the most 251 vulnerable to predation and become less susceptible as they grow. Next, we set all lobster attack 252 rates equal across urchin sizes to remove any size-structure. Third, we enhanced the degree of 253 size-structured predation above the baseline by increasing susceptibility of small urchins and 254 reducing susceptibility of large urchins even further, making the slope of the monotonic 255 predation function steeper. Finally, we created a hump-shaped predation function by making 256 medium urchins the most susceptible size class. While the baseline parameterization most 257 accurately represents the predation function exhibited by California spiny lobsters (Dunn and 258 Hovel 2019), we manipulate this function here to evaluate the importance of size-structured predation during recovery. 259

260 Non-consumptive effects of predators

261 Next, we tested the importance of including a non-consumptive effect (sensu Blaustein 262 1997) of predators on prey behavior following the closure of the fishery for predators. We modelled this behavior by reducing the attack rates of small and medium urchins on kelp ($\delta_{U_{a}}$ 263 and δ_{U_m}) following the closure of the lobster fishery (see Appendix S1: Table S1 for parameter 264 265 values). We chose this implicit approach rather than explicitly modeling behavioral feedbacks in 266 order to maintain the same base model structure across the different scenarios. Nevertheless, 267 indirect effects of marine reserves, such as the behavioral shifts described above, on average 268 appear after 13 y (Babcock et al. 2010), and we accounted for this delay in behavioral changes 269 by altering the parameter values associated with urchin grazing after a 10 y "build-up" period 270 following the closure of the spiny lobsters fishery (knife-edge change in grazing rates after 10 y). However, we also provide the results of simulations in which we forced reduced urchin grazing
to occur simultaneously with setting predator harvest equal to zero, creating an instantaneous
non-consumptive effect (Appendix S1).

274 Recruitment patterns

275 We provide an exploration of how various recruitment processes affect recovery 276 trajectories, including incorporating exogenous recruitment of small urchins and spiny lobsters 277 and, separately, facilitation of juvenile urchins by adult urchins. Our baseline model structure 278 does not include any exogenous recruitment (i.e., all three trophic levels are closed populations). 279 To simulate an open population and remove the complete dependence of urchins on kelp and 280 lobsters on urchins, we added an exogenous recruitment term, φ_i , to the dynamics for small urchins and lobsters, which represents a set amount of biomass recruiting at each time step (see 281 282 Appendix S1).

283 Large urchins can facilitate the survival of small urchins by providing protection 284 underneath their spine canopy (Tegner and Dayton 1977). To describe the strength of this 285 recruitment facilitation, we use the term σ which can range from 0 to 1. When $\sigma = 0$, recruitment 286 is independent of large urchin biomass, while at $\sigma = 1$ recruitment is completely dependent on 287 the protection provided by the spine canopy of large urchins and is scaled by the ratio of the current large urchin biomass to its carrying capacity. For simulations presented in this study, our 288 289 baseline parameterization sets $\sigma = 0.5$. We then set $\sigma = 0$ to test the effect of removing urchin 290 recruitment facilitation on recovery trajectories. A deeper investigation of modelling recruitment 291 facilitation of small urchins by adult urchins is available in Baskett & Salomon (2010) and Dunn et al. (2017). 292

293 Community degradation due to fishing

To investigate the effects of degradation due to fishing on recovery from harvest, we tracked recovery after harvesting predators and prey at three different intensities which led to recovery beginning from either the kelp-dominated community (sustainable lobster harvest), the urchin barren (lobsters overfished/collapsed), or the moderately degraded region between these two alternative communities (on the verge of collapse). Parameter combinations for each are in Appendix S1: Table S1.

300 Three-tiered fishery (including kelp harvest)

301 Currently, nearly 80% of California's kelp beds are open to commercial harvest in one 302 form or another (CDFW 2014). We modelled kelp harvest by adding an additional removal 303 parameter to the equation describing the dynamics of giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) 304 (Appendix S1). We define F_K as the harvest rate of kelp and incorporate this new fishery into our 305 recovery trajectory analyses just as described above for the two-tiered fishery. However, given 306 that there are now three trophic levels being harvested, sequential recovery can be either 307 completely sequential (e.g., close predator then prey then basal) or partially sequential (e.g., 308 close predator then synchronously close prey and basal), and the order of closures may influence 309 the recovery trajectories. We calculate volatility and return time just as above, but now also 310 include the harvested biomass of kelp in addition to the harvested biomass of lobsters and large 311 urchins.

312 Sensitivity analysis

313 Each of the above scenarios could be considered a local sensitivity analysis. To 314 understand the importance of all individual parameters in driving transient volatility of the fished 315 community, and to quantify the range of possible recovery trajectories given uncertainty in 316 parameter values (due to spatio-temporal variability in carrying capacity, growth rates, and 317 predation parameters, among others), we conducted global sensitivity analyses. For both 318 analyses, we used a single set of 4,000 parameter combinations drawn at random from a range of 319 potential values (parameter ranges provided in Appendix S1: Table S1). First, to understand the 320 importance of individual parameters in driving fished species volatility during the transient 321 period, we conducted random forest analyses (Harper et al. 2011). We used all 4,000 model runs 322 to calculate normalized importance values for each parameter under each of the three 323 management scenarios (synchronous, predator-first, or prev-first closure), initiating the model 324 from both the kelp forest and the urchin barren community (8,000 total model runs). Modelled 325 conditions when initiating fishery closures and starting the recovery phase were thus caused by a 326 combination of our initial community states, either kelp forest or urchin barren, as well as the 327 fishing mortality rates introduced within the global sensitivity analysis. Thus, for "kelp forest" 328 simulations within the global sensitivity analysis, randomly selected fishing rates could still have 329 been high enough to drive the system to a degraded state prior to initiating fishery closures. 330 Analogously, for the "urchin barren" simulations with low fishing harvest rates during the initial 331 harvesting period, recovery could have begun from a less degraded state. Parameter importance

332 values are a measure of how informative each parameter is in predicting fished species volatility, 333 and we normalize values to sum to 1 to aid their interpretability. Parameters with high 334 importance values have strong impacts on volatility during the transient period, given the 335 model's assumptions. Second, to provide an example of how our results could be applied on pre-336 specified management time-scales while incorporating parameter uncertainty, we simulated the 337 model for all 4,000 parameter combinations using the predator-first closure management 338 strategy, which we implemented by first closing the lobster fishery ($F_L = 0$) and running the 339 model for 2 y, and then closing the urchin fishery ($F_U = 0$) and running for an additional 15 y. 340 From these simulations, we examined the biomass response of the recovering fished community 341 through time. For each of the 4,000 model simulations under both sets of initial conditions, we 342 present the range of recovery trajectories (recovering biomass time series) and plot the 343 distributions of fished species biomass (lobsters + large urchins) at 5, 10, and 15 y after the closure of both fisheries (8,000 total model runs). We base this time horizon on the ~5-year 344 345 recurring monitoring events used for management of marine protected areas in California, U.S.A.

346 **Results**

347 In contrast to previous results suggesting synchronous management of predators and prey 348 to be more efficient than either sequential closure strategy (Samhouri et al. 2017), our model 349 demonstrated that predator-first closures provided the least volatile and most rapid recovery in 350 nearly all simulated scenarios in our model system. The prey-first strategy generally led to the 351 least effective recovery outcomes (Figs. 2-4), in agreement with previous findings (Samhouri et 352 al. 2017). When recovery began in the kelp-dominated or moderately degraded state, 353 synchronous closure of predator and prey fisheries demonstrated a similar trajectory to predator-354 first management (differences in fished community volatility were < 13%, volatility peaked at 355 the same point, and return times were within 1 y using the baseline parameterization; Fig. 2). 356 Conversely, when the system was already severely degraded due to high fishing mortality rates 357 (i.e., initial conditions were in the urchin barren), a predator-first closure outperformed 358 synchronous and prey-first management in both fished species volatility and return time, and 359 peak volatility occurred earlier (Fig. 2). A prey-first closure is particularly sub-optimal in this 360 case (return time = 161 y versus 61 y for the predator-first case) because low predation rates on 361 the largest urchins, when combined with the closure of the urchin fishery, allow them to persist

for generations (red urchin age-at-maturity ~ 5 y, Ebert et al. 1999; purple urchin age-at-maturity
 ~ 2 y, Kenner and Lares 1991) in the low-kelp, low-lobster state.

364 The shape of the size-structured predation function did not alter our finding that a 365 predator-first closure was generally least volatile and fastest, although when we removed size-366 structure so that all prey were equally likely to be consumed, all three management scenarios 367 provided virtually equivalent results (Fig. 3). The mechanism for this pattern is that with the 368 assumption of size-independent predation, there is an increased probability of predation mortality 369 for large urchins during the recovery of predatory lobsters, accelerating the return to the kelp state. When the predation function was hump-shaped, return time in the predator-first case was 370 371 reduced by more than 50 % (Fig. 3). The mechanism is again that the assumption of hump-372 shaped, size-structured predation reduced the likelihood of urchins reaching the large size-class 373 due to high predation on medium sized individuals, speeding up recovery to the kelp state. 374 Interestingly, the shape of the size-structured predation function had differing effects on the 375 timing of peak volatility, which was later by at least 2 years for all three management scenarios 376 under the hump-shaped parameterization (Fig. 3A), even though return times were reduced or 377 similar to the other size-structure cases (Fig. 3B). All of the transient behavior occurred 378 following the lobster fishery closure, while the closure of the urchin fishery contributed very 379 little to the return time (Fig. 3B).

380 Non-consumptive effects of predators on prey behavior increased both volatility and 381 return time relative to the baseline scenario without non-consumptive effects, although 382 differences among management strategies were minimal and volatility peaked at approximately 383 the same time for each (Appendix S1: Fig. S2). The lengthening of return times at first appears 384 surprising because we include non-consumptive effects that reduce kelp consumption and should 385 ostensibly lead to a more rapid return to the unexploited equilibrium, characterized by high kelp 386 abundance. However, recovering to this state ultimately requires lobsters to consume urchins, 387 and by reducing urchin grazing, non-consumptive effects actually lowered lobster abundance due 388 to the dependence of lobster population growth on urchins. As in the size-structured cases, all of 389 the transient behavior occurred following the lobster fishery closure (Appendix S1: Fig. S2B). 390 As would be expected, delayed initiation of a behavioral shift in grazing rate led to higher fished 391 species volatility and longer return times than when non-consumptive effects were initiated 392 immediately at the closure of the lobster fishery (Appendix S1: Fig. S2). This occurs because in

393 the delayed non-consumptive effects case, urchins can continue to consume kelp at high rates 394 until predator biomass is sufficient to alter their grazing behavior, lengthening recovery time.

395 Simulations testing various recruitment scenarios demonstrated that exogenous 396 recruitment (i.e., open populations supported from outside) led to reduced volatility (though the 397 timing of peak volatility was similar) and shorter return times than the corresponding 'closed 398 population' scenarios. This was the case whether starting conditions were in the kelp forest or 399 urchin barren, or if non-consumptive effects of predators were included (Fig. 4). The mechanism 400 behind this result is that with open population dynamics there is no time lag in recruitment 401 during the transient period following fishery closure. The impact of exogenous recruitment was 402 most evident when comparing simulations with initial conditions in the urchin barren: recovery 403 from the barren state to the unexploited equilibrium using the predator-first closure strategy was 404 shortened by 85% and volatility was reduced by 44% when populations were open compared 405 with our initial simulations of a closed population (Figs. 2 & 4). These gains were even greater 406 when focusing on the least effective management strategy based on our metrics (prey-first): 407 volatility was more than halved and return times were shortened by an order of magnitude (160 y 408 versus 12 y; Figs 2 & 4). In contrast to external recruitment, removing recruitment facilitation by 409 adult urchins reduced volatility relatively little compared to the baseline scenario, though return 410 times were halved (6 y versus 12 y for all three management scenarios; Figs. 2 & 4). In all 411 simulations altering recruitment processes, predator-first closure was again typically the least 412 volatile and fastest (Fig. 4), though the gains achieved by choosing predator-first closure were 413 substantially reduced when exogenous recruitment occurred (we show a similar result when 414 removing recruitment facilitation; Figs. 2B & 4B). As with other scenarios, closing the lobster 415 fishery contributed to the majority of the transient behavior during recovery (Fig. 4B). 416 Incorporating harvest of the basal resource, thereby creating a tri-trophic level fishery, 417 did not alter our general finding that predator-first closure was typically the least volatile 418 management strategy, while return times were identical and relatively short (4 y and 12 y, when 419 including versus excluding kelp biomass, respectively) for each of the 10 tri-trophic level 420 management scenarios. In the tri-trophic level fishery case, differences in recovering species

421 volatility among closure scenarios were minimal compared with differences observed when

422 investigating other ecological dynamics or community scenarios (Appendix S1: Fig. S3). Of

423 note, however, volatility was reduced when we include the harvest of kelp in calculating the

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

424 community biomass (Appendix S1: Fig. S3B) compared with only including lobster and urchin
425 biomass (Appendix S1: Fig. S3A), as we did for the two-trophic level harvest scenarios.

426 Global sensitivity analysis using random forests demonstrated that regardless of the 427 recovery strategy or initial community structure, community volatility during recovery is largely 428 driven by the initial fishing mortality rate for lobsters (F_L) or the attack rate of lobsters on small 429 urchins (δ_I). Together, these two parameters account for over 50% of the normalized importance value in each recovery scenario (Appendix S1: Fig. S4-5). Interestingly, urchin 430 431 fishing mortality (F_{II}) was moderately important only in the predator-first closure cases (~5% of 432 normalized importance value versus < 1% for prey-first and synchronous closures; Appendix S1: 433 Fig. S4-5).

434 In our case study using a predator-first closure, recovery trajectories demonstrate a 435 similar result: when initial conditions were in the macroalgal-dominated kelp forest (a proxy for 436 low lobster harvest rate), recovery towards higher fished biomass was initiated 2-3 years earlier 437 than when initial conditions were urchin-dominated (Appendix S1: Fig. S6). Similarly, 5 y after 438 the closure of both fisheries, the distribution of recovering biomass when starting from the kelp 439 forest was right-skewed compared with initial conditions in the urchin barren (Fig. 5), suggesting 440 a more rapid rebuilding of the population across size classes. However, in both cases, parameter 441 variability could drive the system to low recovering biomass at 10 and 15 years post-fishery 442 closure (Fig. 5, Appendix S1: Fig. S6).

443 Discussion

444 Population depletion in many fisheries has led to calls for rebuilding of exploited species 445 (NOAA 1996, Safina et al. 2005), and prompted a concerted effort to understand the "how" 446 (Wakeford et al. 2009, Neubauer et al. 2013) and "why" (Sumaila et al. 2012) of rebuilding 447 harvested stocks. Importantly, connecting rebuilding mandates to rebuilding strategies is now 448 feasible and typically includes consideration of ecological processes (Link 2002, Mangel and 449 Levin 2005). For our modelled kelp forest, predator-first closures generally provide the fastest 450 and least volatile recovery strategy. This is the case for most of the ecological processes we 451 examined, but is particularly evident when initiating recovery from the degraded urchin barren 452 community. Size-structured predation and recruitment facilitation are two modelled feedbacks 453 that can lead to alternative stable states under certain parameter combinations with this model 454 (Dunn et al. 2017), but alternative stable state dynamics only occur when fishery harvest is

455 occurring and therefore do not apply in the case of zero fishing mortality that is the end state
456 here. Nevertheless, these feedbacks can make recovery from the barren state particularly slow
457 (for all three management scenarios) and volatile (for prey-first and synchronous closures),
458 magnifying the gains from selecting the predator-first closure strategy.

459 For a given community, the management strategy that is least volatile and has the 460 quickest return time will likely depend heavily on the biotic interactions occurring among 461 harvested species. In the case of our kelp forest model, lack of size-structured predation 462 decreases the volatility and recovery time of fished species by $\sim 2x$ and 1.5x, respectively, compared to the enhanced size-structure case, and negates the differences between alternate 463 464 management strategies (Fig. 3). Our results differ from previous theoretical work which 465 demonstrated that synchronous closures of predator and prey fisheries provided a rapid and low 466 volatility means to return to the unharvested community state (Samhouri et al. 2017). The 467 mechanism for this discrepancy likely lies in the requirement, in the model presented here, for 468 predators to consume herbivores to drive shifts between community states. In previous recovery 469 trajectory models, predators and prev were dynamically linked but their dependence was reduced 470 by including an alternative prey species (Samhouri et al. 2017). Here, top-down control by 471 predators is required for the persistence of the kelp forest because when lobster fishing mortality 472 is moderate to high, the urchin barren is the only stable state (Dunn et al. 2017). With a predator-473 first fishery closure, removing urchins via fishing while they also experience predation from a 474 recovering population of specialist lobsters provides the strongest degree of top-down control, 475 and thus offers the quickest and least volatile recovery trajectory. With a prey-first closure, the 476 recovery process is slowed because of time lags required for lobster biomass to build-up to the 477 point at which top-down control is strong enough to drive the system back to the kelp-dominated state (Fig. 2B). We speculate that synchronous management could be more effective for diffuse 478 479 food webs with generalist predation [a common feature among predatory species (Fryxell and Lundberg 1994)], while sequential closures would be more effective for food webs with 480 481 specialist consumption or a few key interacting species, as exhibited here. 482 Modeling drivers of community structure on rocky reefs 483 There have been multiple previous efforts to model kelp forest communities on rocky

reefs around the world, utilizing a variety of modelling structures and analytical frameworks.
Time and again these models demonstrate the primacy of predator mortality rates (fishing and

486 natural mortality) in driving community structure (Marzloff et al. 2013, Blamey et al. 2014, Eddy 487 et al. 2014, 2015, Dunn et al. 2017) as well as recovery times on the scale of decades or more 488 (Blamey et al. 2013, Marzloff et al. 2016, Johnson et al. 2017, Steyn 2019). For example, a 489 model of Tasmanian rocky reefs exhibits similar results to our simulations: reduced lobster 490 fishing and implementing urchin culling can limit the likelihood of barrens formation, but 491 hysteresis in the system requires drastic management action in order to reverse the system from 492 an urchin barren to an algal-dominated state (Marzloff et al. 2016). Interestingly, this model, 493 which includes size-structure for lobsters, demonstrates that a maximum size limit for lobsters 494 (i.e., a slot-limit regulation) could be a useful management tool, but only when lobster fishing 495 mortality is high. At modest harvest rates, sufficient lobsters reach large size classes so that a 496 slot-limit does not substantially reduce the risk of barren formation (Marzloff et al. 2016). We 497 suspect that this finding could affect recovery trajectories of our kelp forest system because when 498 lobsters are initially harvested in a slot-limit fishery, return times should be much more rapid 499 than when only a minimum size is enforced. This is because large lobsters provide both strong 500 predation pressure on urchins (Ling et al. 2009, Eddy et al. 2014, Eisaguirre et al. 2020), as well 501 as enhanced egg production relative to smaller lobsters (Dunn, unpublished data), potentially 502 speeding recovery through stronger top-down pressure (Fig. 3B) and enhanced recruitment (Fig. 503 4B), respectively. Interestingly, an ecosystem model for coastal New Zealand is parameterized to 504 indicate increased herbivory for recovering lobsters due to reduced prey abundance (Eddy et al. 505 2014). This has not been demonstrated empirically in our model system to date, but could have 506 important implications for lobster-urchin predation rates, and by extension, transient dynamics 507 during the recovery period.

508 Transient dynamics and recovery in multi-trophic level systems

509 Understanding ecological processes through time is at the heart of many important 510 questions in ecology, and the short-term response of a system to a perturbation (its transient 511 behavior) can differ drastically from its long-term equilibria (Hastings et al. 2018). Our 512 simulations demonstrate the transient nature of species responses following fishery closure, as 513 observed empirically for rocky reef communities (Babcock et al. 2010). All compartments 514 exhibit damped oscillations for tens to hundreds of years, depending on the ecological 515 architecture and fishery closure scenario, though some of our estimated return times are shorter 516 than empirical data suggest is generally the case (Hutchings 2000). The duration of the transient

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

517 period (return time) is strongly dependent on the initial state of the system (Fig. 2), which in our 518 case is a direct result of the fishery mortality rates of predators and prey prior to fishery closure 519 (Dunn et al. 2017). The importance of harvest mortality prior to reserve establishment on 520 recovery time (White et al. 2013, Kaplan et al. 2019) and abundance or biomass responses to 521 reserves (Micheli et al. 2004, Jaco and Steele 2020) are well documented. We show that this is 522 also true for recovery volatility, where initial lobster fishing rate (F_I) was typically the main 523 driver of volatility when starting from the kelp forest state (Appendix S1: Fig. S4). Importantly, 524 we also demonstrate that predatory attack rates can determine recovery volatility, particularly 525 when initial conditions are in the overfished state (Appendix S1: Fig. S5).

526 We intend our model for strategic use to qualitatively compare different management 527 approaches rather than tactical use to make precise predictions (Collie et al. 2016). Nevertheless, 528 analysis of system behavior during the transient period can provide important insights into 529 ecological systems, predator-prey dynamics (Hastings 2004) and management applications 530 (Hastings 2016) in particular. We utilize two general measures of transient behavior that may be 531 particularly useful in a management context. First, the time lag between when a management 532 action is taken and when the maximum volatility of the system occurs can inform the timeline for 533 evaluation of management efficacy in monitoring and adaptive management. Second, the 534 duration of recovery within asynchronous management scenarios (predator- or prey-first 535 closures) could provide managers with information regarding the social-ecological trade-offs 536 required when planning for recovery from multi-trophic level harvest (discussed further below). 537 Finally, quantifying the drivers of transient dynamics can provide insight into which species and 538 associated life histories provide higher or lower reliability for monitoring (White et al. 2011, 539 2013, Kaplan et al. 2019).

540 Theoretical context

541 Our model includes several simplifying assumptions that have the potential to alter 542 recovery planning for harvested species. First, we did not include any sources of environmental 543 stochasticity, which can drive rocky reef community structure via kelp loss during storms and 544 temperature-dependent nutrient availability (Jackson 1977, Seymour et al. 1989, Cavanaugh et 545 al. 2011). In addition, stochastic recruitment pulses may be particularly important in the case of 546 recovery dynamics by determining the likelihood of return to the unexploited equilibrium 547 (Nickols et al. 2019). Sea urchins and spiny lobsters can exhibit episodic recruitment (Pringle 548 1986, Shears et al. 2012), which can cascade to kelp abundance and determine the community 549 state under feedbacks that lead to alternative stable states (Karatavev and Baskett 2019). Second, 550 we describe only a sub-module of the diverse kelp forest food web, and the alternative predators 551 and prey not included could strongly influence recovery trajectories. For example, California 552 sheephead (*Semicossyphus pulcher*) are a large-bodied fish that consumes both sea urchins 553 (Cowen 1983, Dunn and Hovel 2019) and juvenile spiny lobsters (Loflen and Hovel 2010), and 554 are recovering from a harvest-induced population decline (Hamilton and Caselle 2015). The 555 local abundance of sheephead could strongly influence population dynamics of both spiny 556 lobsters and sea urchins through intra-guild predation (Polis and Holt 1992). In addition, predator 557 specialization can lead to delayed recovery for both biomass and mean body size (Aalto and 558 Baskett 2017), and our sub-web model does not include all potential prey for a generalist 559 predator. Third, our size-structured model assumes that growth, mortality, and fecundity rates are 560 deterministic and not influenced by environmental conditions or conspecific density. A result of 561 this framework is potential mis-estimation of the time spent in each stage due to a fluctuating 562 environment or density-dependence affecting demographic rates (De Roos et al. 1992).

563 Our choice to model the behavioral feedbacks between urchin grazing and predator 564 recovery implicitly (rather than an explicit, density-dependent formulation) is based on the fact 565 that the spatial scale at which predators can induce changes in prey behavior within marine 566 ecosystems remains poorly defined, though an area of active research (Dunn et al. 2018, DiFiore et al. 2019). Thus, we used a simpler implementation to model the effect of predators on prey 567 568 grazing behavior, implicitly changing urchin grazing rates based on a delay following 569 management action. Importantly, when urchin grazing behavior was changed simultaneously 570 with closing the predator fishery, results were similar (Appendix S1: Fig S2); an explicitly 571 modelled, density-dependent parameterization is expected to be very similar to the delayed non-572 consumptive effect case based on the return time associated with the lobster compartment (~ 12 573 y; Fig 2B) and the 10 y delay we implemented, established from empirical data (Babcock et al. 574 2010). Finally, predators in our model are not size-structured despite evidence that larger lobsters 575 exhibit increased top-down control on sea urchins (Ling et al. 2009, Ling and Johnson 2012, 576 Eisaguirre et al. 2020). Generally, our aim was to develop a moderate-complexity, 'sweet-spot' 577 model with both flexibility and specificity (Collie et al. 2016), so simplifying assumptions were 578 required for analytical tractability. Exploration of the effects of stochastic events on recovery

579 would be a valuable future development, as would the derivation of transient metrics for multi-

- 580 species models using the Jacobian of the system, analogous to the population-level, discrete-time
- 581 metrics introduced by White et al. (2013).

582 Integrating community ecology into environmental management

583 Predator-first, prey-first, and synchronous fishery closures are approximately equally 584 likely to be implemented for a given multi-trophic level fisheries management situation, though 585 predator-first management is typically least observed historically (Samhouri et al. 2017). 586 However, recovering top predators, particularly marine mammals, appear to strongly affect their 587 prey (Swain et al. 2019), with pinnipeds, for example, potentially removing enough fish biomass 588 to cause conflicts with fisheries (Chasco et al. 2017). Managers have the difficult task of 589 balancing competing interests when attempting to grow populations of interacting species, 590 suggesting that an ecosystem-based management approach which explicitly accounts for biotic 591 relationships could help to optimize ecosystem services in a multi-species context (Kellner et al. 592 2011).

593 To more fully explore the social and ecological trade-offs of different management 594 strategies, future analyses of multi-species recovery trajectories could incorporate the ex-vessel 595 values of harvested predator and prey and use optimal control analysis to explore more nuanced 596 pathways to recovery over time (e.g., Essington et al. 2018). Future investigations could also 597 include reduced exploitation rather than outright bans on harvest, or varying the length of the 598 initial closure period under sequential management. Varying degrees of exploitation reduction 599 within a network of marine reserves strongly impacts community abundance, biomass, and size 600 distribution (Rife et al. 2013), and long-term differences in the level of fishery exploitation can 601 set the stage for different patterns of recovery across space (Collie et al. 2013). However, the 602 degree to which varying levels of exploitation reduction (versus an outright harvest ban) leads to 603 differences in recovery outcomes within a multi-trophic level fishery context has, to our 604 knowledge, not been explored comprehensively (Oken and Essington 2016). Similarly, varying 605 time lags between sequential fishery closures is an additional dimension that could be explored, 606 but to date has not received attention from researchers. In particular, varying the time lags 607 between sequential fishery closures while accounting for species generation times across trophic 608 levels could inform recovery strategies more broadly. In our model system, predators and prey 609 reach sexual maturity on similar time-scales (≤ 5 y), but that need not always be the case. For

example, predatory lingcod reproduce at < 5 y (Haltuch et al. 2018) while their rockfish prey can
take 20 y or more to reach sexual maturity (Conrath 2017). Finally, future work focused
explicitly on conservation goals could also examine the recovery of non-fished components of
this model community (or others) in further detail.

614 Ultimately, confronting models with data will be required to gauge the efficacy of synchronous conservation tools such as marine protected areas (White et al. 2011). Comparing 615 616 our simulations against data from future in situ sampling of predator and prey abundance within 617 the recently-established protected area network in southern California (California Dept. Fish and 618 Game 2008) will provide an empirical estimate of synchronous management. There is also 619 potential to compare synchronous versus sequential management between reserves (synchronous 620 closure) and historically fished areas in northern California following the recent closure of the 621 recreational abalone fishery (sequential closure) due to widespread kelp loss (Rogers-Bennett 622 and Catton 2019). As marine reserves are increasingly implemented and populations of 623 overharvested species grow, empirical explorations of recovery trajectories will boost the 624 capacity to test theoretical predictions.

625

Acknowledgments: Financial support was provided through the California Sea Grant NMFSSea Grant Population and Ecosystem Dynamics Fellowship, U.S. National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration operations grants to the North Inlet-Winyah Bay National Estuarine
Research Reserve (Award #'s NA19NOS420069 and NA20NOS4200030), and YY-19 of the
NOAA California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment program. We appreciate the
suggestions from C.J. Harvey and the two anonymous reviewers who provided feedback on
previous versions of the manuscript.

633

634 Supporting Information

- Additional supporting information may be found online at: [link to be added in production]
- 636 **Open Research**

637 Code (Dunn et al. 2021) associated with these analyses is available in Zenodo:

638 <u>https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4521227</u>

639

640 Literature Cited

- Aalto, E. A., and M. L. Baskett. 2017. Post-harvest recovery dynamics depend on predator
 specialization in size-selective fisheries. Marine Ecology Progress Series 564:127–143.
- 643 Babcock, R. C., N. T. Shears, A. C. Alcala, N. S. Barrett, G. J. Edgar, K. D. Lafferty, T. R.
- McClanahan, and G. R. Russ. 2010. Decadal trends in marine reserves reveal differential
 rates of change in direct and indirect effects. Proceedings of the National Academy of
 Sciences 107:18256–18261.
- Baskett, M. L., M. Yoklavich, and M. S. Love. 2006. Predation, competition, and the recovery of
 overexploited fish stocks in marine reserves. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
 Sciences 63:1214–1229.
- Blamey, L. K., É. E. Plagányi, and G. M. Branch. 2013. Modeling a regime shift in a kelp forest
 ecosystem caused by a lobster range expansion. Bulletin of Marine Science 89:347–375.
- Blamey, L. K., É. E. Plagányi, and G. M. Branch. 2014. Was overfishing of predatory fish
 responsible for a lobster-induced regime shift in the Benguela? Ecological Modelling
 273:140–150.
- Blaustein, L. 1997. Non-consumptive effects of larval *Salamandra* on crustacean prey: can eggs
 detect predators? Oecologia 110:212–217.
- Bradshaw, A. D. 1996. Underlying principles of restoration. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
 Aquatic Sciences 53:3–9.
- California Dept. Fish and Game. 2008. California Marine Life Protection Act: Master Plan for
 Marine Protected Areas, Revised Draft January 2008. CA Department of Fish and Game,
 Sacramento, CA.
- 662 Cavanaugh, K. C., D. A. Siegel, D. C. Reed, and P. E. Dennison. 2011. Environmental controls
 663 of giant-kelp biomass in the Santa Barbara Channel, California. Marine Ecology Progress
 664 Series 429:1–17.

665 CDFW. 2014. Informational Digest to the Regulations Governing the Harvest of Kelp and other 666 Marine Algae in California. Page 42. California Department of Fish & Wildlife.

667 Chasco, B. E., I. C. Kaplan, A. C. Thomas, A. Acevedo-Gutiérrez, D. P. Noren, M. J. Ford, M. 668 B. Hanson, J. J. Scordino, S. J. Jeffries, K. N. Marshall, A. O. Shelton, C. Matkin, B. J. 669 Burke, and E. J. Ward. 2017. Competing tradeoffs between increasing marine mammal 670 predation and fisheries harvest of Chinook salmon. Scientific Reports 7:1-14. 671 Collie, J., M.-J. Rochet, and R. Bell. 2013. Rebuilding fish communities: the ghost of fisheries 672 past and the virtue of patience. Ecological Applications 23:374–391. 673 Collie, J. S., L. W. Botsford, A. Hastings, I. C. Kaplan, J. L. Largier, P. A. Livingston, É. 674 Plagányi, K. A. Rose, B. K. Wells, and F. E. Werner. 2016. Ecosystem models for 675 fisheries management: finding the sweet spot. Fish and Fisheries 17:101–125. 676 Conrath, C. L. 2017. Maturity, Spawning Omission, and Reproductive Complexity of Deepwater 677 Rockfish. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 146:495–507. 678 Cowen, R. 1983. The effect of sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher) predation on red sea urchin 679 (Strongylocentrotus franciscanus) populations - an experimental analysis. Oecologia 680 58:249-255. 681 Cruz, J., S. K. Windels, W. E. Thogmartin, S. M. Crimmins, L. H. Grim, J. H. Larson, and B. 682 Zuckerberg. 2019. Top-down effects of repatriating bald eagles hinder jointly recovering 683 competitors. Journal of Animal Ecology 88:1054-1065. 684 De Roos, A. M., O. Diekmann, and J. a. J. Metz. 1992. Studying the dynamics of structured 685 population models: a versatile technique and its application to Daphnia. The American 686 Naturalist 139:123-147. 687 DiFiore, B. P., S. A. Queenborough, E. M. P. Madin, V. J. Paul, M. B. Decker, and A. C. Stier. 688 2019. Grazing halos on coral reefs: predation risk, herbivore density, and habitat size 689 influence grazing patterns that are visible from space. Marine Ecology Progress Series 627:71-81. 690 691 Dunn, R. P., A. H. Altieri, K. Miller, M. E. Yeager, and K. A. Hovel. 2018. Contrasting 692 behavioral responses to predatory risk cues reflect different foraging strategies in two 693 Caribbean sea urchins. Marine Ecology Progress Series 604:187–198. 694 Dunn, R. P., M. L. Baskett, and K. A. Hovel. 2017. Interactive effects of predator and prey 695 harvest on ecological resilience of rocky reefs. Ecological Applications 27:1718–1730. 696 Dunn, R. P., and K. A. Hovel. 2019. Experiments reveal limited top-down control of key 697 herbivores in southern California kelp forests. Ecology 100:e02625.

698	Dunn, R. P., J. F. Samhouri, and M. L. Baskett. 2021. Data from: Transient dynamics during
699	kelp forest recovery from fishing across multiple trophic levels (Version 1.0),
700	Ecological Applications. Zenodo. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4521227
701	Ebert, T. A., J. D. Dixon, S. C. Schroeter, P. E. Kalvass, N. T. Richmond, W. A. Bradbury, and
702	D. A. Woodby. 1999. Growth and mortality of red sea urchins Strongylocentrotus
703	franciscanus across a latitudinal gradient. Marine Ecology Progress Series 190:189–209.
704	Eddy, T. D., M. Coll, E. A. Fulton, and H. K. Lotze. 2015. Trade-offs between invertebrate
705	fisheries catches and ecosystem impacts in coastal New Zealand. ICES Journal of Marine
706	Science 72:1380–1388.
707	Eddy, T. D., T. J. Pitcher, A. B. MacDiarmid, T. T. Byfield, J. C. Tam, T. T. Jones, J. J. Bell, and
708	J. P. A. Gardner. 2014. Lobsters as keystone: only in unfished ecosystems? Ecological
709	Modelling 275:48–72.
710	Eisaguirre, J. H., J. M. Eisaguirre, K. Davis, P. M. Carlson, S. D. Gaines, and J. E. Caselle. 2020.
711	Trophic redundancy and predator size class structure drive differences in kelp forest
712	ecosystem dynamics. Ecology n/a.
713	Essington, T. E., J. N. Sanchirico, and M. L. Baskett. 2018. Economic value of ecological
714	information in ecosystem-based natural resource management depends on exploitation
715	history. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 115:1658–1663.
716	Filbee-Dexter, K., and R. E. Scheibling. 2014. Sea urchin barrens as alternative stable states of
717	collapsed kelp ecosystems. Marine Ecology Progress Series 495:1–25.
718	Freeman, A. 2006. Size-dependent trait-mediated indirect interactions among sea urchin
719	herbivores. Behavioral Ecology 17:182–187.
720	Fryxell, J. M., and P. Lundberg. 1994. Diet choice and predator—prey dynamics. Evolutionary
721	Ecology 8:407–421.
722	Haltuch, M. A., J. Wallace, C. A. Akselrud, J. Nowlis, L. A. Barnett, J. L. Valero, T. Tsou, and
723	L. Lam. 2018. 2017 Lingcod Stock Assessment. Page 295. Pacific Fishery Management
724	Council, Portland, OR, USA.
725	Hamilton, S. L., and J. E. Caselle. 2015. Exploitation and recovery of a sea urchin predator has
726	implications for the resilience of southern California kelp forests. Proceedings of the
727	Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences 282:20141817.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

- Harper, E. B., J. C. Stella, and A. K. Fremier. 2011. Global sensitivity analysis for complex
 ecological models: a case study of riparian cottonwood population dynamics. Ecological
 Applications 21:1225–1240.
- Hastings, A. 2004. Transients: the key to long-term ecological understanding? Trends in Ecology
 & Evolution 19:39–45.
- Hastings, A. 2016. Timescales and the management of ecological systems. Proceedings of the
 National Academy of Sciences 113:14568–14573.
- Hastings, A., K. C. Abbott, K. Cuddington, T. Francis, G. Gellner, Y.-C. Lai, A. Morozov, S.
 Petrovskii, K. Scranton, and M. L. Zeeman. 2018. Transient phenomena in ecology.
 Science 361:eaat6412.
- Hopf, J. K., G. P. Jones, D. H. Williamson, and S. R. Connolly. 2016. Fishery consequences of
 marine reserves: short-term pain for longer-term gain. Ecological Applications 26:818–
 829.
- 741 Hutchings, J. A. 2000. Collapse and recovery of marine fishes. Nature 406:882–885.
- Jackson, G. A. 1977. Nutrients and production of giant kelp, *Macrocystis pyrifera*, off southern
 California. Limnology and Oceanography 22:979–995.
- Jaco, E. M., and M. A. Steele. 2020. Pre-closure fishing pressure predicts effects of marine
 protected areas. Journal of Applied Ecology 57:229–240.
- Johnson, C. R., R. H. Chabot, M. P. Marzloff, and S. Wotherspoon. 2017. Knowing when (not)
 to attempt ecological restoration. Restoration Ecology 25:140–147.
- Kaplan, K. A., L. Yamane, L. W. Botsford, M. L. Baskett, A. Hastings, S. Worden, and J. W.
 White. 2019. Setting expected timelines of fished population recovery for the adaptive
- 750 management of a marine protected area network. Ecological Applications 29:e01949.
- Karatayev, V. A., and M. L. Baskett. 2019. At what spatial scales are alternative stable states
 relevant in highly interconnected ecosystems? Ecology 101:e02930.
- Kellner, J. B., J. N. Sanchirico, A. Hastings, and P. J. Mumby. 2011. Optimizing for multiple
 species and multiple values: tradeoffs inherent in ecosystem-based fisheries management.
 Conservation Letters 4:21–30.
- 756 Kenner, M. C., and M. T. Lares. 1991. Size at first reproduction of the sea urchin
- 757 *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* in a central California kelp forest. Marine Ecology
- 758 Progress Series 76:303–306.

- Ladd, M. C., M. W. Miller, J. H. Hunt, W. C. Sharp, and D. E. Burkepile. 2018. Harnessing
 ecological processes to facilitate coral restoration. Frontiers in Ecology and the
 Environment 16:239–247.
- Larkin, P. A. 1996. Concepts and issues in marine ecosystem management. Reviews in Fish
 Biology and Fisheries 6:139–164.
- Lester, S. E., B. S. Halpern, K. Grorud-Colvert, J. Lubchenco, B. I. Ruttenberg, S. D. Gaines, S.
 Airamé, and R. R. Warner. 2009. Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: a
 global synthesis. Marine Ecology Progress Series 384:33–46.
- Lindegren, M., C. Möllmann, A. Nielsen, and N. C. Stenseth. 2009. Preventing the collapse of
 the Baltic cod stock through an ecosystem-based management approach. Proceedings of
 the National Academy of Sciences 106:14722–14727.
- Ling, S. D., and C. R. Johnson. 2012. Marine reserves reduce risk of climate-driven phase shift
 by reinstating size- and habitat-specific trophic interactions. Ecological Applications
 22:1232–1245.
- Ling, S. D., C. R. Johnson, S. D. Frusher, and K. R. Ridgway. 2009. Overfishing reduces
 resilience of kelp beds to climate-driven catastrophic phase shift. Proceedings of the
 National Academy of Sciences 106:22341–22345.
- Link, J. S. 2002. Ecological considerations in fisheries management: when does it matter?
 Fisheries 27:10–17.
- Loflen, C. L., and K. A. Hovel. 2010. Behavioral responses to variable predation risk in the
 California spiny lobster *Panulirus interruptus*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 420:135–
 144.
- Mangel, M., and P. S. Levin. 2005. Regime, phase and paradigm shifts: making community
 ecology the basic science for fisheries. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society
 B: Biological Sciences 360:95–105.
- Marshall, K. N., A. C. Stier, J. F. Samhouri, R. P. Kelly, and E. J. Ward. 2016. Conservation
 challenges of predator recovery. Conservation Letters 9:70–78.
- Marzloff, M. P., C. R. Johnson, L. R. Little, J.-C. Soulié, S. D. Ling, and S. D. Frusher. 2013.
 Sensitivity analysis and pattern-oriented validation of TRITON, a model with alternative
 community states: Insights on temperate rocky reefs dynamics. Ecological Modelling
 258:16–32.

- Marzloff, M. P., L. R. Little, and C. R. Johnson. 2016. Building resilience against climate-driven
 shifts in a temperate reef system: staying away from context-dependent ecological
 thresholds. Ecosystems 19:1–15.
- Micheli, F., B. S. Halpern, L. W. Botsford, and R. R. Warner. 2004. Trajectories and correlates
 of community change in no-take marine reserves. Ecological Applications 14:1709–1723.
- Minto, C., and B. Worm. 2012. Interactions between small pelagic fish and young cod across the
 North Atlantic. Ecology 93:2139–2154.
- Moxley, J. H., T. E. Nicholson, K. S. V. Houtan, and S. J. Jorgensen. 2019. Non-trophic impacts
 from white sharks complicate population recovery for sea otters. Ecology and Evolution
 9:6378–6388.
- Neubauer, P., O. P. Jensen, J. A. Hutchings, and J. K. Baum. 2013. Resilience and recovery of
 overexploited marine populations. Science 340:347–349.
- 802 Nickols, K. J., J. W. White, D. Malone, M. H. Carr, R. M. Starr, M. L. Baskett, A. Hastings, and
- L. W. Botsford. 2019. Setting ecological expectations for adaptive management of
 marine protected areas. Journal of Applied Ecology 56:2376–2385.
- NOAA. 1996. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act. NOAA Technical
 Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-23. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,
 Silver Spring, MD, USA.
- Oken, K. L., and T. E. Essington. 2016. Evaluating the effect of a selective piscivore fishery on
 rockfish recovery within marine protected areas. ICES Journal of Marine Science
 73:2267-2277.
- 811 Peckarsky, B. L., P. A. Abrams, D. I. Bolnick, L. M. Dill, J. H. Grabowski, B. Luttbeg, J. L.
- 812 Orrock, S. D. Peacor, E. L. Preisser, O. J. Schmitz, and G. C. Trussell. 2008. Revisiting
- 813 the classics: considering nonconsumptive effects in textbook examples of predator-prey
 814 interactions. Ecology 89:2416–2425.
- 815 Perring, M. P., R. J. Standish, J. N. Price, M. D. Craig, T. E. Erickson, K. X. Ruthrof, A. S.
- 816 Whiteley, L. E. Valentine, and R. J. Hobbs. 2015. Advances in restoration ecology: rising
 817 to the challenges of the coming decades. Ecosphere 6:art131.
- Polis, G. A., and R. D. Holt. 1992. Intraguild predation: the dynamics of complex trophic
 interactions. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 7:151–154.

- Pringle, J. D. 1986. California spiny lobster (*Panulirus interruptus*) larval retention and
 recruitment: a review and synthesis. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
 43:2142–2152.
- Rife, A. N., B. Erisman, A. Sanchez, and O. Aburto-Oropeza. 2013. When good intentions are
 not enough ... Insights on networks of "paper park" marine protected areas. Conservation
 Letters 6:200–212.
- Rogers-Bennett, L., and C. A. Catton. 2019. Marine heat wave and multiple stressors tip bull
 kelp forest to sea urchin barrens. Scientific Reports 9:1–9.
- Safina, C., A. A. Rosenberg, R. A. Myers, T. J. Q. Ii, and J. S. Collie. 2005. U.S. ocean fish
 recovery: staying the course. Science 309:707–708.
- Samhouri, J. F., A. C. Stier, S. M. Hennessey, M. Novak, B. S. Halpern, and P. S. Levin. 2017.
 Rapid and direct recoveries of predators and prey through synchronized ecosystem

832 management. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1:s41559-016-0068–016.

- Schiel, D. R., and M. S. Foster. 2015. The biology and ecology of giant kelp forests. University
 of California Press, Berkeley, US.
- Seymour, R. J., M. J. Tegner, P. K. Dayton, and P. E. Parnell. 1989. Storm wave induced
 mortality of giant kelp, *Macrocystis pyrifera*, in Southern California. Estuarine, Coastal
 and Shelf Science 28:277–292.
- Shears, N. T., and R. C. Babcock. 2002. Marine reserves demonstrate top-down control of
 community structure on temperate reefs. Oecologia 132:131–142.
- Shears, N. T., D. J. Kushner, S. L. Katz, and S. D. Gaines. 2012. Reconciling conflict between
 the direct and indirect effects of marine reserve protection. Environmental Conservation
 39:225–236.
- 843 Silliman, B. R., E. Schrack, Q. He, R. Cope, A. Santoni, T. van der Heide, R. Jacobi, M. Jacobi,
 844 and J. van de Koppel. 2015. Facilitation shifts paradigms and can amplify coastal
- restoration efforts. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 112:14295–14300.
- 846 Spyksma, A. J. P., R. B. Taylor, and N. T. Shears. 2017. Predation cues rather than resource
- 847 availability promote cryptic behaviour in a habitat-forming sea urchin. Oecologia848 183:821–829.

- Steyn, C. 2019. Changes in food web structure and energy flow in kelp forest ecosystems on the
 south-west coast of South Africa following the invasion of *Jasus lalandii*. University of
 Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Stier, A. C., J. F. Samhouri, M. Novak, K. N. Marshall, E. J. Ward, R. D. Holt, and P. S. Levin.
 2016. Ecosystem context and historical contingency in apex predator recoveries. Science
 Advances 2:e1501769.
- Sumaila, U. R., W. Cheung, A. Dyck, K. Gueye, L. Huang, V. Lam, D. Pauly, T. Srinivasan, W.
 Swartz, R. Watson, and D. Zeller. 2012. Benefits of rebuilding global marine fisheries
 outweigh costs. PLOS ONE 7:e40542.
- Swain, D. P., H. P. Benoît, M. O. Hammill, and J. A. Sulikowski. 2019. Risk of extinction of a
 unique skate population due to predation by a recovering marine mammal. Ecological
 Applications 29:e01921.
- Tegner, M. J., and P. K. Dayton. 1977. Sea urchin recruitment patterns and implications of
 commercial fishing. Science 196:324–326.
- Wakeford, R. C., D. J. Agnew, and C. C. Mees. 2009. Review of institutional arrangements and
 evaluation of factors associated with successful stock recovery plans. Reviews in
 Fisheries Science 17:190–222.
- Walters, C., and J. F. Kitchell. 2001. Cultivation/depensation effects on juvenile survival and
 recruitment: implications for the theory of fishing. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
 Aquatic Sciences 58:39–50.
- White, J. W., L. W. Botsford, M. L. Baskett, L. A. Barnett, R. J. Barr, and A. Hastings. 2011.
 Linking models with monitoring data for assessing performance of no-take marine
 reserves. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 9:390–399.
- White, J. W., L. W. Botsford, A. Hastings, M. L. Baskett, D. M. Kaplan, and L. A. K. Barnett.
 2013. Transient responses of fished populations to marine reserve establishment.
 Conservation Letters 6:180–191.
- Young, T. P., K. L. Stuble, J. A. Balachowski, and C. M. Werner. 2017. Using priority effects to
 manipulate competitive relationships in restoration. Restoration Ecology 25:S114–S123.
- 878
- 879 Figure legends

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

880 Fig. 1: Outline of the updated rocky reef community dynamics model (originally published: 881 Dunn et al. 2017) is shown in Panel A. Boxes indicate state variables; arrows indicate biomass 882 flows affecting dynamics and are labelled with the associated parameter names. Colored arrows 883 and labels represent each of the five ecological processes we simulate: size-structured predation 884 (dark blue), non-consumptive effects of predators (light blue), recruitment dynamics (grey), 885 alternative stable states (purple), and kelp harvest (green). Within the model, predators consume 886 urchins at size-specific rates, $\delta_{L_{2}}$ which were manipulated to create various shapes of sizestructured predation. Similarly, urchins graze on kelp at size-specific rates, δ_{U_i} , which we 887 888 reduced for small and medium urchins when simulating the behavioral change exhibited by 889 urchins following the closure of the lobster fishery. To create open populations of urchins and 890 lobsters, we added a constant source of exogenous recruitment, where φ_i is a biomass of either 891 small urchins or lobsters that recruits at each time step. To investigate the effects of fishery-892 induced degradation on recovery, we varied the fishery harvest rates F_U and F_L which led to 893 population recovery beginning from either the kelp forest (sustainable harvest), the urchin barren 894 (collapsed), or the moderately degraded region between these two alternative communities (on 895 the verge of collapse). Finally, we added an additional kelp fishery with harvest rate F_K . In Panel 896 B, we show time-series of fished biomass (lobsters + large urchins) for synchronous fishery 897 closures with initial conditions in the kelp forest (solid green line) and urchin barren (dashed 898 purple line). Horizontal and vertical boxes denote the return time and volatility metrics, respectively. 899

900 Fig. 2: Fished community volatility (A) and return time (B) for baseline model scenarios with 901 initial conditions either in the kelp forest, moderately degraded, or urchin barren states, 902 established by varying fishing mortality. For both volatility and return time, we show the 903 combined biomass of lobsters and large urchins, the two compartments affected by fishery 904 closure. In panel A, numbers on each bar provide the number of years following fishery 905 closure(s) until community volatility peaks. In B, black lines on bars for predator- and prey-first 906 management designate the portion of the return time associated with each fishery closure. For 907 example, for prey-first closure from the urchin barren, intermediate recovery to equilibrium 908 following closure of the urchin fishery took 10 years, while complete recovery following 909 secondary closure of the lobster fishery took an additional 150 years.

910 Fig. 3: Fished community volatility (A) and return time (B) for model simulations with alternate 911 shapes of the size-structured predation function, initiated from the kelp forest. Predator-first 912 recovery remains the least volatile and fastest return time (or tied, in the no size structure case). 913 Fig. 4: Fished community (large urchin, lobster) volatility (A) and return time (B) for various 914 recruitment scenarios. With constant exogenous recruitment of lobsters and urchins, predator-915 first recovery remains the least volatile. Non-consumptive effects of predators (with exogenous 916 recruitment) shows a similar result. When removing the possibility for recruitment facilitation of 917 small urchins by large red urchins (setting $\sigma = 0$), volatility and return time are reduced for all 918 recovery scenarios.

919 **Fig. 5:** Histograms representing the number of simulations that end with lobster + urchin

biomass at varying amounts, 5, 10, and 15 years after the closure of both predator and prey

921 fisheries. These simulations use a predator-first closure management strategy and include

922 parameter uncertainty, leading to variation in biomass at each time point. Green bars represent

923 simulations with initial conditions (prior to closure of the lobster fishery) in the kelp forest

924 community, purple bars are for initial conditions the urchin barren.

Author Ma





This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved





