Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

American Lobster Advisory Panel Call and Webinar
Monday, April 10th, 2023
5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.

DRAFT AGENDA

Webinar: https://meet.goto.com/384676861
You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (872) 240-3412
Access Code: 384-676-861

1. **Welcome & Review of the Agenda** *(G. Moore)*   5:30 p.m.

2. **Review Draft Addendum XXVII on increasing protection of the Gulf of**   5:35 p.m.
   Maine/Georges Bank spawning stock *(C. Starks)*
   - Review Public Comments

3. **AP Discussion and Recommendations on Management Options** *(G. Moore)*   6:00 p.m.

4. **Adjourn**   7:00 p.m.

MEMORANDUM

TO: **American Lobster Advisory Panel**

FROM: **Caitlin Starks, FMP Coordinator**

DATE: **March 15, 2023**

SUBJECT: **Advisory Panel Meeting Scheduled for April 10, 2023**

An American Lobster Advisory Panel (AP) meeting has been scheduled for **Monday, April 10th from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.** The information to access the webinar is as follows:

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://meet.goto.com/384676861
You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (872) 240-3412
Access Code: 384-676-861

The purpose of the meeting is to review Draft Addendum XXVII to Amendment 3 to the American Lobster Fishery Management Plan. The addendum considers measures for LCMA 1, LCMA 3 and the Outer Cape Cod area to increase protection of the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank spawning stock. Addendum XXVII also considers options to modify some management measures upon final approval of the Addendum to achieve more consistency in measures within and across LCMAs.

During this AP meeting we will solicit input from the lobster advisors on the proposed management options for the Board's consideration in May. A copy of the Draft Addendum for Public Comment is enclosed for your review. Additional materials including a summary of public comments on the addendum will be provided in advance of the AP meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. You can reach me at cstarks@asmfc.org or 703.842.0740.

Enclosed: Draft Addendum XXVII to Amendment 3 to the American Lobster Fishery Management Plan for Public Comment

M23-23

Draft Document for Public Comment

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

DRAFT ADDENDUM XXVII TO AMENDMENT 3 TO THE AMERICAN LOBSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Increasing Protection of the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank Spawning Stock

February 2023
Revised March 9, 2023

Sustainable and Cooperative Management of Atlantic Coastal Fisheries

Draft Document for Public Comment

Public Comment Process and Proposed Timeline

In August 2017, the American Lobster Management Board (Board) initiated Draft Addendum XXVII to increase the resiliency of the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank (GOM/GBK) stock. Work on this addendum was paused due to the prioritization of work on take reduction efforts for North Atlantic right whales and the 2020 stock assessment. The Board reinitiated work on Draft Addendum XXVII in February 2021, and has since revised the goal of the addendum to consider a trigger mechanism such that, upon reaching the trigger, measures would be automatically implemented to increase the overall protection of spawning stock biomass of the GOM/GBK stock. The management action was initiated in response to signs of reduced juvenile settlement and the combining of the GOM and GBK stocks following the 2015 Stock Assessment. This document presents background on the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's management of lobster, the addendum process and timeline, a statement of the problem, and management measures for public consideration and comment. Additionally, three appendices are included, which provide information on (A) the current condition of the stock, (B) potential impacts of proposed management measures, and (C) the development of the proposed trigger index.

==This document was revised on March 9. Changes were made to section 3.2 (Issue 2, Option C) for Lobster Conservation Management Area 3 and Outer Cape Cod, and the public comment deadline has been extended.==

The public is encouraged to submit comments regarding the proposed management options in this document at any time during the addendum process. The final date comments will be accepted is **April 8, 2023 at 11:59 p.m**. **EST.** Comments may be submitted by mail or email. If you have any questions or would like to submit comments, please use the contact information below.

Mail: Caitlin Starks
      Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission   Email: comments@asmfc.org
      1050 N. Highland St. Suite 200A-N   (Subject line: Lobster
      Arlington, VA 22201   Draft Addendum XXVII)

May – Dec 2022	Draft Addendum for Public Comment Developed
January 2023	Board Approved Draft Addendum for Public Comment
February - April 2023	Public Comment Period Including Public Hearings
May 2023	Board Reviews Public Comment, Selects Management Measures, Final Approval of Addendum XXVII
TBD	Implementation of Addendum XXVII Provisions

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) has coordinated the interstate management of American lobster (*Homarus americanus)* from 0-3 miles offshore since 1996. American lobster is currently managed under Amendment 3 and Addenda I-XXVI to the Fishery Management Plan (FMP). Management authority in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) from 3-200 miles from shore lies with NOAA Fisheries. The management unit includes all coastal migratory stocks between Maine and Virginia. Within the management unit there are two lobster stocks and seven management areas. The Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank (GOM/GBK) stock (subject of this draft addendum) is primarily comprised of three Lobster Conservation Management Areas (LCMAs), including LCMAs 1 (GOM), 3 (federal waters), and Outer Cape Cod (OCC) (Figure 1). There are three states (Maine through Massachusetts) which regulate American lobster in states waters of the GOM/GBK stock; however, landings from the GOM/GBK stock occur from Rhode Island through New York and these states regulate the landings of lobster in state ports.

The American Lobster Management Board (Board) initiated Draft Addendum XXVII as a proactive measure to improve the resiliency of the GOM/GBK stock. Since the early 2000s, landings in the GOM/GBK stock have exponentially increased. In Maine alone, landings have increased three-fold from 57 million pounds in 2000 to a record high of 132.6 million pounds in 2016. Maine landings have declined slightly but were still near time-series highs at 97.9 million and 108.9 million in 2020 and 2021, respectively. However, since 2012, lobster juvenile settlement surveys throughout the GOM have generally been below the time series averages in all areas. These surveys, which measure trends in the abundance of newly-settled lobster, can be used to track populations and potentially forecast future landings. Consequently, persistent lower densities of settlement could foreshadow decline in recruitment and landings. In the most recent years of the time series, declines in other recruit indices have already been observed.

Given the American lobster fishery is one of the largest and most valuable fisheries along the Atlantic coast, potential decreases in abundance and landings could result in vast economic and social consequences. With peak values in 2016 and 2021, the at-the-dock value of the American lobster fishery has averaged $660 million dollars from 2016-2021, representing the highest ex-vessel value of any species landed along the Atlantic coast during peak years. Ex-vessel value declined slightly from 2017 to 2020, but not proportionally to declines in landings. The vast majority of the overall landings value (>90%) comes from the GOM/GBK stock, and more specifically from the states of Maine through Rhode Island. As a result, the lobster fishery is an important source of jobs (catch, dock side commerce, tourism, etc.) and income for many New England coastal communities. The lack of other economic opportunities, both in terms of species to fish and employment outside the fishing industry, compounds the economic reliance of some coastal communities on GOM/GBK lobster – particularly in Maine.

Draft Addendum XXVII responds to signs of reduced juvenile settlement and the combination of the GOM and GBK stocks following the 2015 Stock Assessment. The Board specified the following objective statement for Draft Addendum XXVII:

Given persistent low settlement indices and recent decreases in recruit indices, the addendum should consider a trigger mechanism such that, upon reaching the trigger, measures would be automatically implemented to increase the overall protection of spawning stock biomass of the GOM/GBK stock.

Draft Addendum XXVII considers implementing management measures—specifically gauge and vent sizes—that are expected to add an additional biological buffer through the protection of spawning stock biomass (SSB). The addendum also considers immediate action upon final approval to standardize some management measures within and across LCMAs in the GOM/GBK stock. The purpose of considering more consistency in measures is to resolve discrepancies between the regulations for state and federal permit-holders, to provide a consistent conservation strategy, and simplify enforcement across management areas and interstate commerce.


Figure 1. Lobster conservation management areas (LCMAs) in the American lobster fishery. LCMAs 1, 3, and Outer Cape Cod make up the majority of the GOM/GBK stock. The Area 3 v-notch line is shown in red where v-notching is required north of the 42°30' line.

2.0 Overview

2.1 Statement of Problem

While 2016 landings in the GOM/GBK lobster fishery were the highest on record, settlement surveys for more than five years have consistently been below the 75th percentile of their time series, indicating neutral or poor conditions. Additionally, there is evidence of declines in recruit abundance in ventless trap survey and trawl surveys for the GOM/GBK stock since the most recent stock assessment. These declines could indicate future declines in recruitment and landings. Given the economic importance of the lobster fishery to many coastal communities in New England, especially in Maine, potential reductions in landings could have vast socioeconomic impacts. In addition, the 2015 Stock Assessment combined the GOM and GBK stocks into a single biological unit due to evidence of migration between the two regions. As a result, there are now varying management measures within a single biological stock. In response to these two issues, the Board initiated Draft Addendum XXVII to consider the standardization of management measures across LCMAs.

However, in 2021, the Board revised the focus of Addendum XXVII to prioritize increasing biological resiliency of the stock over standardization of management measures across LCMAs. Increased resiliency may be achieved without completely uniform management measures, so the main objective of the Draft Addendum is to increase the overall protection of SSB while also considering management options that are more consistent than status quo. Increasing consistency across management areas may help to address some assessment and enforcement challenges, as well as concerns regarding the shipment and sale of lobsters across state lines.

2.2 Status of the GOM/GBK Fishery

The GOM/GBK fishery has experienced incredible growth over the past two decades. Throughout the 1980s, GOM/GBK landings averaged 35 million pounds, with 91% of landings coming from the GOM portion of the stock. In the 1990s, landings slightly increased to an average of 53 million pounds; however, landings started to rapidly increase in the mid-2000s. Over a one-year span (2003-2004), landings increased by roughly 18 million pounds to 86 million pounds. This growth continued through the 2000s with 97 million pounds landed in 2009 and 113 million pounds landed in 2010. Landings continued to increase and peaked at 156 million pounds in 2016 (Figure 2).

In the peak year of 2016, Maine alone landed 132.7 million pounds, representing an ex-vessel value of over $541 million. The states of Maine through Rhode Island (the four states that account for the vast majority of harvest from the GOM/GBK stock), landed 158 million pounds in 2016, representing 99% of landings coastwide. Total ex-vessel value of the American lobster fishery in 2016 was $670.4 million, the highest valued fishery along the Atlantic coast in 2016. While landings have declined slightly from peak levels in 2016, they remain near all-time highs. Coastwide landings and ex-vessel value for 2017-2021 averaged 133.4 million pounds and $658.4 million, respectively. However, ex-vessel value in 2021 increased and was estimated at over $924 million, the highest value in the time series.

GOM/GBK American Lobster Landings (millions of pounds)

Figure 2. Landings in the GOM/GBK stock (1982-2018). Stock-specific landings are updated during each benchmark stock assessment.

2.3 Status of the GOM/GBK Stock
2.3.1 *2020 Stock Assessment*

Results of the 2020 Benchmark Stock Assessment indicate a dramatic overall increase in the abundance of lobsters in the GOM/GBK stock since the late 1980s. After 2008, the rate of increase accelerated, and the stock reached a record high abundance level in 2018. Based on a new analysis to identify shifts in the stock that may be attributed to changing environmental conditions and new baselines for stock productivity, the GOM/GBK stock shifted from a low abundance regime during the early 1980s through 1995 to a moderate abundance regime during 1996-2008, and shifted once again to a high abundance regime during 2009-2018 (Figure 3). Spawning stock abundance and recruitment in the terminal year of the assessment (2018) were near record highs. Exploitation (proportion of stock abundance removed by the fishery) declined in the late 1980s and has remained relatively stable since.

Based on the new abundance reference points adopted by the Board, the GOM/GBK stock is in favorable condition. The average abundance from 2016-2018 was 256 million lobsters, which is greater than the fishery/industry target of 212 million lobsters. The average exploitation from 2016-2018 was 0.459, below the exploitation target of 0.461. Therefore, the GOM/GBK lobster stock is not depleted and overfishing is not occurring.

However, stock indicators based on observed data were also used as an independent, model-free assessment of the lobster stocks, and some of these have shown concerning trends. These indicators included exploitation rates as indicators of mortality; young-of-the-year (YOY), fishery recruitment, and spawning stock biomass (SSB) as indicators of abundance; encounter rates as indicators of distribution; and total landings, effort, catch per unit effort, and monetary

Abundance for GOM/GBK Relative to Reference Points

Figure 3. GOM/GBK stock abundance from the 2020 Stock Assessment.

measures as fishery performance indicators. Additionally, annual days with average water temperatures >20°C at several temperature monitoring stations and the prevalence of epizootic shell disease in the population were added as indicators of environmental stress. The 20°C threshold is a well-documented threshold for physiological stress in lobsters. Epizootic shell disease is considered a physical manifestation of stress that can lead to mortality and sub-lethal health effects.

While the stock assessment model and model-free indicators supported a favorable picture of exploitable stock health during the recent 2020 Stock Assessment, the assessment conversely noted YOY indices did not reflect favorable conditions in recent years and indicate potential for decline in recruitment to the exploitable stock in future years (Table 2). Specifically, YOY indices in two of five regions were below the 25th percentile of the time series (indicating negative conditions) in the terminal year of the assessment (2018) and when averaged over the last five years (2014-2018); the remaining three regions were below the 75th percentile (indicating neutral conditions).

Mortality indicators generally declined through time to their lowest levels in recent years. Fishery performance indicators were generally positive in recent years with several shifting into positive conditions around 2010. Stress indicators show relatively low stress, but indicate some

increasingly stressful environmental conditions through time, particularly in the southwest portion of the stock.

As recommended in the 2020 stock assessment, a data update process will occur annually to update American lobster stock indicators, including YOY settlement indicators, trawl survey indicators, and ventless trap survey indices. The second annual data update was completed in 2022 with data through 2021, and the results are provided in Appendix A.

2.3.2 *YOY Surveys*

Since 2018, YOY indices have continued to show unfavorable conditions in the GOM/GBK stock. There have been sustained low levels of settlement observed from 2012 to 2021 (Figure 4). In Maine, 2019, 2020, and 2021 YOY indices were below the 75th percentile of their time series throughout most statistical areas sampled, (all except Statistical Area 512 in 2019). In 2021, YOY values fell below the 25th percentile in all three Northeast areas. In New Hampshire, YOY values have shown a lot of interannual variation over the past three years (2019-2021) with values above the 50th percentile in 2019, then below the 25th in 2020, followed by an increase in 2021 above the 75th percentile of the time series. In Massachusetts, the 2019 index was below the 25th percentile of its time series; it rebounded slightly in 2020 and 2021, but remained below the 75th percentile.

Sustained and unfavorable YOY indices are concerning as they could foreshadow poor future year classes in the lobster fishery. Lobster growth is partially temperature-dependent and it is expected that it takes seven to nine years for a lobster to reach commercial size. Thus, decreased abundance of YOY lobsters today could foreshadow decreased numbers of lobsters available to the fishery in the future. Given there have been nine consecutive years of low YOY indices in the GOM, this trend may soon be reflected in the GOM/GBK stock. What is more concerning is that declines in the Southern New England (SNE stock), which is currently at record low abundance, began with declines in YOY indices. Specifically, SNE YOY indices began to decline in 1995, two years before landings peaked in 1997, and roughly five years before landings precipitously declined in the early 2000s.

There are several hypotheses as to why the YOY indices have been low and what this could mean for the future of the GOM/GBK stock. One hypothesis is that declines in the YOY indices are reflecting a true decline in the newly-settled portion of the stock, and are related to declining food resources (specifically zooplankton). Carloni et al. (2018) examined trends in lobster larvae to explore linkages between SSB and YOY abundance. The study found a significant increasing trend in stage I larval abundance consistent with the increases in SSB in the GOM. Planktonic postlarvae, on the other hand, had a declining trend in abundance similar to trends for YOY settlement throughout western GOM. The study also found significant correlations between lobster postlarvae and the copepod *C. finmarchicus*, but there were no relationships with other zooplankton. This suggests recruitment processes in the GOM could be linked to larval food supply.

Figure 4. GOM abundance indicators: YOY indices.

Declines in the YOY indices could also be an artifact of the lobster population moving further offshore. Recent work suggests warming in the GOM on the scale of decades has expanded thermally suitable habitat areas and played a significant role in the increase of observed settlement into deeper areas, particularly in the Eastern Gulf of Maine (Goode et al. 2019), so lobster settlement may be diluted across a greater area. Given the YOY surveys typically occur inshore, the surveys may be unable to account for increased abundance of YOY lobsters farther offshore. In an effort to test this theory, the Technical Committee (TC) looked at potential

increases in the habitat available for recruitment in the GOM/GBK stock due to warming waters. Specifically, the TC calculated the quantity of habitat by depth in the GOM. Results showed that incremental increases in depth result in incremental increases in habitat suitable for recruitment and small observed decreases in recruit densities in shallow waters. Therefore, there is no evidence that incremental increases in depth result in exponential increases in available habitat. In order for the diffusion of YOY lobsters over a larger area to completely explain the observed decreases in the YOY indices, the habitat available to recruitment would have to more than double. This suggests dilution effects from increased habitat availability alone are not sufficient to explain decreases in the YOY indices, and there are likely other changes occurring in the system.

2.3.3 *Ventless Trap Surveys and Trawl Surveys*

While YOY surveys have detected declines in the number of newly settled lobsters for about a decade, results of the ventless trap survey (VTS) and trawl surveys, which encounter larger sized lobsters just before they recruit to the fishery, have only exhibited evidence of decline in the most recent years. The interpretation of these trends is complicated by sampling restrictions and limited surveys in 2020 resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. VTS indices show declines since peaking in 2016, especially in the eastern regions (Figure 5). The Maine/New Hampshire and the Massachusetts Fall Trawl Surveys have both showed declines in recruit lobster abundance since 2018. For the spring trawl surveys, recruit abundance indices increased from 2018 to 2019, but decreased again in 2021. Only the Maine/New Hampshire Fall Trawl Survey ran in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is important to continue to closely monitor these surveys as continued decreases in the VTS and/or trawl surveys would confirm the declines seen in the YOY surveys.

Figure 5. GOM abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance

2.4 Economic Importance of the American Lobster Fishery

Much of the concern regarding the declines in the lobster indices result from the vast economic importance of the lobster fishery throughout the GOM. For the states of Maine through Massachusetts, lobster is one of the most valuable fisheries and the large majority of landings come from the GOM/GBK stock.

For Maine, American lobster is an essential economic driver for the coastal economy. Lobster annually represents more than 75% of Maine's marine resource landings by ex-vessel value (82% in 2021). The landings peaked in 2016 with more than 132 million pounds harvested, while in 2021, the ex-vessel value was estimated as more than $730 million dollars[1]. The lobster harvester sector includes more than 5,770 license holders, 4,200 of which are active license holders who complete more than 250,000 trips a year selling to 240 active lobster dealers (Maine DMR, unpublished data). The lobster distribution supply chain was estimated in 2018 to contribute an additional economic impact of $1 billion annually ("Lobster to Dollars," 2018).

---

[1] https://www.maine.gov/dmr/commercial-fishing/landings/documents/lobster.table.pdf

Not included in these numbers are the vessel crew members and other associated businesses (bait vessels and dealers, boat builders, trap builders, and marine supply stores) that are essential in delivering lobsters to consumers worldwide, supporting the industry, and driving Maine's coastal communities.

The American lobster fishery is the most valuable commercial fishery in New Hampshire with an ex-vessel value of over $44 million in 2021. The value of lobster landed accounted for over 90% of the value of all commercial species landed in New Hampshire. The lobster fishery in New Hampshire includes over 300 licensed commercial harvesters, over 200 of which are active, who sold to more than 30 licensed wholesale lobster dealers (Renee Zobel, personal communication). The importance of the economic impact of the lobster fishery to New Hampshire is also seen in the over 350 businesses licensed to sell lobster to consumers at the retail level.

For Massachusetts, American lobster is the second most valuable fishery in terms of overall landings value, and the most valuable of all fisheries conducted within Massachusetts state waters. The total estimated value for annual lobster landings in Massachusetts has been over $93 million per year on average for 2017-2021. On average, landings from the GOM/GBK stock make up 96% of the total lobster landings for Massachusetts; roughly 72% of this comes from LCMA 1, 22% from LCMA 3, and 7% from LCMA OCC (Massachusetts DMF, unpublished data).

Though the state is not directly situated on the GOM, a significant contingent of the Rhode Island commercial lobster fleet harvests lobsters in GOM/GBK. In 2020 and 2021, approximately 30% and 19% of Rhode Island's commercial landings, respectively, came from statistical areas in GOM/GBK (2020: 497,705 pounds, 2021: 257,225 pounds). The estimated ex-vessel value for lobsters from this stock was approximately $2.9 million in 2020.

2.5 Current Management Measures in the GOM/GBK Stock
Lobster is currently managed under Amendment 3, and its 27 addenda. One of the hallmarks of Amendment 3 was the creation of seven LCMAs along the coast. The GOM/GBK stock is primarily comprised of LCMAs 1 and OCC as well as the northern half of LCMA 3. Each management area has a unique set of management measures. Table 1 shows the current measures for each area. Because the GOM/GBK stock is now assessed as a single area, the result is a diverse suite of regulations for each LCMA within a single stock unit, creating challenges for assessing the impacts of management measures within the stock. Specifically, the minimum gauge size (the smallest size lobster that can be legally harvested) in LCMA 1 is 3 ¼", while it is $3^3/_8$" in LCMA OCC and $3^{17}/_{32}$" in LCMA 3. It should be noted that the coastwide minimum size remains at 3 ¼", which is the minimum size any LCMA may implement. Each LCMA has its own minimum size that may be larger than the coastwide minimum size.

Likewise, the maximum gauge size (the largest size lobster that can be legally harvested) differs among the three areas, with a 5" maximum gauge size in LCMA 1, a 6 ¾" maximum gauge size in LCMA 3 and for federal permit holders in LCMA OCC, and no maximum gauge size for state-only OCC permit holders. V-notch definitions are also inconsistent. LCMA 1 has a no tolerance

for possession of any size v-notch or mutation. LCMA 3 defines a v-notch as greater than $^1/_8$" with or without setal hairs while OCC has different definitions for federal permits (similar to LCMA 3) and state only permits (> ¼" without setal hairs). There are also inconsistent v-notch requirements across LCMAs, with LCMA 1 requiring all egg-bearing lobsters to be v-notched, LCMA 3 only requiring v-notching above 42°30' line, and no requirement in OCC (Figure 1).

Several concerns have been noted regarding the current management measures beyond these disparities. At the current minimum sizes, growth overfishing is occurring in the LCMAs within the GOM/GBK stock. Growth overfishing refers to the harvest of lobsters before they reach the size where their collective biomass (and fishery yield) would be greatest, and when they have very large scope for additional growth. This is demonstrated by the potential increases in catch weight associated with increasing the minimum gauge size (see Appendix B). In LCMA 1, most of the catch consists of individuals within one molt of minimum legal size, which results in a much smaller yield-per-recruit (YPR) than could be achieved if lobsters were allowed to survive and grow to larger sizes before harvest. While the size distribution of the lobsters harvested lobsters in LCMA 3 is much broader than inshore (the fishery is less recruit-dependent) there is still considerable potential for additional growth, and delaying harvest could increase yield per recruit in this region as well. Another concern is the loss of conservation benefits across LCMAs due to inconsistent measures between areas. The 2015 assessment combined the GOM and GBK areas into one stock because the Northeast Fisheries Science Trawl Survey showed evidence of seasonal exchange and migration of lobsters between areas. Loss of conservation benefits occurs when lobsters are protected in one area but can be harvested in another when they cross LCMA boundaries.

2.6 Biological Benefits of Modifying Gauge Sizes
Of the existing biological management measures for the lobster fishery, minimum and maximum gauge sizes are most likely to have biological impacts on the GOM/GBK stock and fishery. Analyses were performed by the TC to evaluate the impacts of alternate minimum and maximum sizes for the LCMAs within the stock. For LCMA 1, analysis involved updating existing simulation models with more recent data to estimate the impacts of specific minimum and maximum gauge size combinations on total weight of lobsters landed, number of lobsters landed, SSB and exploitation. A separate analysis for LCMA 3 was performed due to concerns that the offshore fishery in LCMA 3 is considerably different from the inshore (which tends to drive stock-wide modelling results). For OCC, simulations were run with both LCMA 1 and LCMA 3 parameters because it is considered a transitional area. The full report on these analyses is included in Appendix B.

Based on these analyses, several general assumptions can be made about potential changes to the minimum and maximum gauge sizes. Increasing the minimum legal gauge size in LCMA 1 is projected to result in large increases in SSB; while increasing the minimum gauge size for LCMA 3 and OCC is projected to result in much smaller increases in SSB relative to LCMA 1. This is primarily because of the significantly larger magnitude of the LCMA 1 fishery and that the current minimum legal size in LCMA 1 is significantly below the size at maturity. Meanwhile, the current minimum gauge sizes in LCMA 3 and OCC are much closer to the size at maturity and

landings from these areas account for only a small fraction of the fishery. Minimum sizes that approach or exceed the size at maturity produce increasing returns on SSB as this allows a much larger portion of the population to reproduce at least once. Therefore, increasing minimum legal size in LCMA 1 to $3^{15}/_{32}$" (88 mm) is projected to result in a near doubling of SSB. This would significantly increase egg production potential and may provide some buffer against the effects of future changes in productivity. At the same time, this change would be expected to produce only marginal decreases in the total number of lobsters landed but result in a net increase in YPR and total weight of catch.

Generally, decreasing maximum gauge sizes is projected to have larger effects for LCMA 3 both relative to increasing the minimum size in LCMA 3 and to changing the maximum sizes for the other LCMAs. However, relative to increasing the minimum size in LCMA 1, the positive impact to the overall stock projected to result from decreasing the maximum gauge sizes in LCMA 3 and OCC is significantly smaller.

2.7 Potential Implications of Increasing Consistency of Measures
Beyond the biological concerns for the GOM/GBK lobster stock, the disparities in the current measures also create challenges for stock assessment, law enforcement, and commerce. Increasing consistency among the measures for the LCMAs within the stock could have benefits in each of these areas, which are described in the following sections.

2.7.1 Stock Boundaries
A complicating factor in the management of lobster is that the boundaries of the LCMAs do not align with the biological boundaries of the stocks (GOM/GBK vs. SNE). This is particularly problematic in LCMA 3 which spans both GOM/GBK and SNE. The intricacy of the stock boundaries is further complicated by the fact that many vessels fishing out of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, which are harvesting lobsters on Georges Bank, must travel through the SNE stock area to reach their port of landing. In addition, these vessels may be permitted to fish in multiple management areas, including areas that span both lobster stocks.

To date, there have been no permit requirements to delineate within which stock a harvester in LCMA 3 is eligible to fish. In addition, management actions responding to the decline in the SNE stock have been applied throughout LCMA 3. Given the Board initiated this addendum with the goal of increasing resiliency in the GOM/GBK stock, new management measures must either apply to all LCMA 3 fishermen regardless of location and stock fished (with implications on the SNE fishery) or be stock specific.

2.7.2 Interstate Shipment of Lobsters
Increasing consistency in regulations may address concerns regarding the sale and shipment of lobsters across state lines. With decreased landings in SNE and expanding markets for the GOM/GBK stock, there has been increased demand for the shipment of lobsters across state lines. This movement of lobster can be complicated by the fact that the gauge sizes differ across LCMAs, and many states implement the minimum and maximum gauge sizes as possession limits rather than landing limits per state regulation or law. This means the gauge sizes apply to

anyone in the lobster supply chain, not just harvesters. While these strict regulations improve the enforcement of gauge sizes, it can complicate interstate shipment of lobsters, particularly given the minimum size in LCMA 1 is smaller than the other management areas. As a result, some dealers must sort lobster by size in order to ship product across state lines.

Moving toward more consistent minimum sizes within the inshore LCMAs would help alleviate this issue by easing the ability of states to participate in the GOM/GBK lobster supply chain. This would not only reduce the burden on dealers that sort product by size but also enhance the enforcement of gauge sizes in the fishery.

2.7.3 Improve Enforcement

Another potential advantage of more consistent management measures is the ability to improve enforcement throughout the stock. Currently, disparate management measures hinder the ability for law enforcement to enforce various regulations in the lobster fishery. For example, vessels landing in Massachusetts harvest lobsters from four LCMAs, each of which has a different set of minimum gauge sizes (ranging from 3 ¼" to 3 $^{17}/_{32}$") and maximum gauge sizes (ranging from 5" to no maximum gauge size). Because a dealer can legally purchase and sell lobsters from areas with different minimum and maximum gauge sizes, only the most liberal measure can be implemented as a strict possession limit. The Law Enforcement Committee has continually recommended the use of standardized management measures in the lobster fishery, as inconsistent regulations mean that the least restrictive regulation becomes the only enforceable standard once product leaves the dock. In addition, regulatory inconsistencies decrease the likelihood of successful prosecution of violators.

3.0 Proposed Management Options

The following management options consider modifications to the management program with the goal of increasing protection of the GOM/GBK spawning stock. The final management program selected will apply to LCMAs 1, 3, and OCC.

- Issue 1 considers the standardization of a subset of management measures within LCMAs and across the GOM/GBK stock (Section 3.1).
- Issue 2 considers applying either a trigger mechanism or a predetermined schedule for implementing biological management measures that are expected to provide increased protection to SSB and increase the resiliency of the stock (Section 3.2).

When the Board takes final action on the addendum, there is the opportunity to select any measure within the range of options that went out for public comment, including combining options across issues.

3.1 Issue 1: Measures to be standardized upon final approval of Addendum XXVII

This issue considers options to modify some management measures immediately upon final approval of the Addendum to achieve more consistency in measures within and across LCMAs. One option proposes to modify some of the OCC measures to address differing regulations for state and federal permit holders. Specifically, for state-permitted harvesters in state waters there is no maximum gauge size and the v-notch definition is $^{1}/_{4}$" without setal hairs. For

federal permit holders, the maximum gauge size is $6\,^3/_4$" and the v-notch definition is $^1/_8$" with or without setal hairs. The disparity between regulations for different harvesters within the same area creates challenges for enforcement, and potentially weakens the conservation benefit of the stricter definition.

Additional options are proposed to standardize v-notch regulations across the LCMAs within the GOM/GBK stock, as well as regulations related to the issuance of tags for trap tag losses. Uniformity in these measures would benefit enforcement and apply a consistent conservation strategy across the stock unit.

Option A: Status Quo
This option would maintain the current management measures for each LCMA at final approval of the addendum.

Option B: Standardized measures to be implemented upon final approval of addendum
The Board may select more than one of the below options. The states would be required to implement the selected management measures for the fishing year specified by the Board at final approval of the addendum.

- **Sub-option B1**: Upon final approval of the addendum, implement standardized measures within GOM/GBK stock LCMAs to the most conservative measure where there are inconsistencies between state and federal regulations. This would result in the maximum gauge being standardized to 6-3/4" for state and federal permit holders, and the v-notch possession definition being standardized to $^1/_8$" with or without setal hairs in Outer Cape Cod (OCC). This means harvest is prohibited for a female lobster with a v-shaped notch greater than $^1/_8$".

- **Sub-option B2**: Upon final approval of the addendum, implement a standard v-notch requirement across all LCMAs that include the GOM/GBK stock. This would result in mandatory v-notching for all eggers in LCMAs 1, 3, and OCC.

- **Sub-option B3**: Upon final approval of the addendum, implement a standard v-notch possession definition of $^1/_8$" with or without setal hairs for LCMAs 1, 3, and OCC. Any jurisdiction could implement more conservative regulations.

- **Sub-option B4:** Upon final approval of the addendum, standardize regulations across LCMAs 1, 3, and OCC to limit the issuance of trap tags to equal the harvester trap tag allocation. This would mean no surplus trap tags would be automatically issued until trap losses occur and are documented.

3.2 Issue 2: Implementing management measures to increase protection of SSB
The primary objective of this proposed action is to increase the protection of SSB in the GOM/GBK stock. The proposed options consider changes to the minimum and maximum gauge sizes along with corresponding vent sizes for the LCMAs within the stock. The proposed measures are expected to 1) increase SSB, and 2) result in the minimum gauge size increasing

to meet or exceed the size at 50% maturity (L50) for each LCMA (LCMA 1: eastern GOM L50 = 88 mm, western GOM L50 = 83 mm, LCMA 3: Georges Bank L50 = 91 mm). Appendix B includes a full technical report of analysis performed to project the impacts of various gauge size combinations on total weight of lobsters landed, number of lobsters landed, SSB and exploitation.

This issue proposes two approaches for implementing management changes to increase protection of SSB. One approach, which is applied in Option B, is to establish a trigger mechanism whereby pre-determined management changes would be triggered upon reaching a defined trigger level based on observed changes in recruit (71-80 mm carapace length) abundance indices. The proposed mechanism includes establishing a management trigger based on recruit conditions observed in three surveys that were used to inform the assessment model estimates of reference abundance and stock status for the GOM/GBK stock. These recruit indices include: 1) combined Maine/New Hampshire and Massachusetts spring trawl survey index, 2) combined Maine/New Hampshire and Massachusetts fall trawl survey index, and 3) model-based VTS index.

The management trigger is defined by a certain level of decline in the indices from an established reference period. The reference value for each index is calculated as the average of the index values from 2016-2018. This reference period reflects the condition of the stock when the 2020 stock assessment was completed, and includes the same years used to determine the stock status and reference points. The percent declines in the indices are expected to approximate comparable declines in overall abundance of the stock, and relate to the abundance reference points established by the Board. The analyses conducted to develop the trigger mechanism and evaluate its performance in appropriately triggering management are described in detail in Appendix C. Figure 6 (top left panel) shows the calculated trigger index compared to the two proposed trigger levels in this document.

A second approach, which is applied in Option C, is to establish a pre-determined schedule for future changes to the management measures. This approach is more proactive in nature and addresses the issue of growth overfishing by increasing the minimum legal size while the stock conditions are favorable.

Figure 6. Scaled survey-specific indices and combined trigger index compared to proposed trigger levels. Top-left: combined trigger index that would be used to trigger changes in management measures. Top-right: moving three-year average of fall trawl survey indices. Bottom-left: moving three-year average of spring trawl survey indices. Bottom-right: moving three-year average of VTS indices.

Option A: Status Quo

Under this option there would be no additional changes to the management measures for the LCMAs within the GOM/GBK stock beyond the option(s) selected under Issue 1.

Option B: Gauge and vent size changes triggered by a defined change in trigger index

Under this option, the Board would establish a trigger mechanism whereby pre-determined management changes would be implemented upon reaching a defined trigger level based on observed changes in recruit abundance indices compared to the reference level of the trigger index. Upon the defined trigger level being reached, a predetermined set of management measures selected by the Board (see *Management Measures,* below) would be implemented for the following fishing year. Including the 2021 survey data as the terminal year, the most recent trigger index value was 0.765, which equates to a 23% decline from the reference period (Figure 6).

Trigger Level

If Option B is selected, the Board must establish a trigger level that, when reached, would result in the implementation of biological management measures to increase the protection of SSB in the GOM/GBK stock. The Board may select one of the following options as the trigger level, or any number within the range of the proposed options.

- **Trigger Option 1**: Management measures for the following fishing year would be implemented when a 32% decline in the trigger index is observed relative to the reference abundance level (equal to the average of the index values from 2016-2018). This trigger level approximates a decline in reference abundance to the level where the stock abundance regime shifted from moderate to high abundance (Figure 3).

- **Trigger Option 2**: Management measures for the following fishing year would be implemented when a 45% decline in the trigger index is observed relative to the reference abundance level (equal to the average of the index values from 2016-2018). This trigger level approximates a decline in stock abundance to the 75th percentile of lobster abundance during the moderate abundance regime from the stock assessment (Figure 3).

Management Measures

If Option B is selected, the Board must also select the biological management measures that would be automatically implemented to increase the protection of SSB in the GOM/GBK stock when the defined trigger level is reached. The following options include specific gauge and escape vent sizes for each LCMA in the GOM/GBK stock, and possible timelines for implementing changes to the gauge and vent sizes. In the first option, a single change in gauge and vent sizes would occur, whereas the second option would allow for management measures to be implemented via a series of gradual changes in gauge sizes, with the first change triggered by a change in the abundance indices, as defined by the Board.

- **Measures Option 1:** Upon the established trigger level being reached, the minimum gauge size for LCMA 1 would increase from the current size (3 ¼") to 3 $^3/_8$" for the following fishing year. The escape vent size in LCMA 1 would be adjusted corresponding with the minimum gauge size change. Additionally, the maximum gauge size in LCMA 3 and OCC would decrease to 6" for the following fishing year. The table below lists the management measures that would be automatically implemented when the trigger point is reached, with changes from the current measures in bold.

  The proposed increase to the minimum gauge size in LCMA 1 is expected to increase the proportion of the population protected from being harvested by the fishery before being able to reproduce. The proposed decreases to the maximum gauge sizes in LCMA 3 and OCC are expected to enhance resiliency by placing forever protections on a small proportion of the population, including larger lobsters of both sexes. The proposed gauge and vent size changes are expected to maintain similar retention rates of legal lobsters and protection of sub-legal sizes as the current gauge and vent sizes. The vent size is consistent with the current vent size used in SNE for the same minimum gauge size of 3 $^3/_8$".

Issue 2, Option B: Management Measures Option 1			
Area	**LCMA 1**	**LCMA 3**	**OCC**
Measures to Implement in Following Fishing Year	**Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$" (86 mm)** Maximum gauge: status quo **Vent size: 2 x 5$^3/_4$" rectangular; 2 $^5/_8$" circular**	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo

- **Measures Option 2:** Under this option, when the established trigger level is reached a series of gradual changes in gauge sizes for the LCMAs in the GOM/GBK stock would be initiated. The minimum gauge size would change in increments of $^1/_{16}$", and the maximum gauge size would change in increments of ¼". The first change in measures would be triggered by a change in the recruit abundance indices greater than or equal to the trigger level established by the Board. Following this initial change, incremental changes to the gauge sizes would occur every other year. The gauge size changes that would be implemented at each step and the final gauge sizes that would be reached for each area are shown in the table below. The escape vent size in LCMA 1 would be adjusted once, when the final gauge size is implemented, to maintain protection of sub-legal sizes. The final vent size is also consistent with the current vent size used in SNE for the same minimum gauge size of 3$^3/_8$".

Issue 2, Option B: Management Measures Option 2			
Area	**LCMA 1**	**LCMA 3**	**OCC**
Current Measures	Minimum gauge: 3 ¼" Maximum gauge: 5" Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: 3$^{17}/_{32}$" Maximum gauge: 6 ¾" Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$" Maximum gauge: 6 ¾" Vent size: status quo
Initial gauge size changes	**Minimum gauge: 3 $^5/_{16}$" (84 mm)** Maximum gauge: status quo Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ½"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ½"** Vent size: status quo
Intermediate gauge sizes	**Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$" (86 mm)** Maximum gauge: status quo **Vent size: 2 x 5 $^3/_4$" rectangular; 2 $^5/_8$" circular**	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ¼"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ¼"** Vent size: status quo
Final gauge and vent sizes	Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$" Maximum gauge: status quo Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo

Option C: Scheduled changes to gauge and escape vent sizes

This option considers establishing a predetermined schedule for implementing gradual changes to the minimum gauge and vent size in to increase the SSB (see table below for the proposed changes). The first step increases the minimum gauge size in LCMA 1 by $^1/_{16}$" to $3^5/_{16}$" and decreases the maximum gauge size in LCMA 3 and OCC to 6 ½". The second step only decreases the maximum gauge size in LCMA 3 and OCC to 6 ¼". The third and final step increases the minimum gauge size in LCMA 1 to 3 $^3/_8$", and decreases the maximum gauge size in LCMA 3 and OCC to 6". The vent size in LCMA 1 would also be adjusted once, at the same time the final minimum gauge size is implemented. The final gauge and vent size changes are expected to maintain similar retention rates of legal lobsters and protection of sub-legal sizes as the current gauge and vent sizes.

The implementation deadline for the measures included in the first step would be no later than the 2026 fishing year. The implementation deadline for the measures included in the second step would be one year after the first step. The implementation deadline for the measures in the third step would be two years after the first step.

Issue 2, Option C			
Option C	**LCMA 1**	**LCMA 3**	**OCC**
Current Measures	Minimum gauge: 3 ¼" Maximum gauge: 5" Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: $3^{17}/_{32}$" Maximum gauge: 6 ¾" Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$" Maximum gauge: 6 ¾" Vent size: status quo
Step 1: Implementation no later than 2026 fishing year	**Minimum gauge: 3 $^5/_{16}$" (84 mm)** Maximum gauge: status quo Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Max gauge: 6 ½"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Max gauge: 6 ½"** Vent size: status quo
Step 2: Implementation one year after initial measures		Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ¼"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6 ¼"** Vent size: status quo
Step 3: Implementation two years after initial measures	**Minimum gauge: 3 $^3/_8$ (86 mm)** Maximum gauge: status quo **Vent size: 2 x 5 $^3/_4$" rectangular; 2 $^5/_8$" circular**	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo	Minimum gauge: status quo **Maximum gauge: 6"** Vent size: status quo

3.3 Implementation of Management Measures in LCMA 3

Although only a portion of LCMA 3 pertains to the GOM/GBK stock (see Section 2.8 Stock Boundaries for additional information), the measures selected by the Board pertaining to LCMA 3 would apply to all LCMA 3 permit holders, including those that fish on the SNE stock.

Applying the selected measures to only the GOM/GBK portion of LCMA 3 would create a significant administrative burden, as well as additional potential for confusion and noncompliance among LCMA 3 permit holders. To date, there have been no permit requirements that delineate in which stock area an LCMA 3 harvester is eligible to fish. Given the objective of this addendum is specific to protecting the GOM/GBK spawning stock, new management measures must either apply to all LCMA 3 harvesters regardless of location and stock fished (and therefore also impact the SNE fishery) or new measures would have to be stock (and geographic area) specific in order to only affect the GOM/GBK fishery. For example, an LCMA 3 harvester seeking to continue fishing in GOM/GBK would either have to declare and be permitted to fish within the GOM/GBK stock area to be held accountable, or opt to not participate in the GOM/GBK fishery to avoid the more restrictive measures.

Applying the measures across the entire management area is consistent with previous changes to the management measures in LCMA 3. When several addenda implemented reductions in fishing capacity and the Area 3 conservation tax (Addendum XIX) to address the declining condition of the SNE stock, the measures were also applied to the GOM/GBK portion of LCMA 3, which was not overfished nor experiencing overfishing. Though the impacts of the proposed measures on the SNE stock and fishery have not been analyzed, it is likely that they would have only minor negative impacts to catch and positive impacts to SSB considering the current depleted status of the stock.

4.0 Compliance

If the existing FMP is revised by approval of this Draft Addendum, the Board will designate dates by which states will be required to implement the provisions included in the addendum. A final implementation schedule will be identified based on the management tools chosen.

5.0 Recommendations for Actions in Federal Waters

The management of American lobster in the EEZ is the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce through the National Marine Fisheries Service. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission recommends that the federal government promulgate all necessary regulations in Section 3.0 to implement complementary measures to those approved in this addendum.

6.0 References

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). 1997. Amendment 3 to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for American Lobster.

ASMFC. 2015. American Lobster Benchmark Stock Assessment and Peer Review Report.

ASMFC. 2020. American Lobster Benchmark Stock Assessment and Peer Review Report.

Maine DMR. "Commercial Fishing." State of Maine Department of Marine Resources, https://www.maine.gov/dmr/commercial-fishing/index.html

Lobsters to Dollars: The Economic Impact of the Lobster Distribution Supply Chain in Maine by Michael Donihue, Colby College. June 2018.
http://www.colby.edu/economics/lobsters/Lobsters2DollarsFinalReport.pdf.

Goode, A. G., D. C. Brady, R. S. Steneck, & R. A. Wahle. 2019. The brighter side of climate change: How local oceanography amplified a lobster boom in the Gulf of Maine. Global change biology, 25(11), 3906-3917.

Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI), 2014. Understanding Barriers and Opportunities to Profitability in the Maine Lobster Industry.

Steneck, R. S., Hughes, T. P., Cinner, J. E., Adger, W. N., Arnold, S. N., Berkes, F., Boudreau, S. A., Brown, K., Folke, C., Gunderson, L., Olsson, P., Scheffer, M., Stephenson, E., Walker, B., Wilson, J., and B. Worm. 2011. Creation of a Gilded trap by the High Economic Value of the Maine Lobster Fishery. *Conservation Biology,* 25(5):904-912.

7.0 Tables

Table 1. Existing LCMA specific management measures.

Mgmt. Measure	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6	OCC
Min Gauge Size	3 $1/4$"	$3^3/_8$"	3 $17/32$"	$3^3/_8$"	$3^3/_8$"	$3^3/_8$"	$3^3/_8$"
Vent Rect.	$1^{15}/_{16}$ x $5^3/_4$"	2 x $5^3/_4$"	2 $1/_{16}$ x $5^3/_4$"	2 x $5^3/_4$"	2 x $5^3/_4$"	2 x $5^3/_4$"	2 x $5^3/_4$"
Vent Cir.	2 $^7/_{16}$"	2 $^5/_8$"	2 $^{11}/_{16}$"	2 $^5/_8$"	2 $^5/_8$"	2 $^5/_8$"	2 $^5/_8$"
V-notch requirement	Mandatory for all eggers	Mandatory for all legal size eggers	Mandatory for all eggers above 42°30′	Mandatory for all eggers in federal waters. No V-notching in state waters.	Mandatory for all eggers	None	None
V-notch Definition[1] (possession)	Zero Tolerance	$1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]	$1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]	$1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]	$1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]	$1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]	State Permitted fisherman in state waters $1/_4$" without setal hairs Federal Permit holders $1/_8$" with or w/out setal hairs[1]
Max. Gauge (male & female)	5"	5 ¼"	6 $^3/_4$"	5 ¼"	5 ¼"	5 ¼"	State Waters none Federal Waters 6 $^3/_4$"
Season Closure				April 30-May 31[2]	February 1-March 31[3]	Sept 8-Nov 28	February 1-April 30

Table 2. GOM/GBK model-free indicators for the 2020 Stock Assessment. The left table shows the GOM spawning stock abundance, the right table shows GBK spawning stock abundance.

SPAWNING STOCK ABUNDANCE						
Mean weight (g) per tow of mature females						
Survey	NESFC		ME/NH		MA 514	
	fall	spring	fall	spring	fall	spring
1981	175.32	400.28			502.65	430.53
1982	39.45	113.58			626.48	151.21
1983	206.03	234.21			844.76	67.08
1984	234.64	443.81			593.77	126.47
1985	499.62	2771.23			919.56	93.81
1986	267.97	502.99			231.88	112.97
1987	85.35	497.40			194.34	148.62
1988	186.56	244.92			200.58	88.14
1989	325.69	247.15			293.61	230.26
1990	216.65	516.20			1048.72	241.94
1991	247.11	430.56			335.80	165.54
1992	193.95	453.31			512.83	212.89
1993	284.34	484.30			120.59	229.72
1994	430.32	720.67			783.17	285.01
1995	464.96	390.15			520.26	171.71
1996	734.25	872.53			569.39	156.53
1997	568.34	1083.76			235.18	114.78
1998	381.81	1182.44			282.79	170.21
1999	1444.07	807.41			365.53	282.12
2000	585.66	1281.05	4430.55		533.40	236.55
2001	511.25	1498.42	2446.85	690.89	165.74	235.85
2002	1789.42	2022.04	4638.64	1436.34	324.34	175.73
2003	985.93	2343.63	3949.63	1226.05	129.67	72.99
2004	685.89	2773.35	3610.67	907.07	120.27	259.35
2005	465.35	1670.29	4805.25	1990.08	248.23	489.12
2006	681.87	1810.96	3698.94	1327.93	240.27	410.97
2007	445.78	1536.47	3163.24	1437.85	176.95	139.94
2008	805.10	1894.91	4080.36	1107.00	559.70	300.35
2009	1787.92	1864.92	6906.45	1747.30	630.52	219.83
2010	2850.60	2476.79	5793.51	1886.61	1424.75	211.52
2011	2317.94	2089.39	6169.40	2013.80	1268.44	267.51
2012	3215.29	3516.38	4174.85	2287.55	889.87	124.81
2013	3299.56	2499.71	5363.14	2007.92	1135.54	300.86
2014	4979.28	3083.09	5891.58	3010.73	768.88	382.81
2015	3553.44	3665.39	8488.62	2233.05	1947.04	418.46
2016	3692.26	5142.42	7691.01	2613.49	3712.66	1119.26
2017	3274.69	6566.80	4629.68	2530.74	2309.44	564.30
2018	2093.20	3555.09	5242.34	2005.07	2782.55	550.68
2014-2018 mean	3518.57	4402.56	6388.65	2478.62	2304.11	607.10

25th	272.06	487.57	4015.00	1355.03	242.26	149.27
median	539.79	1389.74	4638.64	1938.34	526.83	224.78
75th	1789.05	2443.50	5842.54	2178.24	878.60	296.52

SPAWNING STOCK ABUNDANCE		
Mean weight (g) per tow of mature females		
Survey	NESFC	
	fall	spring
1981	707.14	69.71
1982	670.07	123.96
1983	643.84	152.05
1984	397.33	45.17
1985	504.87	39.00
1986	491.96	307.05
1987	537.31	113.27
1988	695.27	307.49
1989	933.18	161.43
1990	761.64	103.62
1991	848.03	164.32
1992	817.25	213.11
1993	626.81	126.03
1994	774.61	41.77
1995	939.85	71.74
1996	1051.09	482.61
1997	754.00	62.46
1998	993.56	64.67
1999	1363.68	395.66
2000	945.69	132.57
2001	1756.38	313.41
2002	2183.80	341.90
2003	1030.19	842.92
2004	1557.16	298.95
2005	1404.20	491.00
2006	2123.43	465.72
2007	1859.53	728.26
2008	3074.33	1827.61
2009	3703.99	1336.34
2010	2120.51	1126.52
2011	4681.76	1113.11
2012	2696.38	1510.08
2013	2530.26	1369.39
2014	3012.69	1833.98
2015	3743.71	1509.13
2016	3020.98	2138.96
2017	6627.18	3749.60
2018	9630.86	725.09
2014-2018 mean	5207.09	1991.35

25th	755.91	124.47
median	1040.64	310.45
75th	2443.64	1045.56

Appendix A. 2022 Annual Data Update of American Lobster GOM/GBK Stock Indicators

Background

An annual Data Update process between American lobster stock assessments was recommended during the 2020 stock assessment to more closely monitor changes in stock abundance. The objective of this process is to present information—including any potentially concerning trends—that could support additional research or consideration of changes to management. Data sets updated during this process are generally those that indicate exploitable lobster stock abundance conditions expected in subsequent years and include:

- YOY settlement indicators
- Trawl survey indicators, including recruit abundance (71-80 mm carapace length lobsters) and survey encounter rate
- Ventless trap survey sex-specific abundance indices (53 mm+ carapace length lobsters)

This is the second Data Update and provides an update of last year's review with the addition of 2021 data. Indicator status (negative, neutral, or positive – see table below) was determined relative to the percentiles of the stock assessment time series (i.e., data set start year through 2018).

Indicator	< 25th percentile	Between 25th and 75th percentile	> 75th percentile
YOY settlement (larval or YOY)	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Trawl survey recruit abundance	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Trawl survey encounter rate	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Ventless trap survey abundance	Negative	Neutral	Positive

The five-year means provided during the stock assessment (2014-2018) for terminal indicator status determinations were also updated with new years of data. This treatment of data is consistent with stock indicators provided during stock assessments (see Section 5 in the stock assessment report for more detail). As noted in last year's Data Update memo, ventless trap survey abundance indices were added to indicators used in the stock assessment for this Data Update process. Note that updated five-year means (2017-2021) for several trawl survey-based indicators remain impacted by covid-19 data collection disruptions. A change that impacted this year's update is a reduction in the spatial coverage of Massachusetts' Southern New England (statistical area 538) ventless trap survey due to reduced participation. This change necessitates dropping out data collected during earlier years from areas no longer sampled to calculate an index from a consistent survey footprint, resulting in changes to the indices from what was reviewed last year. Note that the updated index increased slightly in scale (the reduced footprint excludes most of the interior of Buzzards Bay), but the pattern over time is generally consistent with the previous index. Below are the results of the data updates by sub-stock.

Results
Gulf of Maine (GOM)
Overall, Gulf of Maine indicators show declines from time series highs observed during the stock assessment.

- YOY conditions showed improvements since the stock assessment, but were still not positive (Table 1 and Figure 1).
  - Updated five-year means were all neutral, indicating improvement since the stock assessment when two of the five-year means were negative (both southwest areas).

- o 2021 values moved from neutral to negative conditions in all three northeast areas, reversing some improvements seen in previous years. The two most southwest areas remained in neutral conditions observed in 2020.
- Trawl survey recruit abundance indicators generally remained positive, but showed some sign of decline since the stock assessment (Table 2 and Figure 2).
    - o One of the updated five-year means changed from positive to neutral. The others remained positive.
    - o 2021 values for three of four inshore indicators were neutral and the only available 2020 value was also neutral, the first observed neutral values since 2014 or 2015 for these indicators.
    - o Five of six indicators were not available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.
- Trawl survey encounter rates show deteriorating conditions inshore since the stock assessment (Table 3 and Figure 3).
    - o All four updated five-year means for inshore indicators were neutral, whereas only one was neutral during the stock assessment. Updated five-year means for the two offshore indicators remain positive.
    - o Five of six indicators were not available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.
- Ventless trap survey indices show abundance declining since the stock assessment (Table 4 and Figure 4).
    - o Seven of eight updated five-year means were neutral and one was negative, compared to four positive means and no negative means during the stock assessment.
    - o Two additional values in 2021 moved into negative conditions.
    - o 2021 values for both sexes in statistical area 514 were among the lowest values observed during the time series.

Georges Bank (GBK)
Overall, Georges Bank indicators show conditions similar to during the stock assessment. Note that there are no YOY or VTS indicators for this sub-stock area.
- Trawl survey recruit abundance indicators showed conditions similar to during the stock assessment (Table 5 and Figure 5).
    - o Updated means for both indicators were neutral. This is unchanged from the stock assessment.
    - o 2021 values were both positive and relatively high compared to other recent years.
    - o No indicators were available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.
    - o These indicators tend to be noisier than some of the other abundance indicators, with high interannual variability and lack of discernible trends.
- Trawl survey encounter rates showed declines in the fall since the stock assessment (Table 6 and Figure 6).
    - o The updated mean for the fall indicator changed from positive to neutral, while the updated mean for the spring indicator remained positive.
    - o No indicators were available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.

Southern New England (SNE)
Overall, Southern New England indicators show continued unfavorable conditions with some further signs of decline since the stock assessment.
- YOY conditions were negative across the stock with some decline since the stock assessment (Table 7 and Figure 7).

- o Updated five-year means were all negative, whereas one of three was neutral during the stock assessment.
  - o Only one non-negative annual indicator has been observed since the stock assessment.
  - o No YOY have been caught during the MA survey for the last seven years.
- Trawl survey recruit abundance indicators generally showed conditions similar to during the stock assessment with some slight decline offshore (Table 8 and Figure 8).
  - o The updated five-year mean for the spring indicator offshore changed from neutral to negative. Other updated means were unchanged, with five inshore indicators remaining negative and the other two indicators (one inshore and one offshore) remaining neutral.
  - o Six of eight indicators were not available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.
- Trawl survey encounter rates showed deteriorating conditions since the stock assessment (Table 9 and Figure 9).
  - o Updated five-year means for all eight indicators were negative, with two changing from neutral to negative since the stock assessment.
  - o 2021 values for all indicators were negative, the first year these uniform conditions have occurred during the time series.
  - o Six of eight indicators were not available for 2020 due to covid-19 sampling restrictions.
- Ventless trap survey indices showed conditions similar to conditions during the stock assessment (Table 10 and Figure 10).
  - o Updated five-year means were all neutral, unchanged from the stock assessment.
  - o All annual values since the stock assessment have been negative in statistical area 539, but higher values observed in 2018 have kept the five-year means neutral.
  - o The female index calculated with reduced survey area in statistical area 538 was similar to the index from the historical survey area reviewed last year. The 2018 and 2019 values for the male index changed from neutral for the historical survey area to negative for the reduced survey area.
  - o It is important to note that the ventless trap survey has only taken place during depleted stock conditions coinciding with an adverse environmental regime, so interannual variability can be misleading without the context of a longer time series encompassing varying stock conditions.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. GOM abundance indicators: YOY indices.

Survey	ME				MA
	511	512	513 East	513 West	514
1981					
1982					
1983					
1984					
1985					
1986					
1987					
1988					
1989			1.64		
1990			0.77		
1991			1.54		
1992			1.30		
1993			0.45		
1994			1.61		
1995		0.02	0.66		0.91
1996		0.05	0.47		
1997		0.05	0.46		0.10
1998		0.00	0.14		0.03
1999		0.04	0.65		0.43
2000	0.00	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.07
2001	0.24	0.43	2.08	1.17	0.39
2002	0.13	0.29	1.38	0.85	1.00
2003	0.22	0.27	1.75	1.22	0.75
2004	0.18	0.36	1.75	0.67	1.02
2005	1.42	1.25	2.40	1.12	1.06
2006	0.49	1.06	1.57	1.08	0.45
2007	0.59	1.11	2.23	1.30	1.27
2008	0.32	0.59	1.27	1.10	0.33
2009	0.66	0.33	1.51	0.48	0.17
2010	0.16	0.64	1.25	0.63	0.44
2011	0.41	0.98	2.33	0.90	0.58
2012	0.44	0.62	1.27	0.30	0.08
2013	0.10	0.20	0.48	0.12	0.00
2014	0.16	0.47	1.04	0.42	0.11
2015	0.15	0.22	0.42	0.03	0.00
2016	0.13	0.21	0.42	0.14	0.08
2017	0.21	0.36	0.65	0.23	0.08
2018	0.27	0.34	0.62	0.22	0.03
2014-2018 mean	0.18	0.32	0.63	0.21	0.06
2019	0.43	0.64	0.94	0.45	0.06
2020	0.29	0.51	1.06	0.33	0.19
2021	0.06	0.12	0.38	0.28	0.28
2017-2021 mean	0.25	0.39	0.73	0.30	0.13
25th	0.15	0.18	0.51	0.23	0.08
median	0.22	0.34	1.26	0.63	0.33
75th	0.42	0.60	1.60	1.09	0.67

Figure 1. GOM abundance indicators: YOY indices.

Table 2. GOM abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Survey	NEFSC		ME/NH		MA 514	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
1981	0.13	0.06			6.38	4.84
1982	0.29	0.42			2.74	3.85
1983	0.28	0.90			1.76	9.76
1984	0.20	0.31			2.15	6.13
1985	0.14	1.41			4.48	9.60
1986	0.27	1.29			3.01	3.80
1987	0.67	0.57			2.47	1.16
1988	0.67	1.21			2.52	4.12
1989	0.00	1.61			4.48	7.51
1990	0.27	1.76			6.11	15.36
1991	0.55	1.41			2.73	7.55
1992	0.50	1.37			4.31	8.95
1993	0.25	0.86			5.12	3.19
1994	0.15	2.75			7.59	13.77
1995	1.45	1.44			4.54	12.12
1996	0.76	4.59			3.09	12.10
1997	2.02	2.12			4.59	6.46
1998	1.59	2.16			4.50	7.47
1999	1.51	3.01			4.29	8.73
2000	4.64	3.01		24.09	4.24	8.87
2001	1.05	1.51	9.28	17.81	4.32	1.58
2002	1.08	1.91	22.00	22.41	3.43	5.00
2003	1.41	0.36	10.65	18.32	1.96	0.66
2004	0.84	2.26	7.55	12.29	2.46	1.30
2005	0.34	0.87	18.51	25.90	4.35	2.11
2006	2.17	1.27	18.07	18.30	6.09	5.30
2007	1.62	0.64	15.91	16.82	0.77	1.61
2008	0.99	2.41	17.88	31.61	2.54	6.12
2009	4.88	4.90	24.72	32.67	3.19	8.88
2010	2.98	4.53	17.66	37.35	2.22	9.39
2011	10.27	11.83	39.25	46.09	5.24	15.04
2012	11.25	6.74	36.55	37.12	3.03	11.30
2013	10.93	18.12	34.50	37.86	4.83	12.20
2014	11.66	21.54	65.07	41.95	3.35	7.06
2015	14.44	17.89	38.51	67.99	7.05	17.91
2016	13.25	22.54	50.83	60.07	13.61	17.44
2017	15.74	X	48.42	48.13	7.85	13.58
2018	14.15	15.87	42.77	55.84	5.25	25.69
2014-2018 mean	13.84	19.46	49.12	54.80	7.42	16.34
2019	16.69	7.62	46.37	50.85	10.69	14.59
2020	X	X	X	34.65	X	X
2021	10.04	8.04	32.86	29.64	6.39	10.16
2017-2021 mean	14.15	10.51	42.61	43.82	7.55	16.01
25th	0.30	1.21	17.72	20.37	2.73	4.30
median	1.07	1.76	23.36	32.67	4.30	7.53
75th	4.23	4.53	39.07	44.02	5.05	11.90

Figure 2. GOM abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Table 3. GOM abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

Survey	NEFSC		ME/NH		MA 514	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
1981	0.44	0.25			0.86	0.72
1982	0.34	0.18			0.50	0.70
1983	0.26	0.33			0.76	0.76
1984	0.28	0.36			0.76	0.76
1985	0.38	0.49			0.71	0.67
1986	0.33	0.47			0.68	0.83
1987	0.43	0.24			0.85	0.54
1988	0.31	0.30			0.76	0.58
1989	0.19	0.35			0.78	0.95
1990	0.41	0.32			0.86	0.95
1991	0.42	0.32			0.87	0.94
1992	0.40	0.24			0.93	0.77
1993	0.41	0.39			0.97	0.82
1994	0.45	0.40			1.00	0.93
1995	0.41	0.37			0.93	0.93
1996	0.54	0.54			0.91	0.95
1997	0.64	0.35			0.93	0.86
1998	0.52	0.40			0.76	0.69
1999	0.51	0.42			0.73	0.91
2000	0.63	0.42		0.94	0.93	0.98
2001	0.57	0.40	0.88	0.86	0.93	0.72
2002	0.75	0.53	0.94	0.95	0.91	0.73
2003	0.69	0.44	0.92	0.85	0.82	0.55
2004	0.87	0.31	0.89	0.86	0.84	0.56
2005	0.77	0.36	0.95	0.91	0.95	0.67
2006	0.72	0.60	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.88
2007	0.72	0.43	0.97	0.85	0.51	0.54
2008	0.84	0.49	0.92	0.86	0.83	0.75
2009	0.82	0.63	0.98	0.92	0.89	0.87
2010	0.85	0.75	0.98	0.96	0.87	0.98
2011	0.83	0.74	0.99	0.96	0.89	0.85
2012	0.86	0.78	0.98	0.98	0.91	0.95
2013	0.87	0.73	1.00	0.93	0.96	0.95
2014	0.90	0.71	1.00	0.99	0.79	0.96
2015	0.93	0.69	1.00	0.96	0.98	0.95
2016	0.94	0.75	1.00	0.96	0.96	0.97
2017	0.86	✕	0.99	0.94	0.84	0.98
2018	0.86	0.71	0.98	0.96	0.84	0.90
2014-2018 mean	0.90	0.72	0.99	0.96	0.88	0.95
2019	0.83	0.71	0.99	0.95	0.85	0.92
2020	✕	✕		0.96	✕	✕
2021	0.90	0.75	1.00	0.91	0.86	0.90
2017-2021 mean	0.86	0.72	0.99	0.94	0.85	0.93
25th	0.41	0.35	0.93	0.89	0.78	0.72
median	0.60	0.42	0.98	0.94	0.87	0.86
75th	0.84	0.60	0.99	0.96	0.93	0.95

SURVEY LOBSTER ENCOUNTER RATE — Proportion of postive tows

Figure 3. GOM abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

Table 4. GOM abundance indicators: ventless trap survey abundance.

	VENTLESS TRAP ABUNDANCE							
	Abundance of lobsters ≥ 53 mm CL							
Survey	511		512		513		514	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
1981								
1982								
1983								
1984								
1985								
1986								
1987								
1988								
1989								
1990								
1991								
1992								
1993								
1994								
1995								
1996								
1997								
1998								
1999								
2000								
2001								
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006	7.65	5.34	6.87	5.38	5.73	4.37	3.10	3.40
2007	5.06	3.91	3.95	3.83	5.82	4.35	1.85	1.84
2008	4.94	3.87	5.78	4.95	5.78	4.97	2.77	2.51
2009	3.60	2.65	6.31	5.35	6.89	5.53	2.72	2.66
2010	5.66	3.90	6.95	5.69	6.61	5.27	2.49	2.22
2011	8.70	6.52	11.10	8.48	7.32	5.60	3.47	2.60
2012	10.95	7.64	12.06	9.47	11.40	7.72	5.21	4.52
2013	11.14	7.95	11.87	8.64	9.36	6.49		
2014	10.38	6.63	11.92	8.04	7.74	4.96	3.15	2.35
2015	8.47	4.63	10.39	7.70	8.54	5.48	4.01	3.16
2016	14.59	9.15	14.34	10.75	10.78	7.56	4.79	3.56
2017	11.69	7.07	11.61	8.52	8.46	5.56	3.38	2.45
2018	15.10	9.43	11.26	8.23	9.57	6.37	3.47	2.43
2014-2018 mean	12.05	7.38	11.90	8.65	9.02	5.99	3.76	2.79
2019	12.93	8.27	8.22	5.94	8.68	5.25	2.85	1.93
2020	7.66	5.47	7.91	5.96	9.29	6.61	2.50	1.69
2021	7.34	5.44	5.94	5.23	8.24	5.93	1.77	1.37
2017-2021 mean	10.94	7.14	8.99	6.78	8.85	5.94	2.80	1.97
25th	5.66	3.91	6.87	5.38	6.61	4.97	2.76	2.41
median	8.70	6.52	11.10	8.04	7.74	5.53	3.27	2.56
75th	11.14	7.64	11.87	8.52	9.36	6.37	3.61	3.22

Figure 4. GOM abundance indicators: ventless trap survey abundance.

Table 5. GBK abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Survey	NEFSC Spring	NEFSC Fall
RECRUIT ABUNDANCE (SURVEY)		
Abundance of lobsters 71 - 80 mm CL (sexes combined)		
1981	0.08	0.28
1982	0.18	0.41
1983	0.16	0.33
1984	0.09	0.40
1985	0.19	0.26
1986	0.57	0.64
1987	0.43	0.54
1988	0.09	0.36
1989	0.04	0.23
1990	0.44	0.47
1991	0.08	0.34
1992	0.13	0.62
1993	0.50	0.22
1994	0.01	0.13
1995	0.03	0.14
1996	0.00	0.35
1997	0.06	0.90
1998	0.01	0.33
1999	0.07	0.29
2000	0.27	0.33
2001	0.47	0.45
2002	0.06	0.56
2003	0.29	0.16
2004	0.04	0.18
2005	0.09	0.13
2006	0.16	0.12
2007	0.03	0.23
2008	0.05	0.17
2009	0.30	0.33
2010	0.30	0.15
2011	0.09	0.35
2012	0.15	0.17
2013	0.14	0.24
2014	0.16	0.21
2015	0.06	0.44
2016	0.15	0.13
2017	0.35	✕
2018	0.04	0.22
2014-2018 mean	0.15	0.25
2019	0.16	0.13
2020	✕	✕
2021	0.41	0.43
2017-2021 mean	0.24	0.26
25th	0.06	0.18
median	0.11	0.29
75th	0.25	0.40

Figure 5. GBK abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Table 6. GBK abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

SURVEY LOBSTER ENCOUNTER RATE		
Proportion of postive tows		
Survey	**NEFSC**	
	Spring	*Fall*
1981	0.23	0.52
1982	0.23	0.43
1983	0.18	0.38
1984	0.12	0.34
1985	0.19	0.35
1986	0.27	0.36
1987	0.18	0.35
1988	0.34	0.40
1989	0.14	0.38
1990	0.18	0.44
1991	0.19	0.45
1992	0.26	0.49
1993	0.22	0.36
1994	0.11	0.38
1995	0.14	0.42
1996	0.16	0.40
1997	0.10	0.48
1998	0.10	0.40
1999	0.16	0.58
2000	0.23	0.41
2001	0.23	0.49
2002	0.29	0.55
2003	0.27	0.44
2004	0.18	0.53
2005	0.16	0.58
2006	0.24	0.54
2007	0.26	0.46
2008	0.29	0.55
2009	0.34	0.54
2010	0.38	0.62
2011	0.30	0.69
2012	0.35	0.57
2013	0.33	0.65
2014	0.37	0.61
2015	0.27	0.59
2016	0.45	0.55
2017	0.40	✕
2018	0.29	0.59
2014-2018 mean	0.36	0.58
2019	0.36	0.57
2020	✕	✕
2021	0.41	0.48
2017-2021 mean	0.37	0.54

25th	0.18	0.40
median	0.23	0.48
75th	0.29	0.55

Figure 6. GBK abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

Table 7. SNE abundance indicators: YOY indices.

Survey	MA	RI	CT / ELIS Larvae
1981			
1982			
1983			
1984			0.43
1985			0.53
1986			0.90
1987			0.78
1988			0.74
1989			0.74
1990		1.18	0.81
1991		1.51	0.55
1992		0.63	1.44
1993		0.51	1.19
1994		1.27	0.98
1995	0.17	0.34	1.46
1996	0.00	0.15	0.31
1997	0.08	0.98	0.21
1998	0.28	0.57	0.55
1999	0.06	1.03	2.83
2000	0.33	0.33	0.78
2001	0.11	0.75	0.32
2002	0.11	0.25	0.64
2003	0.00	0.73	0.25
2004	0.06	0.42	0.45
2005	0.17	0.54	0.49
2006	0.22	0.44	0.71
2007	0.17	0.36	0.37
2008	0.00	0.14	0.37
2009	0.06	0.06	0.19
2010	0.00	0.11	0.35
2011	0.00	0.00	0.26
2012	0.00	0.09	0.12
2013	0.17	0.19	0.16
2014	0.11	0.22	0.06
2015	0.00	0.17	0.19
2016	0.00	0.06	0.45
2017	0.00	0.03	0.10
2018	0.00	0.03	0.17
2014-2018 mean	0.02	0.10	0.19
2019	0.00	0.03	0.21
2020	0.00	0.14	0.10
2021	0.00	0.08	0.19
2017-2021 mean	0.00	0.06	0.15

	MA	RI	CT / ELIS Larvae
25th	0.00	0.14	0.26
median	0.06	0.34	0.45
75th	0.17	0.63	0.76

Figure 7. SNE abundance indicators: YOY indices.

Table 8. SNE abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Survey	NEFSC		MA		RI		CT	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
1981	0.10	0.89	0.65	0.07	0.89	1.31		
1982	0.74	0.74	0.10	0.04	0.26	0.64		
1983	0.45	0.62	0.09	0.04	0.94	0.43		
1984	0.10	0.81	0.42	0.01	1.03	1.35	10.09	6.80
1985	1.99	1.01	0.34	0.09	0.28	0.97	3.08	3.93
1986	0.18	0.59	0.17	0.20	0.91	1.28	2.77	5.76
1987	1.04	0.45	0.26	0.17	0.79	3.14	2.93	6.86
1988	0.55	0.60	0.24	0.16	0.47	4.05	1.85	4.88
1989	0.09	1.65	0.14	0.43	0.90	3.26	4.86	5.28
1990	0.71	0.83	2.29	0.31	2.17	2.69	6.89	7.74
1991	0.31	0.51	1.18	0.87	4.77	3.10	10.83	10.32
1992	0.19	0.94	0.10	0.57	0.62	1.97	10.31	10.65
1993	0.59	0.42	0.25	0.52	7.81	8.29	7.78	15.18
1994	0.15	0.38	0.95	0.42	1.00	3.88	5.07	11.51
1995	0.01	0.61	1.14	0.03	1.33	4.50	12.13	11.20
1996	0.40	2.39	0.40	0.32	1.60	6.55	11.37	11.08
1997	1.64	1.60	1.45	0.12	2.58	6.10	15.42	24.99
1998	0.78	1.06	1.09	0.11	1.63	3.24	24.06	12.72
1999	2.43	0.66	0.75	0.19	1.71	2.07	24.57	12.96
2000	0.67	1.27	0.56	0.13	1.54	1.83	13.37	8.27
2001	0.39	0.45	0.18	0.03	2.97	2.17	10.77	7.41
2002	1.63	0.39	0.34	0.00	2.68	0.73	8.07	2.75
2003	0.34	0.33	0.07	0.00	0.29	0.93	3.52	4.08
2004	0.27	0.28	0.05	0.00	1.86	1.48	2.38	3.37
2005	0.11	0.24	0.08	0.00	1.07	2.53	2.26	1.54
2006	0.19	0.32	0.08	0.03	3.63	2.24	2.02	1.38
2007	0.19	0.35	0.08	0.00	0.68	2.68	2.65	1.12
2008	0.21	0.29	0.16	0.01	0.64	2.95	2.20	1.27
2009	0.15	0.35	0.16	0.05	1.14	1.36	1.20	1.33
2010	0.21	0.73	0.06	0.18	0.44	1.21	1.26	✕
2011	0.10	0.64	0.18	0.00	0.42	1.02	0.43	0.18
2012	0.11	0.99	0.07	0.21	0.30	0.18	0.44	0.08
2013	0.23	0.44	0.11	0.04	0.16	0.02	0.23	0.06
2014	✕	0.67	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.14	0.15	0.05
2015	0.03	0.28	0.07	0.30	0.05	0.37	0.15	0.06
2016	0.83	0.69	0.05	0.14	0.57	0.25	0.16	0.00
2017	0.10	✕	0.13	0.16	0.14	0.41	0.03	0.00
2018	0.08	0.38	0.02	0.01	0.18	0.68	0.00	0.01
2014-2018 mean	0.26	0.51	0.06	0.12	0.19	0.37	0.10	0.03
2019	0.06	0.32	0.01	0.02	0.52	0.50	0.03	0.00
2020	✕	✕	✕	✕	0.23	0.32	✕	✕
2021	0.01	0.59	0.01	0.00	0.27	0.07	0.03	0.00
2017-2021 mean	0.06	0.43	0.04	0.05	0.27	0.40	0.02	0.00

	NEFSC		MA		RI		CT	
25th	0.11	0.38	0.08	0.02	0.42	0.78	1.23	1.16
median	0.23	0.61	0.17	0.10	0.91	1.65	2.93	4.48
75th	0.67	0.83	0.42	0.20	1.62	3.07	10.20	9.81

Figure 8. SNE abundance indicators: trawl survey recruit abundance.

Table 9. SNE abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

Survey	NEFSC		MA		RI		CT	
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
1981	0.18	0.47	0.38	0.15	0.49	0.41		
1982	0.26	0.35	0.28	0.21	0.30	0.43		
1983	0.14	0.26	0.21	0.16	0.46	0.37		
1984	0.08	0.32	0.40	0.18	0.59	0.44	0.63	0.76
1985	0.21	0.34	0.51	0.22	0.31	0.50	0.57	0.69
1986	0.17	0.25	0.39	0.38	0.64	0.46	0.67	0.61
1987	0.13	0.23	0.28	0.18	0.35	0.47	0.63	0.76
1988	0.09	0.28	0.39	0.21	0.49	0.55	0.65	0.66
1989	0.13	0.40	0.50	0.33	0.52	0.57	0.75	0.63
1990	0.14	0.44	0.66	0.44	0.64	0.53	0.73	0.76
1991	0.14	0.33	0.41	0.39	0.77	0.69	0.81	0.77
1992	0.22	0.34	0.51	0.23	0.40	0.57	0.77	0.68
1993	0.12	0.27	0.54	0.26	0.50	0.71	0.73	0.75
1994	0.09	0.25	0.51	0.20	0.58	0.57	0.73	0.74
1995	0.05	0.35	0.44	0.12	0.55	0.67	0.77	0.68
1996	0.10	0.39	0.30	0.16	0.79	0.76	0.66	0.78
1997	0.25	0.28	0.45	0.21	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.81
1998	0.12	0.34	0.54	0.13	0.59	0.55	0.83	0.71
1999	0.22	0.28	0.41	0.21	0.76	0.59	0.78	0.79
2000	0.13	0.31	0.45	0.15	0.68	0.63	0.81	0.73
2001	0.21	0.25	0.28	0.18	0.65	0.60	0.77	0.58
2002	0.19	0.24	0.28	0.03	0.61	0.45	0.73	0.59
2003	0.11	0.26	0.14	0.03	0.51	0.40	0.71	0.64
2004	0.10	0.19	0.28	0.03	0.54	0.50	0.61	0.66
2005	0.08	0.19	0.34	0.15	0.49	0.45	0.63	0.54
2006	0.14	0.23	0.42	0.03	0.79	0.62	0.61	0.51
2007	0.13	0.21	0.34	0.10	0.44	0.54	0.70	0.53
2008	0.10	0.22	0.32	0.10	0.55	0.52	0.63	0.65
2009	0.17	0.32	0.50	0.05	0.57	0.40	0.49	0.55
2010	0.12	0.33	0.22	0.24	0.47	0.45	0.54	⨯
2011	0.13	0.35	0.17	0.05	0.30	0.23	0.46	0.28
2012	0.13	0.34	0.17	0.15	0.27	0.16	0.43	0.20
2013	0.10	0.28	0.18	0.08	0.20	0.09	0.28	0.15
2014	⨯	0.26	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.23	0.26	0.10
2015	0.06	0.27	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.16	0.27	0.10
2016	0.15	0.25	0.08	0.11	0.30	0.14	0.25	0.03
2017	0.08	⨯	0.07	0.16	0.16	0.23	0.08	0.03
2018	0.08	0.29	0.11	0.06	0.09	0.18	0.09	0.01
2014-2018 mean	0.09	0.27	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.19	0.19	0.05
2019	0.05	0.26	0.05	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.09	0.00
2020	⨯	⨯	⨯	⨯	0.16	0.16	⨯	⨯
2021	0.04	0.18	0.07	0.00	0.20	0.12	0.06	0.03
2017-2021 mean	0.06	0.24	0.08	0.08	0.15	0.16	0.08	0.02
25th	0.10	0.25	0.21	0.09	0.32	0.40	0.52	0.52
median	0.13	0.28	0.34	0.16	0.51	0.49	0.65	0.64
75th	0.17	0.34	0.45	0.21	0.60	0.57	0.73	0.74

Figure 9. SNE abundance indicators: trawl survey encounter rate.

Table 10. SNE abundance indicators: ventless trap survey abundance.

VENTLESS TRAP ABUNDANCE				
Abundance of lobsters ≥ 53 mm CL				
Survey	*538*		*539*	
	Female	*Male*	*Female*	*Male*
1981				
1982				
1983				
1984				
1985				
1986				
1987				
1988				
1989				
1990				
1991				
1992				
1993				
1994				
1995				
1996				
1997				
1998				
1999				
2000				
2001				
2002				
2003				
2004				
2005				
2006	2.58	2.95	3.81	3.60
2007	1.89	2.54	4.61	3.61
2008	1.18	1.43	4.80	4.32
2009	2.29	1.90	4.61	3.62
2010	0.97	1.41	3.57	2.67
2011	2.12	2.58	3.11	2.50
2012	1.90	2.65	3.53	2.77
2013	⨉	⨉	2.03	1.67
2014	0.40	0.61	2.22	1.42
2015	0.84	0.87	2.66	2.18
2016	2.53	3.13	2.99	2.38
2017	1.61	1.43	2.17	2.06
2018	0.82	1.39	3.97	3.12
2014-2018 mean	1.24	1.48	2.80	2.23
2019	1.23	1.25	2.57	2.12
2020	1.47	1.85	2.60	2.10
2021	1.36	1.58	2.19	1.95
2017-2021 mean	1.30	1.50	2.70	2.27

25th	0.94	1.40	2.66	2.18
median	1.75	1.67	3.53	2.67
75th	2.16	2.60	3.97	3.60

Figure 10. SNE abundance indicators: ventless trap survey abundance.

Appendix B. Analysis of alternate minimum and maximum sizes as management options for Lobster Management Areas in the Gulf of Maine. Report to the ASFMC Lobster TC and PDT.

Burton Shank and Jeff Kipp

Sept. 9, 2021

The Lobster TC provided analysis to the ASFMC Lobster Board ahead of the Spring 2021 meeting with estimated outcomes to the Gulf of Maine / Georges Bank lobster fishery given the implementation of alternative management measures (min and max gauge size), including changes to total weight of lobsters landed, number of lobsters landed, Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) and Exploitation. The analysis included an attempt to examine how fisheries in different LCMAs would be affected though the population simulation model was not re-parameterized for each LCMA. In discussions, we concluded that the simulations for LCMA1 were probably reasonably accurate because:

1. Many of the inputs for the simulations are taken from the 2020 stock assessment. Because the vast majority of the landings come from LCMA1, the stock assessment parameters are essentially already tuned to the parameters of the LCMA1 fishery.
2. LCMA1 is primarily a recruitment-based fishery in inshore or nearshore habitats and, therefore, likely to be representative of the full stock model.

However, there was concern that the offshore fishery in Lobster Management Area 3 was considerably different from the full stock model and, thus, may have inaccurate outcomes due to a mis-parameterized simulation model. The parameters for the Outer Cape Cod fishery are probably somewhere between LCMA1 and LCMA3 as it consists of both a resident lobster population and a seasonally-migrating population, moving between inshore and offshore habitats.

To address these differences between the LCMAs in population simulations, we performed the following:

1. For the LCMA1 simulations, we used the stock assessment parameters as the inputs.
2. For LCMA3 simulations, we attempted to manually tune the population simulation model to match the catch characteristics of the LCMA3 fishery, under the assumption that a simulation model that could reproduce the catch characteristics of the fishery may more accurately project changes in the fishery given changing management measures.
3. For the OCC simulations, we ran two sets of simulations, using the input parameters for both LCMA1 and LCMA3 under the assumption that this bounds the dynamics we might see in OCC.

For all simulations, populations were initiated with zero abundance and run for 50 years with constant recruitment to allow population abundances and length comps to reach equilibrium.

The equilibrium populations were then compared across the various legal selectivity scenarios to determine the effect of these different management alternatives.

For a simple, model-free analysis of the fishery catch composition for LCMA1 and LCMA3, we calculated the cumulative proportion of catch by weight at length by converting catch-at-size to weight-at-size and weighting for unequal sex ratios and seasonality of landings.

LCMA1 Simulations

The input parameters for the LCMA1 simulations were primarily drawn from the 2020 stock assessment. This includes the recruitment seasonality, length composition and sex ratio, growth model, gear, legal and conservation selectivities and mean estimated fishing mortality from the terminal years.

LCMA1 Results

The cumulative catch weight-by-length curve indicates that the mean size of lobsters landed in the LCMA1 fishery is within the smallest legal size bin (83-91mm, Figure 1). Nearly 90% of the catch are below 100mm CL and only about 2% of the catch are over 120mm CL. This supports the perspective that LCMA1 landings involve a narrow range of small lobster sizes and is primarily a recruitment-dependent fishery.

Increasing the minimum legal size is projected to decrease the total number of lobsters landed but result in a net increase in yield-per-recruit (YPR) and total weight of catch (Table 1 and 2). However, the magnitude of these changes are small enough that they may not be detectable in the actual fishery given inter-annual variations in recruitment and catch. Changing the maximum legal size is projected to have very little effect on either catch number or weight.

Note that these are purely yield-per-recruit simulations so recruitment subsidies from increased SSB are not assumed in the calculations of catch weight or number so, thus, probably represent a conservative, lower bound. A less conservative upper bound would be the product of change in YPR and the change in SSB.

Increasing the minimum legal size is projected to result in large increases in SSB (Table 3). Minimum legal sizes that approach or exceed the size of maturity produce increasing returns on SSB as this allows a much larger portion of the population to reproduce at least once. Thus, increasing minimum legal size to 88mm is projected to result in a near doubling in SSB. Increasing maximum size can result in a large decrease SSB, particularly as the minimum legal size increases and more of the population survives to reach the current maximum legal size.

Increasing legal size would result in moderate to large decreases in exploitation as more of the stock becomes protected (Table 4) with exploitation decreasing by nearly 30% at a minimum legal size of 88mm. As with catch weight and number, changing maximum legal size has little effect on exploitation rates as these sizes represent a very small portion of the LCMA1 population.

LCMA3 Simulations

We first analyzed the port and sea sampling data provided for the 2020 benchmark assessment but constrained to LCMA3 to estimate fishery characteristics, including catch size composition, catch sex ratio, and conservation selectivity (discarding due to egg-bearing or V-notch status).

We then specified the conservation selectivity from the biosamples and current legal selectivity appropriate for LCMA3 in the population simulation model and iteratively tuned the following parameters:

1. Fully-selected fishing mortality, assumed constant across seasons
2. Recruitment sex ratio
3. Recruitment size composition for each sex.

For a given tuning run, the population simulation model was provided an updated set of input parameters and projected forward 25 year to reach equilibrium. The resulting catch composition from the model run was then compared to the average catch composition from the last five years of the biosamples to determine accuracy of the simulation models. Comparisons were conducted both visually for obvious lack-of-fit and by correlating the simulated and observed catch compositions. Correlations were performed on both the catch proportions and logit-transformed catch proportions, the latter to place more emphasis on length compositions that occur in smaller proportions.

Once the model was tuned to perform as well as might be expected, given minor, seasonal lack-of-fit that could not be easily resolved, the simulation model was then run with the tuned parameters for all combinations of proposed minimum and maximum size limits. We then summarized the outputs from the different simulations as values relative to the current minimum and maximum size regulations in place for LCMA3.

Results

The cumulative catch weight-by-length curve indicates that 110 mm carapace length is the approximate mean size of lobsters landed in the LCMA3 fishery (Figure 1). However, the cumulative curve is nearly linear from 90mm through 130mm, indicating lobsters across this size range are about equally important to the landings of this fishery. Lobsters less than about 92mm constitute the lower 10% quantile of landings while lobsters greater than 136mm constitute the upper 10% quantile with lower and upper quartiles around 98mm and 123mm respectively. This suggests that LCMA3 landings include a broad range of lobster sizes, unlike typical inshore lobster fisheries that are primarily recruitment-driven.

The final tuned parameters included a quarterly fishing mortality of 0.1 (0.4 total annual mortality) and a 70:30 female to male recruitment sex ratio. The tuned recruit length compositions are bi-modal for both sexes, indicating recruitment to the fishery comes both from growth of smaller individual within the LCMA and immigration from outside the LCMA (Figure 2). With these compositions, about 80% of male recruitment and 30% of female

recruitment is attributed to growth with the remainder of new individuals coming from immigration from outside the LCMA.

Fitting the simulation length comps by manually tuning these parameters resulted in reasonably good fits to the observed length compositions (Figures 3, 4, and 5). Some lack-of-fit is still evident within seasons but this lack-of-fit is generally contrary to the lack-of-fit observed in other seasons, making it difficult to further improve the fit with just the parameters of interest. Correlations between observed and predicted compositions were 0.981 for simple proportions and 0.97 for logit-transformed proportions, suggesting both high and low proportion values for observed length comps are well matched by the simulation and we deemed this adequate to a basis to examine alternative management options.

Decreasing either the minimum or maximum legal size is projected to decrease total weight of catch (Table 5). However, contrary to the previous analysis for the full stock or inshore LCMA's, changes to the maximum size have much larger impacts on landings than changes to the minimum size, particularly once the maximum size drops to between 140 and 150mm. Decreasing the maximum size from 171mm to 127mm is projected to decreases landings by about 30% while decreasing the minimum size from 90mm to 83mm is only projected to decrease landings by a couple of percent.

Decreasing the minimum legal size is projected to marginally increase the number of lobsters being landed but decreasing the maximum size marginally to moderately decreases the number of lobsters landed, producing neutral effects for many of the management options explored here (Table 6).

Decreasing maximum legal size from current regulations is projected to increase SSB, possibly significantly, but decreasing minimum sizes would decrease SSB (Table 7). The greatest observed increase would be from holding the minimum size at current values but maximally decreasing maximum sizes, essentially narrowing the length range where lobsters are legal, which is estimated to result in a 64% increase in spawning stock. As above, changes to maximum size have bigger effects on SSB than changes to minimum sizes.

Decreasing maximum sizes would result in a decrease in exploitation but decreasing minimum sizes would increase exploitation (Table 8), countering each other and paralleling patterns observed for SSB. Because the calculation of exploitation is based on numbers of individuals rather than mass, decreasing minimum sizes have larger effects on exploitation than observed above for landings or SSB. Again, changes in exploitation increase rapidly with decreasing maximum sizes once the alternate maximum gauge size reaches a size that includes a significant portion of the catch for the LCMA.

OCC Simulations

Due to time and data constraints, we did not attempt to tune a simulation model for OCC. Rather, we assume that population dynamics and fishing mortality rates in OCC are bounded by

the conditions observed in the LCMA1 and LCMA3 fisheries. Thus, we ran simulations for OCC using the OCC legal size range with both the LCMA1 and LCMA3 parameterizations and present both sets of results with the understanding that results for OCC should fall between these extremes.

In general, outputs (catch weight, number, SSB and exploitation) show different responses for the LCMA1 than the LCMA3 parameterizations. LCMA1 parameterizations tend to produce simulations that are very sensitive to changes in minimum legal size but not maximum legal size, while simulations with LCMA3 parameterization only slightly sensitive to changes in minimum legal size but moderately to highly sensitive to changes in maximum legal size.

Total weight of landings is projected to be sensitive to changing minimum legal size with the LCMA1 parameterization but be insensitive with the LCMA3 parameterization (Table 9 A & B). With the LCMA1 parameterization, decreasing minimum size is projected to decrease landings by ~5% while increasing legal size to 88mm would increase landings by 8%. Conversely, landings weight is insensitive to changes in maximum legal size for the LCMA1 parameterization but sensitive to changes for the LCMA3 parameterization.

Total catch number simulations shows trend similar to catch weight with the LCMA1 parameterization being sensitive to changes in minimum size and the LCMA3 parameterization sensitive to changes in maximum size (Figure 10 A & B). The pattern otherwise holds that larger minimum legal sizes result in lower catch numbers.

For SSB, the LCMA1 parameterization is responsive to both changes in minimum and maximum legal size while the LCMA3 parameterization is more sensitive to changes in maximum size (Figure 11 A & B). For example, decreasing minimum legal size to 127mm would increase SSB by between 24% and 65% for the LCMA1 and LCMA3 parameterizations, respectively. The ranges of minimum size tested in simulations produce changes in SSB in the rage of -26% to +76% for the LCMA1 parameterization and -1% to +6.8% for the LCMA3 parameterization.

Decreasing minimum legal size produce increases moderate to small increases in exploitation (16% to 4% for LCMA1 and LCMA3 parameterizations, respectively, Figure 12 A & B). Either increasing minimum legal size or decreasing maximum legal size decrease serve to decrease exploitation with a maximum decrease of ~39% observed at the largest minimum and smallest maximum size and the LCMA3 parameterization.

Discussion

There is a stark difference in cumulative landings by size between LCMA1 and LCMA3. LCMA1 is clearly a recruitment-based fishery that would be highly sensitive to variations in recruitment. The LCMA3 fishery, in contrast, is fishing a broad range of lobster sizes, and therefore ages, and is thus somewhat buffered from interannual variation in recruitment dynamics.

The LCMA1 fishery is highly sensitive to changes in minimum legal size because of high exploitation rates on newly-recruited lobsters. The range of minimum sizes tested in

simulations encompasses size range that represents the majority of landings for the inshore / nearshore fishery. Thus, changes to minimum size would dramatically change the length composition of the catch. Increases in the minimum size will have temporarily but significantly depress landing in the years immediately after are implemented but the benefits to SSB would be similarly immediate. Increasing the minimum legal size can add to the resilience of the fishery by marginally increasing the spread of effort across multiple year classes and significantly increasing SSB and egg production which may buffer the effects in any future change in productivity.

Generally, decreasing maximum gauge sizes have larger effects for LCMA3 both relative to decreasing minimum sizes in LCMA3 or for changing maximum sizes for the other LCMAs. This matches the conclusions based on the cumulative catch curve (Figure 1) that showed that the LCMA3 fishery lands a much broader size range of individuals than the inshore LCMAs, with the upper portion of length compositions overlapping proposed alternative maximum sizes.

This analysis for LCMA3 matches previous analysis conducted for inshore LCMAs, finding that larger minimum legal sizes had positive effects across population parameters including higher catch weights, increased SSB and decreased exploitation. However, decreasing maximum legal sizes has mixed effects, decreasing immediate landings but increasing SSB, potentially by a larger margin. Because recruitment subsidies from increasing SSB are not included in this simulation, the net effect of these two opposing changes are uncertain. While decreasing maximum legal sizes would decrease immediate landings and make a larger portion of the population inaccessible to the fishery permanently (i.e. excluded lobsters won't grow into a legal size in the future), this increase in SSB may eventually produce a recruitment subsidy that could offset this loss of catch. The net effect would depend on multiple factors including the connectivity of the added SSB to larval settlement habitat and the migration patterns of these large females into adjacent habitats including inshore Gulf of Maine and international waters.

Finally, it is important to note the importance of large female lobsters that dominate the landings for much of LCMA3. This both highlights the partial dependence of this fishery on immigration from adjacent habitats and adds uncertainty to this analysis. The growth and molt cycling of such large females is poorly understood and are not particularly well informed in the current growth model. Thus, the tuned parameters may be biased by mis-specification of the growth model and results in this analysis may be sensitive to the growth model used in some cases. Interpretation of tuned parameters and confidence in the precise results of this analysis should be taken with some caution. However, the general patterns of changing catch, SSB and exploitation with changes in minimum and maximum legal sizes is consistent across this and previous analyses so may be treated with higher confidence.

## Cumulative Distribution of Catch Weight by Size

Figure 1. Cumulative proportion of catch weight by carapace length. To interpret, lobsters less than 90mm constitute approximately 8% of landings, while lobsters less than 130mm constitute approximately 85% of landings.

**Recruit proportions for tuned population model**

Figure 2. Tuned recruitment length compositions for the fitted model. The bi-modal length distribution suggests a combination of recruitment by growth (individuals <70mm) and migration (individuals >85 mm) with males primarily recruiting by growth and females primarily recruiting by migration as mature adults.

Figure 3. LCMA 3 catch length compositions by sex and quarter based on biosampling and from the tuned population model.

Figure 4. Relationship between length composition proportions observed in biosamples and predicted in the tuned population model by quarter and sex. The diagonal 1:1 line shows an ideal fit between the data sets.

Figure 5. Relationship between length composition proportions observed in biosamples and predicted in the tuned population model by quarter and sex. Data points are logit-transformed to emphasize fit to lengths that occur in low proportions. The diagonal 1:1 line shows an ideal fit between the data sets.

Table 1. LCMA1 projected relative changes to <u>Weight of</u> <u>Landings</u> resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

		Maximum Gauge Size						
		5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
Minimum Gauge Size	3.25in / 83mm	0.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
	3.31in / 84mm	3.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
	3.38in / 86mm	5.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
	3.47in / 88mm	13.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%
	3.53in / 90mm	14.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
	3.594in / 91mm	16.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%	18.00%

Table 2. LCMA1 projected relative changes to <u>Number of lobsters</u> <u>Landed</u> resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

		Maximum Gauge Size						
		5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
Minimum Gauge Size	3.25in / 83mm	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%
	3.31in / 84mm	-2.00%	-1.80%	-1.80%	-1.80%	-1.80%	-1.80%	-1.80%
	3.38in / 86mm	-3.60%	-3.30%	-3.30%	-3.30%	-3.30%	-3.30%	-3.30%
	3.47in / 88mm	-8.50%	-8.10%	-8.00%	-8.00%	-8.00%	-8.00%	-8.00%
	3.53in / 90mm	-9.50%	-9.00%	-9.00%	-9.00%	-9.00%	-9.00%	-9.00%
	3.594in / 91mm	-11.30%	-10.80%	-10.70%	-10.70%	-10.70%	-10.70%	-10.70%

Table 3. LCMA1 projected relative changes to Spawning Stock Biomass resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	0.00%	-16.50%	-18.30%	-18.50%	-18.50%	-18.60%	-18.60%
3.31in / 84mm	19.00%	-1.40%	-3.60%	-3.80%	-3.90%	-3.90%	-3.90%
3.38in / 86mm	38.00%	13.90%	11.30%	11.00%	10.90%	10.90%	10.90%
3.47in / 88mm	98.00%	61.00%	56.90%	56.60%	56.50%	56.40%	56.40%
3.53in / 90mm	117.00%	75.80%	71.30%	70.90%	70.70%	70.70%	70.70%
3.594in / 91mm	151.00%	101.70%	96.40%	95.90%	95.70%	95.70%	95.60%

Table 4. LCMA1 projected relative changes to Exploitation resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	0.00%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%
3.31in / 84mm	-8.50%	-7.70%	-7.60%	-7.60%	-7.60%	-7.60%	-7.60%
3.38in / 86mm	-14.40%	-13.60%	-13.50%	-13.50%	-13.50%	-13.50%	-13.50%
3.47in / 88mm	-29.40%	-28.40%	-28.30%	-28.30%	-28.30%	-28.30%	-28.30%
3.53in / 90mm	-32.10%	-31.00%	-30.90%	-30.90%	-30.90%	-30.90%	-30.90%
3.594in / 91mm	-36.50%	-35.40%	-35.30%	-35.20%	-35.20%	-35.20%	-35.20%

Table 5. <u>LCMA3</u> projected relative changes to <u>Weight of</u> <u>Landings</u> resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-31.30%	-14.60%	-6.30%	-4.20%	-2.80%	-2.10%	-0.80%
3.31in / 84mm	-31.20%	-14.30%	-6.00%	-3.80%	-2.40%	-1.60%	-0.40%
3.38in / 86mm	-31.20%	-14.00%	-5.60%	-3.40%	-2.00%	-1.20%	0.00%
3.47in / 88mm	-31.10%	-13.60%	-5.00%	-2.70%	-1.30%	-0.50%	0.80%
3.53in / 90mm	-31.40%	-13.40%	-4.60%	-2.30%	-0.90%	0.00%	1.30%
3.594in / 91mm	-31.70%	-13.20%	-4.10%	-1.70%	-0.30%	0.60%	1.90%

Minimum Gauge Size (vertical axis label)

Table 6. <u>LCMA3</u> projected relative changes to <u>Number of lobsters</u> <u>Landed</u> resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-11.10%	-0.80%	3.20%	4.00%	4.50%	4.70%	5.00%
3.31in / 84mm	-12.20%	-1.70%	2.30%	3.20%	3.70%	3.90%	4.20%
3.38in / 86mm	-13.20%	-2.60%	1.50%	2.30%	2.80%	3.10%	3.40%
3.47in / 88mm	-15.20%	-4.20%	-0.10%	0.80%	1.30%	1.50%	1.80%
3.53in / 90mm	-17.10%	-5.90%	-1.70%	-0.80%	-0.30%	0.00%	0.30%
3.594in / 91mm	-19.50%	-7.90%	-3.60%	-2.60%	-2.10%	-1.90%	-1.50%

Minimum Gauge Size (vertical axis label)

Table 7. LCMA3 projected relative changes to Spawning Stock Biomass resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	56.00%	19.00%	3.00%	-1.50%	-3.80%	-5.20%	-6.90%
3.31in / 84mm	57.00%	20.00%	3.00%	-0.80%	-3.10%	-4.50%	-6.20%
3.38in / 86mm	59.00%	21.00%	4.00%	0.00%	-2.40%	-3.70%	-5.50%
3.47in / 88mm	61.00%	23.00%	6.00%	1.50%	-0.90%	-2.30%	-4.10%
3.53in / 90mm	64.00%	25.00%	8.00%	3.80%	1.40%	0.00%	-1.80%
3.594in / 91mm	69.00%	29.00%	11.00%	6.70%	4.20%	2.80%	1.00%

Table 8. LCMA3 projected relative changes to Exploitation resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell).

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-20.40%	-0.30%	8.40%	10.30%	11.40%	11.90%	12.50%
3.31in / 84mm	-22.30%	-2.40%	6.30%	8.10%	9.20%	9.70%	10.30%
3.38in / 86mm	-24.10%	-4.40%	4.10%	6.00%	7.00%	7.50%	8.10%
3.47in / 88mm	-27.40%	-8.10%	0.30%	2.20%	3.10%	3.70%	4.30%
3.53in / 90mm	-30.60%	-11.60%	-3.30%	-1.50%	-0.50%	0.00%	0.60%
3.594in / 91mm	-34.20%	-15.60%	-7.50%	-5.70%	-4.80%	-4.20%	-3.70%

Table 9. OCC projected relative changes to Weight of Landings resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell), based on (A) LCMA1 or (B) LCMA3 paramerizations.

A.

Minimum Gauge Size	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-5.60%	-5.00%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%
3.31in / 84mm	-2.70%	-2.00%	-1.90%	-1.90%	-1.90%	-1.90%	-1.90%
3.38in / 86mm	-0.90%	-0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3.47in / 88mm	6.60%	7.80%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
3.53in / 90mm	7.40%	8.80%	8.90%	8.90%	8.90%	8.90%	8.90%
3.594in / 91mm	9.30%	11.00%	11.20%	11.20%	11.20%	11.20%	11.20%

B.

Minimum Gauge Size	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-30.40%	-13.50%	-5.20%	-3.00%	-1.60%	-0.80%	0.00%
3.31in / 84mm	-30.30%	-13.20%	-4.80%	-2.60%	-1.20%	-0.40%	1.00%
3.38in / 86mm	-30.30%	-13.00%	-4.40%	-2.20%	-0.80%	0.00%	1.00%
3.47in / 88mm	-30.30%	-12.50%	-3.80%	-1.50%	-0.10%	0.70%	2.00%
3.53in / 90mm	-30.60%	-12.40%	-3.40%	-1.10%	0.40%	1.20%	3.00%
3.594in / 91mm	-30.90%	-12.10%	-2.90%	-0.50%	1.00%	1.90%	3.00%

Table 10. OCC projected relative changes to <u>Number of lobsters</u> <u>Landed </u>resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell), based on (A) LCMA1 or (B) LCMA3 paramerizations.

A.

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	3.40%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%	3.60%
3.31in / 84mm	1.30%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%
3.38in / 86mm	-0.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3.47in / 88mm	-5.40%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%	-4.90%
3.53in / 90mm	-6.40%	-5.90%	-5.90%	-5.90%	-5.90%	-5.90%	-5.90%
3.594in / 91mm	-8.30%	-7.70%	-7.70%	-7.70%	-7.70%	-7.70%	-7.70%

B.

	Maximum Gauge Size						
Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-13.80%	-3.70%	0.10%	0.90%	1.40%	1.60%	1.90%
3.31in / 84mm	-14.80%	-4.60%	-0.70%	0.10%	0.60%	0.80%	1.10%
3.38in / 86mm	-15.80%	-5.50%	-1.50%	-0.70%	-0.20%	0.00%	0.30%
3.47in / 88mm	-17.70%	-7.10%	-3.10%	-2.20%	-1.70%	-1.50%	-1.20%
3.53in / 90mm	-19.60%	-8.70%	-4.60%	-3.70%	-3.20%	-3.00%	-2.70%
3.594in / 91mm	-21.90%	-10.70%	-6.40%	-5.50%	-5.00%	-4.80%	-4.50%

Table 11. OCC projected relative changes to Spawning Stock Biomass resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell), based on (A) LCMA1 or (B) LCMA3 paramerizations.

A.

Maximum Gauge Size

Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-9.80%	-24.70%	-26.40%	-26.50%	-26.60%	-26.60%	-26.60%
3.31in / 84mm	7.00%	-11.10%	-13.10%	-13.30%	-13.30%	-13.30%	-13.30%
3.38in / 86mm	24.30%	2.70%	0.30%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3.47in / 88mm	78.20%	45.10%	41.50%	41.20%	41.10%	41.00%	41.00%
3.53in / 90mm	95.50%	58.50%	54.40%	54.00%	53.90%	53.90%	53.90%
3.594in / 91mm	126.20%	81.80%	77.00%	76.60%	76.50%	76.40%	76.40%

B.

Maximum Gauge Size

Minimum Gauge Size	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	63.00%	24.00%	7.00%	2.00%	-0.10%	-1.50%	-3.30%
3.31in / 84mm	64.00%	25.00%	7.00%	3.00%	0.60%	-0.70%	-2.60%
3.38in / 86mm	65.00%	26.00%	8.00%	4.00%	1.40%	0.00%	-1.80%
3.47in / 88mm	67.00%	27.00%	10.00%	5.00%	2.90%	1.50%	-0.30%
3.53in / 90mm	71.00%	30.00%	12.00%	8.00%	5.30%	3.90%	2.00%
3.594in / 91mm	75.00%	34.00%	15.00%	11.00%	8.30%	6.80%	4.90%

Table 12. OCC projected relative changes to Exploitation resulting from alternative minimum and maximum options, relative to the current regulations (yellow cell), based on (A) LCMA1 or (B) LCMA3 paramerizations.

A.

Minimum Gauge Size	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	15.60%	16.50%	16.50%	16.50%	16.50%	16.50%	16.50%
3.31in / 84mm	5.80%	6.70%	6.80%	6.80%	6.80%	6.80%	6.80%
3.38in / 86mm	-1.10%	-0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
3.47in / 88mm	-18.40%	-17.30%	-17.10%	-17.10%	-17.10%	-17.10%	-17.10%
3.53in / 90mm	-21.50%	-20.20%	-20.10%	-20.10%	-20.10%	-20.10%	-20.10%
3.594in / 91mm	-26.70%	-25.30%	-25.20%	-25.20%	-25.20%	-25.20%	-25.20%

B.

Minimum Gauge Size	Maximum Gauge Size						
	5in / 127mm	5.5in / 140mm	6in / 152mm	6.25in / 159mm	6.5in / 165mm	6.75in / 171mm	None
3.25in / 83mm	-26.00%	-7.30%	0.80%	2.60%	3.60%	4.10%	4.60%
3.31in / 84mm	-27.70%	-9.20%	-1.20%	0.60%	1.50%	2.00%	2.60%
3.38in / 86mm	-29.40%	-11.10%	-3.20%	-1.40%	-0.50%	0.00%	0.60%
3.47in / 88mm	-32.50%	-14.50%	-6.70%	-5.00%	-4.10%	-3.60%	-3.00%
3.53in / 90mm	-35.40%	-17.70%	-10.00%	-8.40%	-7.50%	-7.00%	-6.50%
3.594in / 91mm	-38.80%	-21.50%	-13.90%	-12.30%	-11.40%	-10.90%	-10.40%

Appendix C. Trigger Mechanism Analysis and Recommendation

Recruit (71-80 mm carapace length) indices are used as model-free indicators of recruitment to the lobster fishery in the following year. During the 2020 stock assessment, recruit indicators were found to be correlated with the stock assessment model estimates of reference abundance (78+ mm carapace length), providing a reliable means to track abundance changes and potential need for management response more frequently than through intermittent stock assessments. There are eight GOM/GBK stock recruit indicators updated for each assessment: spring and fall indices for each of the ME/NH, MA DMF, NEFSC GOM, and NEFSC GBK bottom trawl surveys. The NEFSC indicators in the GOM and GBK regions are considered to be indicators of offshore recruitment which differs from the GOM/GBK stock-wide recruitment dynamics. Therefore, the American Lobster Technical Committee (TC) recommended using only the inshore surveys (ME/NH and MA DMF) where the bulk of the population and fishery occur, which are assumed to be more representative of stock-wide recruitment. These trawl surveys employ similar methodologies and, along with selectivity and swept area calibration factors, can be combined into two indices, a spring index and a fall index. Additionally, the TC recommends using the standardized index from the Ventless Trap Survey as an indicator of recruitment during the summer.

To calculate a trigger index, each of the three individual indices were scaled to their 2017 reference levels so they are on the same scale. The one year lag expected between recruit indices and reference abundance due to growth results in 2017 recruit indices mapping to the terminal year reference abundance used in the 2020 stock assessment status determination (2018). The TC recommended linking the trigger index to the reference abundance in this way so the trigger index is an indication of proportional changes to the reference abundance since the 2020 stock assessment. Proportional changes in the trigger index are compared directly to proportional changes between the terminal year reference abundance and abundance reference points established in the assessment to provide an early indication of reference abundance falling below the reference points. Scaled indices were then averaged across surveys to generate a single trigger index. The final trigger index value represents proportional change from 2017 recruitment (and, therefore, expected proportional change from the reference abundance one year later in 2018 - the terminal year of the stock assessment). A value of one indicates no change, a value greater than one indicates an increase (e.g., 1.2 indicates a 20% increase), and a value less than one indicates a decrease (e.g., 0.8 indicates a 20% decrease).

During the 2020 stock assessment, the peer review panel supported using a smoothing algorithm, such as the running average used in past assessments, to determine stock status, but also recommended exploring alternatives (e.g., running median) to evaluate the robustness of status determinations. To evaluate performance of different methods for a trigger mechanism, akin to evaluating stock status in a stock assessment, a simulation analysis was conducted using the trigger index annual point value, three-year running average, and three-year running median to identify need for management action. For each method, all three individual indices were scaled to a 2017 reference level calculated with the same method used to calculate the

index. That is, the 2017 reference level was the 2017 point value for the annual index trigger method, the 2015-2017 average for the three-year running average trigger method, and the 2015-2017 running median for the three-year running median trigger method. The scaled individual and combined indices are compared to various trigger points related to assessment abundance reference points in Figure 1.

The TC treated 0.68 (i.e., a 32% decline) as the trigger for action in the simulation analysis. This decline represents the proportional change between the terminal year stock assessment reference abundance level and the boundary between the high and moderate abundance regimes. Each individual index was projected from 2018 to 2025 following a steady decline that reflected a 32% decline from the observed 2017 index value in 2021. This projected trend is hypothetical to evaluate the performance of the three calculation methods being considered and does not necessarily reflect the true status or projection of the population. It was unclear what impacts the method used to calculate the starting point of the projected trend would have on performance of each trigger mechanism, so declines projected from the (1) 2017 point value, (2) 2015-2017 running average, and (3) 2015-2017 running median were evaluated in three separate scenarios. Indices were then sampled from these simulated trends with CVs equal to the average CV over the respective index's time series, assuming a lognormal error structure. These simulations only consider observation error and do not account for process error. Indices were scaled to their reference level as described above, averaged across surveys, and the combined trigger index was evaluated for whether or not it would trigger action (≤ 0.68) in each year of the projection period. This was repeated 1,000 times for each scenario and action determinations were tallied by year for each of the methods.

Results show similar patterns between the scenarios using a simulated decline from the 2017 point value and from the 2015-2017 average (Table 1; Figures 2-3). The 2015-2017 running median was equal to the 2017 point value for all indices, so the results with a simulated decline from this value were identical to the 2017 point value scenario (Table 2; Figure 4). Incorrect action is triggered very infrequently (< 3% of the time) by the annual and running median methods in the first two years of the projection period and never by the running average method. On average, the annual and running median methods incorrectly triggered action about 9% of the time and about 15 times more frequently than the running average method the year before the decline reached the threshold (2020), but also correctly triggered action ≈38% of the time and roughly twice as frequently as the running average method in the year when the threshold was met (2021). The running average method then tended to perform as well as or better than the other methods from 2022-2025, albeit generally at smaller margins of difference, as all methods tended to perform relatively well in these later years when the decline is exacerbated. The delayed response of the running average method can be seen in Figures 5-7, where the median trigger index value across simulations tends to be slightly higher than the annual and running median methods. The variance in index values, however, is lower for the running average method resulting in more consistency across simulations in terms of guidance for management action, whereas the other methods result in mixed guidance for some of the more extreme simulations in more years than the running average method.

Based on these results, the trigger mechanisms using the annual point value and the running median may be considered precautionary methods that perform better for an immediate trigger, on average, but with more variable guidance than the running average method. The running average method may provide a less responsive trigger mechanism that is less likely to incorrectly trigger premature action, and performs well and more consistently after the initial risk of not triggering action when first needed.

<u>The TC recommended the running average method for calculating the trigger index.</u> The individual surveys display interannual variation that might be related to environmental impacts on catchability (for example), an issue that was identified in the stock assessment and is expected to continue to impact these indices index data sets into the future. This simulation analysis suggests the running average method is more robust to interannual variation than the other methods and therefore can be interpreted with higher confidence.

Table 1. Percentage of 1,000 simulated indices that triggered action for three simulated decline starting point scenarios, and the averages of these scenarios. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.

Simulated Decline Starting Point	Index Calculation Method	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
	Annual	0%	2%	12%	50%	85%	97%	100%	100%
2017 Point Value	Three-Year Running Average	0%	0%	1%	27%	86%	100%	100%	100%
	Three-Year Running Median	0%	2%	12%	44%	84%	98%	100%	100%
	Annual	0%	0%	3%	21%	59%	89%	99%	100%
2015-2017 Average	Three-Year Running Average	0%	0%	0%	3%	46%	95%	100%	100%
	Three-Year Running Median	0%	0%	3%	19%	60%	90%	99%	100%
	Annual	0%	2%	12%	50%	85%	97%	100%	100%
2015-2017 Running Median	Three-Year Running Average	0%	0%	1%	27%	86%	100%	100%	100%
	Three-Year Running Median	0%	2%	12%	44%	84%	98%	100%	100%
	Annual	**0%**	**2%**	**9%**	**40%**	**76%**	**94%**	**100%**	**100%**
Average	**Three-Year Running Average**	**0%**	**0%**	**1%**	**19%**	**73%**	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
	Three-Year Running Median	**0%**	**1%**	**9%**	**36%**	**76%**	**95%**	**100%**	**100%**

Figure 1. Scaled individual and combined indices using three calculation methods compared to four trigger levels (0.83 – Fishery/Industry Target, 0.68 – Moderate/High Abundance Regime Shift Level, 0.55 – Abundance Limit, 0.49 – Abundance Threshold) identified from potential reference abundance declines (dashed lines).


Figure 2. Annual action determinations by method from 1,000 simulated indices with the simulated population declining from the 2017 point value. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.

Figure 3. Annual action determinations by method from 1,000 simulated indices with the simulated population declining from the 2015-2017 average. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.

Figure 4. Annual action determinations by method from 1,000 simulated indices with the simulated population declining from the 2015-2017 median. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.


Figure 5. Distribution of index values by method from 1,000 simulations with the simulated population declining from the 2017 point value. The dashed colored lines are the median index values across simulations, the solid color lines are the minimum and maximum index values across simulations, and the dashed black line is the trigger level. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.

Figure 6. Distribution of index values by method from 1,000 simulations with the simulated population declining from the 2015-2017 running average. The dashed colored lines are the median index values across simulations, the solid color lines are the minimum and maximum index values across simulations, and the dashed black line is the trigger level. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.


Figure 7. Distribution of index values by method from 1,000 simulations with the simulated population declining from the 2015-2017 running median. The dashed colored lines are the median index values across simulations, the solid color lines are the minimum and maximum index values across simulations, and the dashed black line is the trigger level. The simulated stock was projected to decline 32% in 2021.