Horseshoe Crab Draft Addendum VIII for Public Comment

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

DRAFT ADDENDUM VIII TO THE HORSESHOE CRAB FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Implementation of the 2021 Adaptive Resource Management Framework Revision

August 2022

Sustainable and Cooperative Management of Atlantic Coastal Fisheries

Horseshoe Crab Draft Addendum VIII for Public Comment

Public Comment Process and Proposed Timeline

In January 2022, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's (Commission) Horseshoe Crab Management Board (Board) initiated Draft Addendum VIII to the Horseshoe Crab Interstate Fishery Management Plan to consider implementing the recommendations included in the 2021 Revision of the Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) Framework and Peer Review Report, and using the ARM Framework Revision for setting bait harvest specifications for horseshoe crabs of Delaware-Bay origin. This document presents background on the Commission's management of horseshoe crab in the Delaware Bay Region, the addendum process and timeline, a statement of the problem, and management measures for public consideration and comment.

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 **September 30, 2022 at 11:59 p.m**. **EST.** Comments may be submitted by mail, email, or fax. 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: Horseshoe Crab
    Arlington, VA 22201   Draft Addendum VIII)

January 2022	Board Initiated Draft Addendum VIII
August 2022	Board Approved Draft Addendum VIII for public comment
September 2022	Public Comment Period Including Public Hearings
November 2022	Board Reviews Public Comment, Selects Management Measures, Final Approval of Addendum VIII
TBD	Implementation of Addendum VIII Provisions

Horseshoe Crab Draft Addendum VIII for Public Comment

1.0 Introduction

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's (Commission or ASMFC) Horseshoe Crab Management Board (Board) approved the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Horseshoe Crabs (FMP) in October 1998. The goal of the FMP includes management of horseshoe crab populations for continued use by current and future generations of the fishing and non-fishing public, including the biomedical industry, scientific and educational researchers, migratory shorebirds, and other dependent fish and wildlife, including federally listed sea turtles. ASMFC maintains primary management authority for horseshoe crabs in state and federal waters. The management unit for horseshoe crabs extends from Maine through the east coast of Florida.

Additions and changes to the FMP have been adopted by the Board through seven addenda. The Board approved Addendum I in 2000, establishing a coastwide, state-by-state annual quota system to reduce horseshoe crab landings. Addendum I also included a recommendation to the federal government to create the Carl N. Shuster Jr. Horseshoe Crab Reserve. The Board approved Addendum II in 2001, establishing criteria for voluntary quota transfers between states. Addenda III (2004) and IV (2006) required additional restrictions on the bait harvest of horseshoe crabs of Delaware Bay-origin and expanded the biomedical monitoring requirements. Addenda V (2008) and VI (2010) extended the restrictions within Addendum IV. The provisions of Addendum VI were set to expire after April 30, 2013. Addendum VII replaced the Addendum VI requirements by establishing a management program for the Delaware Bay Region (i.e., coastal and bay waters of New Jersey and Delaware, and coastal waters only of Maryland and Virginia).

Draft Addendum VIII considers implementing the 2021 Revision to the Adaptive Resource Management (ARM) Framework originally established under Addendum VII.

2.0 Overview

2.1 Statement of the Problem

The Board initiated Draft Addendum VIII in January 2022 to consider use of the recent 2021 Revision of the ARM Framework (ASMFC 2021) in setting annual bait harvest specifications for horseshoe crabs of Delaware Bay-origin. Delaware Bay horseshoe crab management using the ARM Framework was originally established under Addendum VII for use during the 2013 fishing season and beyond. The Framework considers the abundance levels of horseshoe crabs and shorebirds in determining the optimal harvest level for the Delaware Bay states of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia (east of the COLREGS).

In the past decade, more data has been collected on shorebirds and horseshoe crabs and modeling software and techniques have advanced. Additionally, the original ARM Framework used software that is now antiquated, not supported, does not run on current computer operating systems, and is limited in its capacity to incorporate uncertainty when determining optimum harvest strategies. Thus, the ARM Subcommittee was tasked with revising the ARM

Horseshoe Crab Draft Addendum VIII for Public Comment

Framework to address critiques from the previous peer review panel, include newly available data, and transition to new modeling software.

Following the recommendations of the independent peer review panel, which endorsed the ARM Revision as the best and most current scientific information for the management of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay Region, the Board reviewed and accepted the ARM Framework Revision in January 2022. Draft Addendum VIII considers incorporating the recommended changes in the ARM Framework Revision into the management program for bait harvest of Delaware Bay-origin horseshoe crabs.

2.2 Background

The original ARM Framework and Addendum VII were developed in response to public concern regarding the horseshoe crab population and its ecological role in the Delaware Bay. While the stock assessment at that time (ASMFC 2009a) found increases in the Delaware Bay horseshoe crab abundance, the red knot (*rufa* subspecies), one of many shorebird species that feed on horseshoe crab eggs, was at low population levels. To address these concerns, an effort began to develop a multi-species approach to managing horseshoe crabs by employing the tools of structured decision making and adaptive management. In 2007, the Horseshoe Crab and Shorebird Technical Committees met and endorsed the development of a structured decision making (SDM) framework and adaptive management approach. An ARM Subcommittee was formed including representatives from state and federal partners, as well as horseshoe crab and shorebird biologists. The Subcommittee produced a framework for adaptive management of horseshoe crabs in the Delaware Bay that was constrained by red knots. It was peer-reviewed with a coastwide benchmark stock assessment for horseshoe crab in 2009 (ASMFC 2009a, 2009b).

Addendum VII, approved in February 2012, implemented the ARM Framework for use during the 2013 fishing season and beyond. The Framework considers the abundance levels of horseshoe crabs and shorebirds in determining the optimal harvest level for the Delaware Bay states of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia (east of the COLREGS). Since 2013, the Board has annually reviewed recommended harvest levels from the ARM Subcommittee, who run the ARM model, and specified harvest levels for the following year in New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

2.3 Original ARM Framework

A goal of the ARM Framework is to transparently incorporate the views of stakeholders along with predictive modeling to assess the potential consequences of multiple, alternative management actions in the Delaware Bay Region. The ARM process involved several steps: 1) identify management objectives and potential actions, 2) build alternative predictive models with confidence values that suggest how a system will respond to these management actions, 3) implement management actions based on those predictive models, 4) monitor to evaluate the population response to management actions, validate the model predictions, and provide

timely feedback to update model confidence values and improve future decision making, 5) as necessary, incorporate new data into the models to generate updated, improved predictions, and 6) revise management actions as necessary to reflect the latest state of knowledge about the ecosystem. The ARM Framework is an iterative process that adapts to new information and success of management actions.

Underlying the original ARM model are population models for both red knots and horseshoe crabs. The optimization routine in the ARM model determines the best choice among five potential harvest packages (numbers of male and females that can be harvested) given the current abundance of each species in order to maximize the long-term value of horseshoe crab harvest. The ARM model values female horseshoe crab harvest only when the abundance of red knots reaches 81,900 birds (a value related to the historic abundance of red knots in the Delaware Bay) or when the abundance of female horseshoe crabs reaches 80% of their predicted carrying capacity (11.2 million assuming a carrying capacity of 14 million; ASMFC 2009b). On an annual basis, the ARM model is used to select the optimal harvest package to implement for the next year given the current year's estimate of horseshoe crab abundance from the swept area estimate from the VA Tech trawl survey and a mark-resight estimate of red knot abundance.

Within this ARM Framework, a set of alternative multispecies models were developed for the Delaware Bay Region to predict the optimal strategy for horseshoe crab bait harvest. These models accounted for the need for red knot stopover feeding during migrations through the region. These models incorporated uncertainty in model predictions and are meant to be updated with new information as monitoring and management progress.

On an annual basis, the ARM model is used to select the optimal harvest package to implement for the next year given the current year's estimate of horseshoe crab abundance from the swept area estimate from the VA Tech trawl survey and a mark-resight estimate of red knot abundance. The current harvest packages for horseshoe crab bait harvest that can be selected by the ARM model are:

> Package 1) Full harvest moratorium on both sexes
> Package 2) Harvest up to 250,000 males and 0 females
> Package 3) Harvest up to 500,000 males and 0 females
> Package 4) Harvest up to 280,000 males and 140,000 females
> Package 5) Harvest up to 420,000 males and 210,000 females

The numbers of horseshoe crabs in the packages listed above are totals for the Delaware Bay Region, and not per state. Since its implementation in 2013, neither the 81,900 red knot threshold nor the 11.2 million female horseshoe crab thresholds have been met and harvest package 3 has been selected every year by the Framework and specified by the Board for the Delaware Bay bait harvest limit.

2.4 Allocation of the ARM harvest output

The ARM Framework incorporates horseshoe crabs from the Delaware Bay Region as one unit. The modeling and optimization portions of the Framework do not address distribution and allocation of the harvest among the four Delaware Bay states. Allocation of the overall Delaware Bay harvest allowance was established in Addendum VII. Based on tagging and genetic analysis (ASMFC 2019, 2021), there is very little exchange between Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay horseshoe crab populations. However, there is movement of horseshoe crabs between coastal embayments (from New Jersey through Virginia) and Delaware Bay.

An allocation model for the four Delaware Bay states was developed to allocate the optimized harvest output by the ARM Framework, which is described in Section 2.4 of Addendum VII, and summarized below.

Each state's allocation of the total Delaware Bay-origin harvest recommended by the ARM Framework was determined by multiplying the state's quota under Addendum VI by the proportion of the state's total harvest that is of Delaware Bay-origin (lambda, λ), then dividing this value by the sum of the values for each of four states (Table 1). The state lambda values established in Addendum VII were based on the genetic data available at the time. Virginia's quota level and landings refer to those quota and landings that occur east of the COLREGS line, as these crabs have been shown to be part of a mixed stock.

Table 1. Calculation of State Allocations of Delaware Bay Harvest Established in Addendum VII

State	Lambda	Addendum VI Quota	Delaware Bay-Origin Quota	Add VII Allocation of Delaware Bay-Origin Quota
NJ	1.00	100,000	100,000	32.4%
DE	1.00	100,000	100,000	32.4%
MD	0.51	170,653	87,033	28.2%
VA (east of COLREGS)	0.35	60,998	21,349	7.0%

Along with the state allocation percentages, Addendum VII also established two additional provisions impacting the state quotas for Maryland and Virginia. First, it established a harvest cap for Maryland and Virginia, which set a maximum limit on the total level of allowed harvest by Maryland and Virginia to provide protection to non-Delaware Bay-origin crabs. The cap is based on Addendum VI quota levels for Maryland and Virginia; the Maryland cap is 170,653 crabs, and the Virginia cap is 60,998 crabs. These caps apply except when the ARM Framework recommends a package that prohibits harvest of female horseshoe crabs. When female harvest is prohibited, a second provision allows for a 2:1 offset of males:females for Maryland and Virginia, which allows the total male harvest of Maryland and Virginia to rise above the cap level. Note again that Virginia's quota only refers to the number of crabs that can be harvested east of the COLREGS line.

3.0 Management Options
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.

Draft Addendum VIII considers two management options:

- Option A: No action
- Option B: Implement the ARM Revision for setting bait harvest specifications for Delaware Bay-origin horseshoe crabs

Option B includes additional sub-options to specify how annual harvest recommendations will be made based on the output of the ARM model.

Option A: No Action
Because the ARM Framework adopted under Addendum VII can no longer be updated due to its obsolete software, under this option, the management program would revert back to the provisions implemented under Addendum VI. These include the following harvest quotas and limitations for New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

Addendum VI prohibits directed harvest and landing of all horseshoe crabs in New Jersey and Delaware from January 1 through June 7, and female horseshoe crabs in New Jersey and Delaware from June 8 through December 31. It also limits New Jersey and Delaware's harvest to 100,000 horseshoe crabs per state per year.

Addendum VI prohibits directed harvest and landing of horseshoe crabs in Maryland from January 1 through June 7 for two years, from October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2008. It also prohibits the landing of horseshoe crabs in Virginia from federal waters from January 1 through June 7.

Addendum VI mandates that no more than 40% of Virginia's annual quota may be harvested east of the COLREGS line in ocean waters. It also requires that horseshoe crabs harvested east of the COLREGS line and landed in Virginia must be comprised of a minimum male to female ratio of 2:1.

Table 2. Commercial horseshoe crab bait harvest quotas for the Delaware Bay states under Addendum VI.

Jurisdiction	Addendum VI ASMFC Quota
NJ*	100,000
DE*	100,000
MD	170,653
VA**	152,495
DELAWARE BAY TOTAL	523,148

*Male-only harvest

**No more than 40% of Virginia's annual quota may be harvested east of the COLREGS line in ocean waters. Horseshoe crabs harvested east of the COLREGS line and landed in Virginia must be comprised of a minimum male to female ratio of 2:1.

Option B: Implement the ARM Revision for setting bait harvest specifications for Delaware Bay-origin horseshoe crabs

This option would adopt the updates to the ARM Framework recommended in the 2021 Revision and incorporate them into the process for setting specifications for bait harvest of Delaware Bay-origin horseshoe crabs. Changes to the ARM Framework are described in detail in the 2021 Revision to the Adaptive Resource Management Framework and Peer Review Report, and include:

- Catch multiple survey analysis (CMSA) to estimate male and female horseshoe crab population estimates using all quantifiable sources of mortality (i.e., natural mortality, bait harvest, coastwide biomedical mortality, and commercial dead discards) and several abundance indices from the Delaware Bay Region
- Integrated population model (IPM) to quantify the effects of horseshoe crab abundance on red knot survival and recruitment based on data collected in the Delaware Bay
- Transition to new modeling approach which can be implemented through readily available R software and incorporates uncertainty on all life history parameters for both horseshoe crabs and red knots
- Harvest recommendations based on a continuous scale rather than discrete harvest packages as in the previous Framework
- Female harvest decoupled from the harvest of males

Harvest Recommendations

Harvest recommendations under the ARM Revision are based on a continuous scale rather than the discrete harvest packages in the previous Framework. Therefore, any harvest number between zero and the maximum allowable harvest could be recommended, not just the fixed harvest packages. Harvest of females is decoupled from the harvest of males so that each are determined separately. The maximum possible harvest for both females and males are maintained as in Addendum VII at 210,000 and 500,000, respectively.

Horseshoe Crab Draft Addendum VIII for Public Comment

Although harvest is treated as continuous in the new ARM Framework, if the continuous harvest recommendations were made public, it would be possible to back-calculate the biomedical mortality input, which is confidential. Therefore, it is necessary to round the continuous sex-specific harvest outputs to obscure the confidential biomedical data, unless the maximum sex-specific harvest is recommended. There are two sub-options for rounding the harvest output from the ARM Framework:

- **Sub-option B1:** Round down continuous optimal harvest recommendation to nearest 25,000 horseshoe crabs. For example, if the continuous optimal harvest recommendation is 135,000 males and 96,000 females, these values would be rounded down to 125,000 males and 75,000 females.

- **Sub-option B2:** Round down continuous optimal harvest recommendation to nearest 50,000 horseshoe crabs. For example, if the continuous optimal harvest recommendation is 135,000 males and 96,000 females, these values would be rounded down to 100,000 males and 50,000 females.

The Board is seeking public input on the level of rounding of the optimal harvest recommendation. Sub-option B2 would be more conservative, but sub-option B1 would yield harvest levels closer to the optimal harvest.

Adaptive management cycle

Under this option the adaptive management cycle would include three tiers of short and longer term management, update, and revision processes for the ARM Framework, as follows:

1. **Annual management process:** The annual specification of harvest will occur at the ASMFC annual meeting in calendar year *t* for the harvest to be implemented the following season (year *t*+1). The CMSA requires multiple indices of abundance and removals from multiple sources. Because the necessary data take time to be finalized, and final data for a given year would not be available by the time of the annual meeting, the results of a run of the CMSA in year *t* will be based on data obtained from the previous two years. Inputs to the CMSA will include the Virginia Tech trawl survey that is conducted in the fall of year *t*-2; Delaware and New Jersey trawl surveys from year *t*-1; and removals from year *t*-1. To match the abundance estimates of horseshoe crabs with red knot mark-resight population estimates, horseshoe crab abundance estimates from year *t*-1 and red knot population estimates from year *t*-1 will be used as input to the ARM Revision harvest policy functions in year *t*. Optimal harvest recommendations can then be implemented in year *t*+1. The two year time lag between data availability and implementation of optimal harvest was incorporated in the ARM Revision modeling when determining what the optimal harvest would be based on horseshoe crab and red knot abundance.

Each annual step is identified in the timeline below:
- April - July (year *t*) – The ARM workgroup compiles monitoring data to run the CMSA (Virginia Tech trawl survey data from year *t*-2, New Jersey and Delaware survey data from year *t*-1, removal data from year *t*-1). The ARM workgroup estimates red knot stopover population size from the mark-resight analysis in year *t*-1.
- August (year *t*) – The ARM workgroup inputs horseshoe crab and red knot population estimates to the ARM Revision harvest policy functions and calculates the optimal harvest.
- September (year *t*) – The Delaware Bay Ecosystem Technical Committee reviews the ARM Revision results and optimal harvest recommendations.
- ASMFC Annual Meeting (year *t*) – The Management Board reviews the optimal harvest recommendations from the ARM workgroup and decides on the harvest to be implemented in year *t*+1.

2. **Interim update process:** Every three years, an update process would occur in which the model parameters (e.g., red knot survival and recruitment, horseshoe crab stock-recruitment relationship) are updated based on the annual routine data collected in the region.

3. **Revision process:** every 9 or 10 years (or sooner if desired by the Board), the ARM Framework should undergo a revision process similar to what occurred for the 2021 ARM Revision. This amount of time is appropriate given it allows for two updates to occur, and encompasses one generation for horseshoe crabs. This should incorporate the following components:
    - Solicit formal stakeholder input on ARM Framework to be provided to the relevant technical committees
    - Technical committees review stakeholder input and technical components of ARM models and provide recommendations to the Board
    - At the ASMFC Spring Meeting, Board selects final components of the ARM Framework, and tasks technical committees to work with ARM Working Group to run models /optimization
    - Merge with the annual management process
        - In August, ARM Subcommittee runs models/optimization
        - At the ASMFC Annual Meeting, the Board revisits harvest decision

If Option B is selected, implementation of the ARM Framework Revision would likely occur for the 2023 fishing season, with Board review and decision-making likely to occur at the Board's 2022 annual meeting.

Allocation of the Delaware Bay-origin harvest recommendation

Under this option, the allocation methodology established in Addendum VII would be modified to update state lambda values as recommended in the 2021 Revision based on more recent genetic data analysis. Lambda indicates how much of a state's harvest is of Delaware Bay-origin (i.e., has spawned at least once in Delaware Bay). Lambda shall be assumed to be 1.00 for New

Jersey and Delaware and based upon the recent genetics data and analysis (ASMFC 2021), 0.45 for Maryland, and 0.20 for Virginia.

State	Lambda, λ
NJ	1.00
DE	1.00
MD	0.45
VA	0.20

Allocation values will be calculated using the same formula used under Addendum VII. Lambda will be multiplied by the state's Addendum VI quota. The resulting value will be divided by the sum of values for all four states to provide the percent of the Delaware Bay harvest recommendation that will be allocated to each state. Virginia's quota level and landings refer to quota and landings that occur east of the COLREGS line, as these crabs have been shown to be part of a mixed stock (Shuster 1985).

State	Allocation of Delaware Bay Harvest (%)
NJ	34.6%
DE	34.6%
MD	26.6%
VA	4.2%

Harvest cap for Maryland and Virginia

Under this option the harvest cap for Maryland and Virginia established under Addendum VII will be maintained. The harvest cap places a maximum limit on the total level of allowed harvest by Maryland and Virginia, providing protection to non-Delaware Bay-origin crabs. The cap is based on Addendum VI quota levels for Maryland and Virginia. Note again that Virginia's quota only refers to the amount able to be harvested east of the COLREGS line.

MD Cap	VA Cap
170,653	60,998

These caps shall apply except when the ARM Framework outputs an optimized harvest that prohibits harvest of female horseshoe crabs. In this situation, female horseshoe crab harvest in Maryland and Virginia will be prohibited but a 2:1 offset of males:females shall apply and allow the total male harvest of Maryland and Virginia to rise above the cap level.

2:1 Male:female offset for female crabs below the Addendum VI levels

When a female harvest moratorium output by the ARM Framework restricts female crab harvest in Maryland and Virginia below the Addendum VI quota levels, male harvest would be

increased at a 2:1 ratio. These increases are the only allowable increases above the designated harvest cap above. The offsets assume an allowed harvest under Addendum VI in Virginia of 20,333 female crabs and in Maryland of 85,327 female crabs.

Fallback option if ARM Framework cannot be used

As part of the 2021 ARM Framework Revision, the models are dependent on annual data sets for the yearly harvest setting, and include the following:
- Horseshoe crab abundance estimates from the Virginia Tech Horseshoe Crab Trawl Survey
- Horseshoe crab relative abundance indices from Delaware and New Jersey fishery-independent surveys
- Total horseshoe crab removals (bait harvest, biomedical mortality, and estimated commercial discards)
- Horseshoe crab spawning beach sex ratio from the Delaware Bay Horseshoe Crab Spawning Survey
- Red knot abundance estimates, including stopover counts and re-sightings

The absence of these annually-collected data sets could inhibit the use of the ARM Framework depending on which data sets were missing. If model results were not available for the fall harvest decision, the Board, via Board action and after consultation of the relevant Technical Committees and Advisory Panels, may set the next season's harvest by one of the following methods:
- Based upon Addendum VI quotas and management measures for New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and Virginia coastal waters; or,
- Based upon the previous year's ARM Framework harvest level and allocation for New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and Virginia coastal waters. Harvest could be more conservative than the previous year's ARM Framework harvest level and allocation for New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and Virginia coastal waters.

4.0 Compliance

TBD

5.0 Literature Cited

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). 2009a. Horseshoe Crab Stock Assessment for Peer Review, Stock Assessment Report No. 09-02 (Supplement A) of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Washington D.C. 122pp.

ASMFC. 2009b. A Framework for Adaptive Management of Horseshoe Crab Harvest in the Delaware Bay Constrained by Red Know Conservation, Stock Assessment Report No. 09-02 (Supplement B) of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Washington D.C. 51pp.

ASMFC. 2012. Addendum VII to the Fishery Management Plan for Horseshoe Crab. Fishery Management Report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Washington D.C. 10pp.

ASMFC. 2019. 2019 Horseshoe Crab Benchmark Stock Assessment. Arlington, VA. 271 pp.

ASMFC. 2021. Revision to the Framework for Adaptive Management of Horseshoe Crab Harvest in the Delaware Bay Inclusive of Red Knot Conservation and Peer Review Report. Arlington, VA. 302 pp.

Lyons, J. 2021. Red Knot Stopover Population Estimate for 2021. Memorandum to the Delaware Bay ARM Working Group. U.S. Geological Survey Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland. 13 pp.

Niles, L. J., H. P. Sitters, A. D. Dey, P. W. Atkinson, A. J. Baker, K. A. Bennett, R. Carmona, K. E. Clark, N. A. Clark, C. Espoza, P. M. Gonzalez, B. A. Harrington, D. E. Hernandez, K. S. Kalasz, R. G. Lathrop, Ricardo N. Matus, C. D. T. Minton, R. I. G. Morrison, M. K. Peck, W. Pitts, R. A. Robertson and I. L. Serrano. 2008. Status of the Red Knot in the Western Hemisphere. Studies in Avian Biology No. 36.

Pierce, J., G. Tan, and P. Gaffney. 2000. Delaware Bay and Chesapeake Bay populations of the horseshoe crab *Limulus polyphemus* are genetically distinct. Estuaries 23: 690-698.

Shuster, C.N., Jr. 1985. Introductory remarks on the distribution and abundance of the horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*, spawning in the Chesapeake Bay area. Pages 34-38 in The Chesapeake: Prologue to the Future. Proceedings of the Chesapeake Bay Symposium, National Marine Educators Conference.

Swan, B. L. 2005. Migrations of adult horseshoe crabs, *Limulus polyphemus*, in the middle Atlantic bight: a 17-year tagging study. Estuaries 28: 28-40.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011. Horseshoe Crab Tagging Program. Report to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Delaware Bay Ecosystem Technical Committee (January 24, 2011). 6 pgs.

Williams, B. K., R. C. Szaro, and C. D. Shapiro. 2007. Adaptive management: the US Department of the Interior technical guide. Adaptive Management Working Group, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Appendix A. Example Allocation of Delaware Bay Horseshoe Crab Harvest

Table 1. Horseshoe crab and red knot population estimates and resulting harvest recommendation for 2017-2019 based on the 2021 ARM Revision. Coastwide biomedical mortality was used for model development, so actual Delaware-Bay specific values will result in slightly lower population estimates. Source: Supplemental Report for ARM Revision, Table 11.

Year	CMSA Estimates		Red knots	Optimal HSC Harvest (revised ARM)	
	Female HSC	Male HSC		Female	Male
2017	10,967,100	31,664,430	49,405	154,483	500,000
2018	9,735,690	24,715,290	45,221	146,792	500,000
2019	9,357,400	21,897,920	45,133	144,803	500,000

Table 2. Example allocation of the Delaware Bay optimal horseshoe crab harvest using the 2019 Optimal HSC Harvest (see Table 1). Top: Example allocation under Option B, sub-option B1. Bottom: Example allocation under sub-option B2. Total quota includes crabs of non-Delaware Bay Origin.

State	DE Bay Origin Quota			Total Quota		
	Sexes Combined	Male	Female	Sexes Combined	Male	Female
DE	216,268	173,014	43,254	216,268	173,014	43,254
NJ	216,268	173,014	43,254	216,268	173,014	43,254
MD	166,080	132,864	33,216	170,653	136,522	34,131
VA	26,384	21,107	5,277	60,998	48,798	12,200
Total	**625,000**	**500,000**	**125,000**	**664,187**	**531,349**	**132,837**

State	DE Bay Origin Quota			Total Quota		
	Sexes Combined	Male	Female	Sexes Combined	Male	Female
DE	207,617	173,014	34,603	207,617	173,014	34,603
NJ	207,617	173,014	34,603	207,617	173,014	34,603
MD	159,437	132,864	26,573	170,653	142,211	28,442
VA	25,328	21,107	4,221	60,998	50,832	10,166
Total	**600,000**	**500,000**	**100,000**	**646,885**	**539,071**	**107,814**