



MONITORING HAWAII'S MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

EXAMINING SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL TRENDS USING A SEASCAPE APPROACH

Alan M. Friedlander, U.S. Geological Survey and the University of Hawaii

Lisa M. Wedding, NOAA Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment Biogeography Branch and the University of Hawaii Manoa

Eric Brown, National Park Service Kalaupapa National Historical Park

Mark E. Monaco, NOAA Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment



Citation

Friedlander, A.M., L.M. Wedding, E. Brown, M.E. Monaco. 2010. Monitoring Hawaii's Marine Protected Areas: Examining Spatial and Temporal Trends Using a Seascape Approach. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 117. Prepared by the NCCOS Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment Biogeography Branch. Silver Spring, MD. 130 pp.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this document would not have been possible without the participation of the following people: Donna Brown, Chris Caldow, Brent Carmen, Eric Carr, Athline Clark, Alicia Clarke, Mary Donovan, Tommy Hagawa, Skippy Hau, Brian Hauk, Jamison Higgins, Sarah D. Hile, Alan Hong, Paul Jokiel, Kevin McMahon, Russell Sparks, Kosta Stamoulis, Keoki Stender, Yuko Stender, William Walsh and Darla White. Their efforts to help compose, format, review and edit the document are very much appreciated.

The covers for this document were designed and created by Eric Carr of Consolidated Safety Services. The cover photo was provided by Keoki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com.

For more information

For more information about this report, please contact CCMA's Biogeography Branch Acting Chief Chris Caldow, at (301) 713-3028 or visit <http://ccma.nos.noaa.gov/about/biogeography/>.

Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for their use by the United States government.

Monitoring Hawaii's Marine Protected Areas: Examining Spatial and Temporal Trends Using a Seascape Approach

Prepared by the
Biogeography Branch
Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment (CCMA)
National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS)
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Ocean Service (NOAA)
1305 East West Highway (SSMC-IV, N/SCI-1)
Silver Spring, MD 20910
USA

August 2010

Alan M. Friedlander
U.S. Geological Survey and the University of Hawaii

Lisa M. Wedding
NOAA Biogeography Branch and the University of Hawaii at Manoa

Eric Brown
National Park Service, Kalaupapa National Historic Park

Mark E. Monaco
NOAA Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment

NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 117



United States
Department of
Commerce

Gary Locke
Secretary

National Oceanic and
Atmospheric Administration

Jane Lubchenco
Administrator

National Ocean Service

David Kennedy
Assistant Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Background	1
Objectives	1
Seascape Ecology Approach	2
Hawaii Marine Protected Areas	2
Methods	5
Study Sites	5
Benthic Habitat Mapping	5
Bathymetric LiDAR Data	11
Sampling Locations	11
Fish Sampling Methodology	12
Fish Sample Size Optimization Analysis	12
Benthic Survey Techniques	13
Rugosity Methods	14
Sample Design	14
Data Analysis	14
Quantifying Seascape Metrics	15
Results	17
Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District (MLCD) and Southeast Oahu	17
Sample Allocation	17
Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration	17
Large-scale Benthic Cover	19
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes	24
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes	24
Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes	34
Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats	43
Pupukea MLCD and North Shore Oahu	45
Sample Allocation	45
Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration	46
Evaluation of MLCD Boundary Expansion Using a Seascape Perspective	48
Large-scale Benthic Cover	49
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes	49
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes	52
Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes	59
Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats	68
Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and West Maui	70
Sample Allocation	70
Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration	71
Large-scale Benthic Cover	71
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes	73
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes	76
Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes	83
Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats	92

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Kealakekua Bay MLCD and South Kona	94
Sample Allocation	94
Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape within the MLCD	95
Large-scale Benthic Cover	97
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes	102
Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes	105
Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes	111
Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats	121
Discussion	125
Benthic Habitats	125
Seascape Metrics	125
Fish Assemblages	126
Management Implications	127
References	129

Executive Summary



Photo courtesy of Keoki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

Executive Summary

Hawaii's coastal marine resources have declined dramatically over the past 100 years due to multiple anthropogenic stressors including overfishing, coastal development, pollution, overuse, invasive species and climate change. It is now becoming evident that ecosystem-based management, in the form of marine protected areas (MPAs), is necessary to conserve biodiversity, maintain viable fisheries, and deliver a broad suite of ecosystem services. Over the past four decades, Hawaii has developed a system of MPAs to conserve and replenish marine resources around the state. These Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs) vary in size, habitat quality, and management regimes, providing an excellent opportunity to test hypotheses concerning MPA design and function using multiple discreet sampling units.

NOAA/NOS/NCCOS/Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment's Biogeography Branch used digital benthic habitat maps coupled with comprehensive ecological studies between 2002 and 2004 to evaluate the efficacy of all existing MLCDs using a spatially-explicit stratified random sampling design. The results from this work have shown that areas fully protected from fishing had higher fish biomass, larger overall fish size, and higher biodiversity than adjacent areas of similar habitat quality. Other key findings demonstrated that top predators and other important fisheries species were more abundant and larger in the MPAs, illustrating the effectiveness of these closures in conserving these populations. Habitat complexity, protected area size and habitat diversity were the major factors in determining effectiveness among MPAs.

In order to more effectively evaluate these MLCDs, a seascape ecology approach was subsequently applied to characterize ecosystem patterns at scales that are commensurate with marine resources and their users. Furthermore, a monitoring program in four representative MLCDs (Hanauma Bay and Pupukeya, Oahu; Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay, Maui, and Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii Island) was established and these sites were sampled annually between 2006-2008. These study sites were chosen because they are characterized by a wide range of habitats types, representative wave exposures, varying levels of resource protection and human use. NOAA's 2007 benthic habitat maps, which utilize a more robust classification scheme, were also integrated to apply a stratified random sampling design and to support a seascape ecology approach in order to characterize and quantify the seascape within each MLCD and adjacent area open to fishing. General benthic habitat types were similar inside and outside MLCDs (Friedlander et al. 2007b) although coral cover tended to be higher inside. Therefore, the focus of this study was to examine trends over time in each of these management regimes. This approach allowed for the identification of seascape characteristics that support robust and effective MPAs in the state of Hawaii. The major findings of the study are highlighted below:

Benthic Assemblage Characteristics Among Study Sites and Over Time:

- Coral species richness and cover was greater inside the Hanauma, Pupukeya and Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay MLCDs compared to adjacent open areas and the rank order of these metrics among the four MLCDs did not change over the study period.
- Coral cover generally increased over time in Hanauma, Pupukeya and Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay MLCDs and did not change within Kealakekua MLCD.
- Macroalgae cover was generally greater outside the MLCDs and increased over time, particularly adjacent to the Hanauma Bay MLCD (Maunalua Bay, Oahu), Honolulu Bay MLCD (west Maui) and Kealakekua Bay MLCD (south Kona, Hawaii Island).

Seascape Characteristics Among Study Sites:

- Seascape metrics derived from the 2007 NOAA benthic habitat maps were used to characterize the spatial structure and composition of habitat in the MLCDs, as well as the spatial configuration of the protected area boundary. These metrics included Shannon's habitat diversity and evenness indices, patch fractal dimensions, MLCD perimeter and area and MLCD perimeter/area ratio.

Executive Summary

- Several LiDAR-derived seascape metrics (e.g., depth, rugosity, slope) were developed for each MLCD to better describe the three dimensional seascape structure within each protected area.
- The quantification of both two (e.g. habitat diversity) and three dimensional (e.g. habitat complexity) structure of the seascape in the MLCDs allowed for the characterization of seascape attributes that support a successful protected area and may inform future marine spatial planning efforts.
- Changes to the size and spatial configuration of the Pupukeya MLCD since 2003 have greatly increased the habitat quality and ecosystem health within this protected area.

Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Study Sites and Over Time:

- Rank order of MLCDs by fish assemblage characteristic (species richness, numerical abundance, biomass and diversity) remained the same between the 2002-2004 sampling period and the 2006-2008 sampling period.
- Fish biomass increased in three of the four MLCDs from the initial sampling period. There was a 14% increase in Pupukeya, a 7% increase in Kealakekua and a 5% increase in Honolua Bay. Biomass in Hanauma Bay did not change appreciably during this same period.
- Fish biomass declined by 39% outside the Pupukeya MLCD on Oahu but increased by 32% outside Hanauma Bay on the south shore of Oahu, although the absolute increase (+0.05 t ha⁻¹) was small.
- Apex predator biomass increased in the Pupukeya MLCD and in the Hanauma Bay MLCD as a result of increasing numbers and sizes of bluefin trevally jacks (*omilu*, *Caranx melampygus*). Herbivore biomass increased by 17% within the Pupukeya MLCD and this increase was driven mainly by large parrotfishes that are primary fisheries target species.

Combining seascape-scale habitat stratification with *in situ* ecological data allowed for the development of a statistically robust monitoring program of living marine resources (e.g., fishes, corals and other invertebrates, algae) within and adjacent to four representative marine protected areas in Hawaii. The results clearly show that areas with good habitat quality and management conserve fish populations within their boundaries while areas without protection are in poorer ecological health and continue to decline over time. These temporal patterns support the findings of the initial assessment conducted by Friedlander and colleagues (Friedlander et al. 2006, 2007a, 2007b) and increase confidence in the effectiveness of marine protected areas as a management tool for the conservation of nearshore marine resources in Hawaii.

Remotely sensed data allowed the examination of these MLCDs at spatial scales that are more appropriate for management and provide valuable information on seascape metrics (e.g. rugosity, slope, depth, habitat type) that are relevant to the design of future MPAs. Marine protected areas are spatially discrete forms of management and georeferenced data on seascape metrics can be integrated using a spatial framework to ensure MPA design scenarios are incorporating an appropriate range in depth, habitat complexity, and a mosaic of interconnected habitat types.

The findings from this study greatly contribute to the understanding of marine protected area design and function in Hawaii and can be useful in the development of comprehensive coastal and marine spatial planning.

Introduction



Photo courtesy of Kosta Stamoullis

Background

Coral reef ecosystems are facing overexploitation and severe depletion on a global scale (Birkeland 2004, Bellwood et al. 2004, Pandolfi et al. 2005). Pollution, coastal development, and invasive species all impact coral reefs locally, and climate change now is having a global effect on corals and coral reef communities. Fishing, however, has historically exerted the most direct influence on most reefs and other marine ecosystems (Jennings and Kaiser 1998, Jackson et al. 2001). Increasing fishing pressure on coral reefs over the last few decades has not only led to declines in valued fish stocks, but have also resulted in major impacts to this fragile ecosystem as a whole.

Marine resources were important to the ancient Hawaiians for subsistence, culture, and survival. Today, food, recreation, culture, commerce, aesthetics, and shoreline protection are just a few of the ecosystem services provided by Hawaii's coral reefs. These reefs also have extremely high biodiversity and conservation value due to large proportion of species found nowhere else on earth. However, the 1.2 million residents and nearly seven million tourists each year have put increasing pressure on Hawaii's coral reefs, which have been valued at over US\$10 billion (Figure 1; Cesar and van Beukering 2004, Friedlander et al. 2008a).



Figure 1. Honolulu's crowded coast (left). Photo: A. Clarke. Hawaii's coral reefs provide world famous surfing spots like the Banzai Pipeline on Oahu's north shore (right). Photo: J. Stahl.

The combination of increased fishing pressure and growing coastal populations has reduced the ability to achieve the management goal of sustainable fisheries. In the past, Hawaiians managed fisheries in a sustainable manner based on traditional ecological knowledge and restricted marine resources that were more vulnerable to over harvesting (Poepoe et al. 2007). Currently, the main Hawaiian Islands are faced with the problems of increasing anthropogenic impacts that are a result of a growing coastal population and tourism (Friedlander et al. 2008a,b). The effects of fishing are evident at the level of individual stocks, as well as throughout the entire ecosystem (Friedlander and DeMartini 2002, Williams et al. 2008). In order to preserve marine biodiversity, ecosystem function, and the goods and services provided by resilient systems, marine reserves have been increasingly recommended as part of an ecosystem-based approach to management. Benefits derived from marine reserves include the enhancement of fisheries, insurance against management failures, the protection of essential fish habitat, and increased recruitment of fishes to adjacent open areas (Lubchenco et al. 2003, Browman and Stergiou 2004).

Objectives

The focus of this study was to develop and implement a monitoring program of living marine resources (e.g., fishes, corals and other invertebrates, algae) within and adjacent to four representative MLCs, develop metrics of seascape using remotely sensed data, and organize these data in a GIS to better understand ecosystem processes at the seascape scale.

Specifically:

- Examine temporal variation in fish assemblages and benthic habitat cover across a range of habitat types and management strata to determine trends and variability over time.
- Develop metrics from remotely sensed data (e.g., LiDAR, benthic habitat maps) that provide seascape-level characterization of the benthic environment.

Introduction

- Integrate remotely sensed data with ecological data into GIS to better understand ecosystem processes at broader spatial scales.
- Determine efficacy of marine protected areas using a seascape ecology approach.

Seascape Ecology Approach

Effective management of species and assemblages of concern requires accurate, spatially explicit information that characterizes and quantifies the seascape that supports the resources. Landscape ecology has been widely applied in the terrestrial environment to understand ecological patterns and processes, and this information is often used to inform conservation planning and resource management actions (Turner 2005). A landscape ecology approach can be integrated within a geospatial framework using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and remote sensing to identify the spatial association of reef fishes with the seascape. Information on the seascape, derived from remote sensing methods (e.g., LiDAR, benthic habitat maps), can provide valuable and spatially discrete ecological criteria that can be integrated in GIS, along with social and economic considerations, and ultimately provide support for marine spatial planning applications (Pittman et al. 2007a,b, Wedding et al. 2008, Wedding and Friedlander 2008, Monaco et al. 2005). This integrated approach aids in defining the forces that shape broad-scale community structure, and addresses specific questions about particular groups of economically and ecologically important species at the regional scale that management decisions are typically implemented across the state of Hawaii.

Benthic habitat type is a major determinant of fish assemblage structure and can be used as a surrogate to explain the distribution of fishes across the seascape (Figure 2). Benthic habitat maps provide fundamental information that can be used to guide marine conservation and management actions such as marine protected area (MPA) design, and evaluation (Friedlander et al. 2008 a,b). These maps allow a better understanding of the seascape, ecosystem function, and species habitat utilization patterns in a coastal area (Christensen et al. 2003, Friedlander et al. 2003, Pittman et al. 2007a). This work evaluated four marine protected areas in Hawaii by utilizing NOAA's Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps in order to utilize a seascape approach. Further, these maps were used to characterize and quantify the seascape within each marine protected area to assist in understanding the important attributes of the seascape that support high abundance, diversity and biomass.



Figure 2. A school of white cheek surgeonfish swim over typical Hawaiian reef structure. Photo: K. Stamoulis.

Hawaii Marine Protected Areas

Hawaii established its first MPAs over 30 years ago and since that time numerous protected areas have been established with varying levels of protection, ranging from complete 'no-take' areas to areas that have allowed a wide variety of activities to occur within their boundaries (Figure 3). The state of Hawaii, Division of Aquatic Resources has developed Marine Life Conservation Districts (MLCDs) to conserve and replenish marine resources around the state. Between 2002 and 2004, NOAA/NOS/NCCOS/Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment's Biogeography Branch conducted a comprehensive evaluation of all MLCDs in the state (Friedlander et al. 2006, 2007a, 2007b). Results from this comprehensive assessment showed MLCDs protected from fishing, with high habitat complexity and good habitat quality (e.g., high coral cover and low macroal-

gae cover), had higher values for most fish assemblage characteristics. To more effectively assess the efficacy of these protected areas, a monitoring program in four representative MLCDs (Hanauma Bay, Honolua-Mokuleia Bay, Kealakekua Bay and Pupukea) was established and these sites were sampled annually between 2006 and 2008. These four sites were chosen because they were representative of the diverse habitat types, wave exposures, and benthic environments across a broad geographic area of the main Hawaiian Islands.



Figure 3. Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District (MLCD) was designated as the first “no-take” marine protected area (MPA) in Hawaii in 1967 and encompasses approximately 41 ha. This area receives over one million visitors per year and is the most visited MPA in the world. Photo: L. Wedding.

Methods



Photo courtesy of Keoki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

Study Sites

The study areas are located in the main Hawaiian Islands at Pupukea and Hanauma Bay on the island of Oahu; Honolua-Mokuleia Bay, Maui; and Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii (Figure 4 and Table 1). These study sites were chosen because they are characterized by a wide range of habitats types, representative wave exposures, varying levels of resource protection, and human use. Each site has an MPA, referred to as MLCDs in Hawaii, and an adjacent area of comparable habitat that is open to resource extraction. This provides an opportunity to examine the relationship between relatively intact fish assemblages (MPAs), and their associated habitat, as well as the ability to compare the strength of the fish-habitat relationships in adjacent open access areas.




Figure 4. Map of the Hawaiian Islands and study locations.

Table 1. Summary of Marine Life Conservation Districts at four study sites in the main Hawaiian Islands.

Marine Life Conservation District	Island	Established	Area (km ²)	Use	Protection from fishing	Permitted activities
Pupukea	Oahu	1983* (2003)	0.71	moderate	moderate	pole-and-line from shore; harvest of seaweed (seasonal)**
Hanauma Bay	Oahu	1967	0.41	high	high	complete no-take
Honolua-Mokuleia Bay	Maui	1978	0.19	moderate	high	complete no-take
Kealakekua Bay	Hawaii	1969	1.24	high	moderate	hook and line; throw net; harvest of seaweed (seasonal)** and crustaceans in 60% of the total area

“Use” represents the level of use that was classified by the state of Hawaii, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR 1992). Protection from fishing is based on the qualitative ranking of Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR) regulations.

*Pupukea Marine Life Conservation District (MLCD) boundary was expanded and rules were modified in 2003.

***Selar crumenophthalmus* (November-December) and *Decapterus* spp. (August-September)

Benthic Habitat Mapping

NOAA acquired and visually interpreted orthorectified satellite imagery for selected near-shore waters and parts of the main Hawaiian Islands. An important step in producing benthic habitat maps was the development of a habitat classification scheme. Thirty-two distinct benthic habitat types (e.g., four major and 14 detailed geomorphological structure classes; eight major and three detailed biological cover types) within 13 attribution zones were digitally mapped in GIS using heads-up visual interpretation of orthorectified satellite imagery (Tables 2, 3 and 4).

The classification scheme was influenced by many factors including requests from the management community, the National Ocean Service's coral reef mapping experience, existing classification schemes, and quantitative habitat data for the area. The hierarchical scheme allows users to expand or collapse the thematic detail of the resulting map to suit their needs. For instance, additional hierarchical categories can be added into a GIS system by users with more detailed knowledge or data for specific areas. For example, habitat polygons

Methods

Table 2. Description of attribute “Zone” in the 2007 NOAA benthic habitat classification scheme. Source: Battista et al. 2007.

Zone	Description	Typical Habitats
Shoreline intertidal	Area between the mean high water line and the lowest spring tide level.	Sand, seagrass, rocks, reef and mangroves.
Vertical wall	Near-vertical slope between the shore and the shelf. Not usually distinguishable in remotely sensed imagery.	Rock, boulder, algae and coral
Lagoon	Shallow, between shore and intertidal zone, only present when reef crest is present.	Sand, seagrass, algae, hard bottom, patch reefs
Back reef	Between edge of reef crest and lagoon floor. Only present when a reef crest and lagoon exists.	Sand, rubble, seagrass, algae patch reef
Reef flat	Shallow, between intertidal zone and reef crest. Not usually present if a lagoon is present.	Sand, rubble, seagrass, algae, patch reef
Reef crest	Flattened emergent or nearly emerged segment of reef between back reef and fore reef.	Rubble, aggregated coral
Fore reef	Between edges of reef crest sloping deeper to the edge of the shelf platform. Also, features not forming emergent reef with a slope greater than the shelf.	Spur and groove
Bank/Shelf	A flattened platform extending seaward from the fore reef to the insular shelf escarpment that drops to deeper water.	Sand, patch reefs, algae, pavement, sand channels
Bank/Shelf Escarpment	Edge of shelf where depth increases rapidly to oceanic water.	Sand, spur and groove
Channel	Naturally occurring channels can cut across other zones.	Sand, mud, pavement
Dredged	Natural geomorphology disrupted or altered by excavation or dredging.	Mud, sand
Unknown	Zone, cover, and structure un-interpretable due to turbidity, cloud cover, water depth or other interference.	
Land	Terrestrial features above the spring high tide line.	

Table 3. Description of attribute “Geomorphic Structure” in the 2007 NOAA benthic habitat classification scheme. Source: Battista et al. 2007.

Geomorphic Structure	Description	
Unconsolidated sediment	Sand	Coarse sediment typically found in exposed areas
	Mud	Fine sediment, associated with river discharge and sheltered areas
Coral Reef and Hard bottom	Spur and groove	Alternating sand and high relief coral formations, oriented perpendicular to shore
	Patch reef	Isolated coral formations with no organized structural axis
	Individual patch reef	Distinctive single patch that are larger or equal to the minimum mapping unit
	Aggregate patch reef	Clustered patches that are too small or too close together to map separately
	Aggregate reef	High relief lacking sand channels of spur and groove
	Scattered coral/rock in unconsolidated sediment	Sand or seagrass bottom with small rocks and coral heads too small to delineate individually
	Pavement	Flat, low-relief, solid carbonate rock with biological cover dense enough to obscure surface
	Rock/boulder	Solid carbonate blocks, boulders, or volcanic rock.
	Reef rubble	Dead, unstable coral rubble often colonized by biological cover
Other Delineations	Pavement with sand channels	Alternating low-relief sand/surge channels oriented perpendicular to shore.
	Artificial	Man-made, including: wrecks, piers, submerged jetties, fish ponds, and shoreline created by dredge spoil
Unknown	Land	Terrestrial features above the spring high tide line
	--	Zone, cover, and structure un-interpretable due to turbidity, cloud cover, water depth or other interference.

Table 4. Description of attribute “Biological Cover” in the 2007 NOAA benthic habitat classification scheme. The minimum mapping unit (MMU) is 1 acre. Source: Battista et al. 2007.

Biological Cover		
Live Coral	Substrates colonized by live reef building corals and other organisms with at least 10% live coral cover.	
	Continuous coral	Live coral covering > 90% of the substrate. May include areas < 90% coral cover if < 10% of the total area is too small to be mapped independently (< 1 MMU).
	Patchy coral	Discontinuous live coral with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous coral. Live coral cover 50% > 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse coral	Discontinuous live coral with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous coral. Live coral cover 10% > 50% of the bottom.
Seagrass	Habitat with 10% or more of seagrass.	
	Continuous sea-grass	Seagrass > 90% of the substrate. May include blowouts < 10% of the total area that are too small to be mapped independently (< 1 MMU).
	Patchy seagrass	Discontinuous seagrass community with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous seagrass. Cover 50% > 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse seagrass	Discontinuous seagrass community with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous seagrass. Cover 10% > 50% of the bottom.
Macroalgae	Substrates with > 10 % coverage of any combination of numerous species of red, green, or brown macroalgae.	
	Continuous macroalgae	Macroalgae covering > 90 % of the substrate. May include areas < 10% of the total area that < 1 MMU.
	Patchy macroalgae	Discontinuous macroalgae with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous macroalgae. Cover 50% > 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse macroalgae	Discontinuous macroalgae with breaks in coverage that are too diffuse or irregular, or result in isolated patches of macroalgae that are too small (smaller than the MMU) to be mapped as continuous macroalgae. Overall cover is estimated at 10% > 50% of the bottom.
Encrusting/ Coralline Algae	> 10% coverage of any combination of encrusting or coralline algae.	
	Continuous coralline algae	Coralline algae covering > 90% of the substrate. May include areas < 10% of the total area that are < 1 MMU.
	Patch coralline algae	Discontinuous coralline algae with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous coralline algae. Cover 50% > 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse coralline algae	Discontinuous coralline algae with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous coralline algae. Cover 10% > 50% of the bottom.
Turf Algae	A community of low lying species of marine algae composed of algal divisions dominated by filamentous species lacking upright fleshy macroalgal thali.	
	Continuous turf	Turf algae > 90 %of the substrate. May include areas < 10 % of the total area that are< 1 MMU.
	Patchy turf	Discontinuous Turf algae with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous Turf algae. Cover50% > 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse turf	Discontinuous Turf algae with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous Turf algae. Cover 10% < 50% of the bottom.
Emergent vegetation	Emergent habitat composed primarily of <i>Rhizophora mangle</i> (red mangrove) and <i>Hibiscus</i> sp (hau) trees.	
	Continuous vegetation	Emergent vegetation > 90 % of the substrate. May include areas < 10% of the total area that are < 1 MMU.
	Patchy vegetation	Discontinuous Emergent vegetation with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous Emergent vegetation. Cover 50% < 90% of the bottom.
	Sparse vegetation	Discontinuous Emergent vegetation with breaks in coverage (< 1 MMU) to be mapped as continuous Emergent vegetation. Cover 10% > 50% of the bottom.
Uncolonized	Substrates not covered with a min. of 10% of any of the above biological cover types. This habitat is usually on sand or mud structures.	
Unknown	Zone, Cover, and Structure uninterpretable due to turbidity, cloud cover, water depth, or other interference.	

Methods

smaller than the minimum mapping unit (the minimum mapping unit, or MMU, is 1 acre for NOAA maps) can be delineated, such as individual patch reefs, or habitat polygons delineated as colonized pavement using this scheme could be further attributed with health information (e.g., bleached, percent live cover) or species composition. For more information, visit http://ccma.nos.noaa.gov/products/biogeography/hawaii_cd_07/html/overview.html.

The hierarchical scheme was modified throughout the development process based upon feedback provided by workshop participants and other contributors. Additional modifications were made during the mapping process to ensure that each category definition reflected the intended habitats and zones encountered in the field as accurately as possible. For instance, the separation of biological cover and geomorphological structure in the present scheme represents a significant evolution of previous versions of the classification schemes developed for mapping of the Caribbean in 1999 and of the Hawaiian Islands in 2000. The major product of this effort is a series of GIS-based benthic habitat maps that are characterized by a high degree of spatial and thematic accuracy (Figures 5 and 6; Battista et al. 2007, Coyne et al. 2003).




Figure 5. Example of NOAA's Biogeography Branch benthic habitat map of geomorphic structure in Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii.

Methods




Figure 6. Example of NOAA's Biogeography Branch benthic habitat map of biological cover in Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii.

Bathymetric LiDAR Data

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Scanning Hydrographic Operational Airborne LiDAR Survey (SHOALS) system is an airborne LiDAR bathymeter utilized to remotely collect topographic and bathymetric measurements using infrared (1,064 nm) and blue-green (532 nm) scanning laser pulses (Figure 7). SHOALS LiDAR data was collected in Hawaii between 1999 and 2000. The sensor provides a vertical accuracy of ± 20 cm and a horizontal resolution of ± 1.5 meters. The minimum depth range is typically 0 - 1 meter, with a maximum depth range of approximately 40 meters, and a spatial resolution of 4 meters (Irish and Lillycrop 1999; Figures 7, 8 and 9).

Sampling Locations

A field team consisting of two divers navigated to waypoints using GPS, they then marked the location with a lead weight and float and accurately established the location using GPS measurements. Direction of each transect was determined randomly along the isobath of that point except in cases where that direction caused the transect to traverse multiple habitats. In those situations, transects were run within a habitat polygon at a similar isobath strata. Divers descend together; with diver 1 carrying a 25 m transect line and rugosity chain and diver 2 carrying a digital camera and a 1 square-meter quadrat. Diver 1 began a 25 x 5 m fish transect starting at the marked waypoint and moved along the depth contour. As the fish count diver started his/her count, he or she visualized out to the end of the transect line and enumerated all individuals that were potentially leaving the census area. This partially accounts for the behavior that targeted species acquire in areas that are frequented by spearfishers. The fish count method is described in detail below. As diver 1 laid out transect line, diver 2 conducted benthic surveys within the quadrat. Once diver 1 completed the fish transect, he/she conducted rugosity measurements as described below.




Figure 7. Bathymetric grid derived from LiDAR data at Hanauma Bay, Oahu.



Figure 8. Aerial imagery of Hanauma Bay, Oahu overlaid on LiDAR-derived digital elevation model.

Methods

Fish Sampling Methodology

Fish assemblages at each location were assessed using standard underwater visual belt transect survey methods (Brock, 1954; Brock, 1982). A diver swam each 25m x 5m transect at a constant speed (approximately 15 min/transect) and identified to the lowest possible taxon, all fishes visible within 2.5 m to either side of the centerline (125 m² transect area). Nomenclature followed Randall (1996). Total length (TL) of fish was estimated to the nearest centimeter. Length estimates of fishes from visual censuses were converted to weight using the following length-weight conversion: $W = a \cdot SL^\beta$ where the parameters a and β are constants for the allometric growth equation and SL is standard length in mm and W is weight in grams. Total length was converted to standard

length (SL) by multiplying standard length to total length-fitting parameters obtained from FishBase (www.fishbase.org).

Length-weight fitting parameters were available for 150 species commonly observed on visual fish transects in Hawaii (Hawaii Cooperative Fishery Research Unit, unpublished data). This was supplemented by using information from other published and web-based sources. In the cases where length-weight information did not exist for a given species, the parameters from similar bodied congeners were used. All biomass estimates were converted to metric tons per hectare (t/ha) to facilitate comparisons with other studies in Hawaii. Finally, fish taxa were categorized into three trophic categories (herbivores, secondary consumers and apex predators) according to various published sources and FishBase (www.fishbase.org).

Fish Sample Size Optimization Analysis

Optimal sample size was determined for number of species and number of individuals per transect among the four major habitat types surveyed in the study area (Table 5, Figures 10 and 11). A technique developed by Bros and Cowell (1987) using the standard error of the mean to resolve statistical power was used to determine the number of samples needed using number of species and number of individuals. This method uses a Monte Carlo simulation procedure to generate a range of sample sizes versus power. The sample size at which further increase in sample size does not substantially increase power (decreasing standard error of the mean) is taken as the minimum suitable number of samples. For number of species per transect, high and low standard error of the mean began to level off and converge at ca. four samples in the colonized hardbottom habitat and unconsolidated sediment habitat and ca. eight samples for the macroalgae and uncolonized hardbottom habitats. For number of individuals per transect, high and low standard error of the mean began to converge at six samples in the unconsolidated sediment habitat and nine samples in the macroalgae habitat. Given these results, nine to 10 samples per habitat appeared to be adequate to control the standard error of the mean for number of individuals and number of species per transect.




Figure 9. Bathymetric profile of Hanauma Bay, Oahu derived from LiDAR data.

Table 5. Summary of sampling allocation of transects by location and management regime with a total sample size of $n=329$ per year.

	Pupukea	Hanauma Bay	Honolua-Mokuleia Bay	Kealakekua Bay	Total
MLCD	35	33	37	34	139
FRA				29	29
Open areas	38	47	63	13	161
Total	73	80	100	76	329

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; FRA = Fisheries Replenishment Area; Open = Area open to resource extraction.

procedure to generate a range of sample sizes versus power. The sample size at which further increase in sample size does not substantially increase power (decreasing standard error of the mean) is taken as the minimum suitable number of samples. For number of species per transect, high and low standard error of the mean began to level off and converge at ca. four samples in the colonized hardbottom habitat and unconsolidated sediment habitat and ca. eight samples for the macroalgae and uncolonized hardbottom habitats. For number of individuals per transect, high and low standard error of the mean began to converge at six samples in the unconsolidated sediment habitat and nine samples in the macroalgae habitat. Given these results, nine to 10 samples per habitat appeared to be adequate to control the standard error of the mean for number of individuals and number of species per transect.

Benthic Survey Techniques

The four MLCDs and the surrounding benthic habitat were surveyed using the *in situ* planar point intercept quadrat method (Reed 1980). Each 25 m fish transect was stratified into 5 x 5 m segments with quadrat placement randomly allocated within each segment. The quadrat grid was 1m² in area and consisted of 1 inch PVC tubing fitted with nylon line spaced 10 centimeters apart to form a square grid with 81 intersections. A subset of 25 randomly selected intersections were marked and used for substrate identification. The rationale for the subset was that 25 points sufficiently represented the habitat with acceptable error and optimized sampling time (Friedlander et al. 2006). Each intersection was identified using substrate categories of sand, coralline algae, turf algae, macroalgae, *Halimeda* spp and coral. Coral and macroinvertebrates were identified down to species using Veron (2000) and Hoover (2002) respectively. The macroinvertebrates category incorporated echinoderms and other large invertebrates (e.g., zoo-anthids, octocorals) that occupied significant portions of the substrate. Macroinvertebrates were also included in the results for comparative purposes, but the methodology limited conclusions about distribution and abundance for this group of organisms. Limitations of *in situ* methodology precluded taxonomic resolution of algae down to the species level so algae were identified to genera using Littler and Littler (2003). Percent cover values for each substrate category and coral species were derived by dividing the number of occupied points by the total number of intersections (25) within each quadrat.




Figure 10. Four major habitats using NOAA benthic habitat maps to inform a stratified random sampling approach types (Maunaloa Bay and Hanauma Bay, Oahu).




Figure 11. GPS points of sampling locations at (A) Pupukeya (B) Hanauma Bay (C) Honolua-Mokuleia and (D) Kealahou Bay MLCDs in the main Hawaiian Islands.

Methods

Rugosity Methods

To measure reef rugosity or surface relief, a chain of small links (1.3 cm per link) was draped along the full length of the centerline of each transect (Risk 1972). Care was taken to ensure that the chain followed the contour of all natural fixed surfaces directly below the transect centerline. A ratio of distance along the reef surface contour to linear horizontal distance gave an index of spatial relief or rugosity.

Sample Design

A stratified random sampling design was employed (Figure 12). Habitat polygons were attributed into four major habitat types (colonized hard bottom, uncolonized hard bottom, macroalgae and sand). Within each major habitat type, sampling was further stratified by management regime (MLCD; fisheries management area, or FMA; and open access). All sampling locations were randomly generated in ArcGIS (Figure 13).




Figure 12. A stratified random sampling design was employed to assess MLCDs, FMAs and areas open to fishing by major habitat types.

The overall benthic assemblages were generally similar between the MLCDs and the corresponding areas open to fishing based on multivariate analysis of similarities (ANOSIM; Friedlander et al. 2007). The pairwise ANOSIM R test value comparing benthic habitat composition between MLCDs and open areas was highest in Pupukea ($R = 0.327$), followed by Kealakekua ($R = 0.107$), Hanauma ($R = 0.040$) and Honolulu ($R = 0.002$). The ANOSIM R statistic ranges from well separated ($R > 0.75$), overlapping but clearly different ($R > 0.5$), or barely separable at all ($R < 0.25$). The small R statistics indicated that these benthic assemblages were still relatively similar to their adjacent open access areas.

General benthic habitat types were similar inside and outside MLCDs (Friedlander et al. 2007b) although coral cover tended to be higher inside. Therefore, the focus of this study was to examine trends over time in each of these management regimes. The trends over time tended to be consistent with the level of protection (e.g. MLCD).

Data Analysis

For fish assemblage characteristics, the number of individuals and biomass were $\ln(x+1)$ transformed for statistical analysis. Numbers of individuals were converted to number/m² and biomass was converted to t/ha for comparisons with other studies throughout the state. Comparisons of fish species richness, biomass, and diversity among management strata were conducted using a Nested Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) us-

ing only the habitat types common to all management strata. Significant differences between pairs were examined using the Tukey-Kramer HSD (honestly significant difference) test for ANOVAs ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Species diversity was calculated from the Shannon-Weaver Diversity Index (Ludwig and Reynolds 1988): $H' = -\sum (p_i \ln p_i)$, where p_i is the proportion of all individuals counted that were of species i . An index of relative dominance (IRD) for each fish taxa was created by multiplying the percent frequency of occurrence of the taxa on each transect by the relative percent number of that taxa (Greenfield and Johnson 1990).

Quantifying Seascape Metrics

Bathymetric grids were created from the LiDAR data for each study area by interpolation using Inverse Distance Weighting in ArcGIS Spatial Analyst (ESRI) at a grid cell size of 4 meters. Slope was derived from the gridded (4 m cell size) LiDAR bathymetry using the ArcGIS Spatial Analyst extension, where the raster cell values represented the maximum rate of change in elevation between neighboring cells and were calculated in degrees. Rugosity was derived from the gridded (4 m cell size) LiDAR bathymetry using the 'Benthic Terrain Modeler for ArcGIS', where the raster cell values reflected the ratio of the seascape surface area to the planimetric area determined in a neighborhood analysis (Jenness 2004, Lundblad et al. 2006).




Figure 13. GIS layers used to quantify and characterize the seascape cover were compiled for each site by management regime.

Results



Photo courtesy of Keeki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

HANAUMA BAY MLCD AND SOUTHEAST OAHU

The south shore Oahu study area extended from Waiupe Peninsula to Sand Beach (9.1 km²) and included the Hanauma Bay MLCD (Figure 14).

Sample Allocation

A total of 80 samples were collected in 2004 and 2006, in 2007 and 2008 only hardbottom habitat was sampled (n=59; Table 6). The two levels of sampling stratification included major habitat types (CHB, MAC, UCH and UCS) and fisheries management regime (open access and MLCD). Macroalgae habitat was not present at the 1 acre minimum mapping unit within the MLCD.

Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration

The total seascape area within Hanauma Bay MLCD was 0.41 km², with a perimeter to area ratio of 7.78 and a fractal dimension of 1.47. (Tables 7 and 8). Based on the NOAA Biogeography Branch 2007 benthic habitat maps the habitat diversity, represented by Shannon's diversity index and Shannon's evenness index was 0.85 and 0.62 respectively (Table 7). Bathymetric grids were created from the LiDAR data within Hanauma Bay MLCD that represented an approximate depth range of 0–27.68 m (\bar{x} = 8.55; Table 9 and




Figure 14. Overview of Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and adjacent areas with sampling locations.

Table 6. Sample allocation at Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District by habitat (2004-2008).

	2004	2006	2007	2008	Total
MLCD	33	33	22	22	110
CHB	12	12	12	12	48
UCH	10	10	10	10	40
UCS	11	11			22
Open	47	47	37	37	168
CHB	11	11	11	11	44
MAC	11	11	11	11	44
UCH	15	15	15	15	60
UCS	10	10			20
Total	80	80	59	59	278

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; UCS = Unconsolidated sediment; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae.

Results

Figure 15). Percent slope (ranging from 0-92.18, [\bar{x} =7.89]) and rugosity (ranging from 0-1.45, [\bar{x} =1.01]) were also derived from the bathymetric grids.

Table 7. Summary of seascape metrics derived from 2007 NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps.

Hanauma Bay MLCD*	
Shannon's diversity index	0.85
Shannon's evenness index	0.62
Mean patch fractal dimension	1.47
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.	

Table 8. Summary of marine reserve boundary analysis.

Hanauma Bay MLCD*	
Reserve perimeter (km)	3.19
Reserve area (km ²)	0.41
Perimeter to area ratio	7.78
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.	

Table 9. Summary of seascape structure derived from LIDAR bathymetric grids for Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District.

Hanauma Bay MLCD*					
Depth (m)		Rugosity		Slope (percent)	
Average depth	8.55	Average rugosity	1.01	Average slope	7.89
Standard deviation	6.67	Standard deviation	0.02	Standard deviation	8.58
Depth range	0 – 27.68	Rugosity range	1 – 1.45	Slope range	0 – 92.18
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.					




Figure 15. Aerial imagery of Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas with other panels describing seascape characteristics (e.g. depth, slope, rugosity) derived from bathymetric LiDAR data.

Large-scale Benthic Cover

Benthic coverage for the Hanauma Bay MLCD was derived from the 2007 NOAA benthic habitat maps with the majority (69%) of the geomorphic structure comprised generally of coral reef and hard bottom within the MLCD (Table 10, Figures 16 and 17). The coral reef and hard bottom structure consisted mostly of pavement (34%), aggregated reef (18%) and rock/boulder (15%) with only 2% of individual patch reef. The remaining portion of the MLCD was characterized by sand (22%). Biological cover was dominated by coral, with coral 10%-50% cover (48%) followed by coral 50%-90% cover (7%). The remaining portion of the biological cover in the MLCD consisted of uncolonized bottom (22%), turf (8%) and coralline algae (6%; Table 11, Figures 18 and 19).

Table 10. Geomorphic structure for the Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District (MLCD) derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Structure	Detailed Structure	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral Reef and Hard bottom	Aggregate Reef	0.07	18%
Coral Reef and Hard bottom	Individual Patch Reef	0.01	2%
Coral Reef and Hard bottom	Pavement	0.14	34%
Coral Reef and Hard bottom	Rock/Boulder	0.06	15%
Other Delineations	Land	0.01	2%
Unconsolidated Sediment	Sand	0.09	22%
Unknown	Unknown	0.03	7%

Table 11. Biological cover for the Hanauma Bay MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Cover	Percent Cover	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral	10% - 50%	0.20	48%
Coral	50% - 90%	0.03	7%
Coralline Algae	50% - 90%	0.02	6%
Turf	50% - 90%	0.03	8%
Unclassified		0.01	2%
Uncolonized	90% - 100%	0.09	22%
Unknown		0.03	7%

Results




Figure 16. Sampling locations and benthic structure for the Hanauma Bay Marine Life Conservation District, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.




Figure 17. Sampling locations and benthic structure for the Maunalua Bay study area.

Results




Figure 18. Sampling locations and benthic cover for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.




Figure 19. Sampling locations and benthic cover for the Maunalua Bay study area.

Results

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes

Average coral species richness per transect for colonized hard bottom (CHB) habitat in Hanauma Bay MLCD was slightly greater than the adjacent open area with grand means of 5.77 and 4.39, respectively. Average species richness in CHB habitat in the MLCD ranged from 5.67 (± 0.28) in 2007 to 5.83 (± 0.41) in 2004. This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 4.09 (± 0.25) in 2004 to 4.64 (± 0.62) in 2006 (Table 12 and Figure 20). Spatial patterns in coral richness from 2004-2007 increased overall in shallow water areas of both Maunalua and Hanauma Bays (Figure 20). Coral richness decreased over time for several transects, typically located in shallow water. For a large number of transects inside and outside the MLCD richness did not change. Generally, over time, coral richness increased in both the MLCD and open areas from 2004 to 2007 (Table 12, Figures 21 and 22a). Average coral richness was relatively stable across sampling years for both open CHB and MLCD CHB with the macroalgae (MLCD) being greater across all years sampled. Uncolonized hard bottom (UCH) habitat in both areas generally had greater variability in coral species richness, possibly due to the patchy distribution of coral cover on the hard substrate in these environments. Patterns in coral richness in MAC habitat demonstrated similar variability with overall low values over time compared to the other two major habitats (Figure 22a).

Table 12. Comparison of coral species richness in major habitats and among different management regimes at Hanauma Bay, Oahu.

	2004		2006		2007	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
MLCD						
CHB	5.83	0.41	5.83	0.55	5.67	0.28
UCH	1.30	0.21	2.70	0.62	2.80	0.44
Open						
CHB	4.09	0.25	4.64	0.62	4.36	0.64
MAC	0.09	0.09	0.82	0.63	0.18	0.18
UCH	1.53	0.24	3.00	0.48	2.53	0.54

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes

Average percent coral cover over the sampling period was more than three times greater in Hanauma Bay MLCD (\bar{x} = 18.05) compared to the adjacent area (\bar{x} = 5.65). Average percent coral cover per transect in Hanauma Bay MLCD ranged from 14.50% (± 3.72) in 2004 to 25.20% (± 4.15) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where coral cover ranged from 4.69% (± 1.02) in 2004 to 6.62% (± 1.57) in 2007 (Figure 23). Patterns of percent change of coral cover per transects between 2004-2007 generally increases in Hanauma Bay MLCD while only increasing slightly or staying the same in Maunalua Bay (Figure 24). Temporal patterns in percent coral cover are generally consistent over the sampling period, with the greatest values consistently found within CHB habitat inside the MLCD in all three years (Figure 22b).

Average percent macroalgal cover over the sampling period was greater in the open area (\bar{x} = 35.48) compared to the MLCD (\bar{x} = 4.36). Average percent macroalgal cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 1.55% (± 0.39) in 2004 to 4.36% (± 0.75) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where macroalgal cover ranged from 16.68% (± 3.29) in 2004 to 35.48% (± 4.14) in 2007 (Figure 25). Patterns of percent change of macroalgae cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general increase in Manualua Bay with small or no increases in Hanauma Bay (Figure 26). Temporal patterns in percent macroalgae cover show increases in the open MAC but decreases in open UCH habitat across the study site (Figure 22c). Macroalgae cover in the MLCD showed small increases across all years in both the CHB and UCH habitat types.




Figure 20. Coral species richness by individual transects for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2007. Classification based on natural breaks.

Results




Figure 21. Change in coral species richness from 2004-2007 for the Hanauma Bay MLCDA, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.




Figure 22. Temporal change in benthic communities at Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunaloa Bay and other adjacent open areas by habitat type from 2004-2007. (a) Mean species richness by year (b) Mean percent cover of coral (c) Mean percent cover of macroalgae (d) Mean percent cover of turf algae.

Average percent turf cover over the sampling period was greater in Hanauma Bay MLCD (\bar{x} = 33.72) compared to the adjacent open area (\bar{x} = 27.54). Average percent turf cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 26.64% (± 4.33) in 2006 to 38.93% (± 5.61) in 2004. This compared to the adjacent open area where turf cover ranged from 15.56% (± 2.66) in 2006 to 42.03% (± 4.82) in 2004 (Figure 27). Patterns of percent change of turf cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general decrease in cover in Maunaloa Bay with small decreases in Hanauma Bay. A few transects both inside and outside the MLCD had increases in turf cover (Figure 28). Temporal patterns in percent turf cover show overall decreases in all management regimes and habitat types from 2004-2006. Turf algae is generally much greater in Maunaloa Bay compared to Hanauma Bay MLCD across all years sampled (Figure 22d).

Results




Figure 23. Mean percent coral cover by individual transects for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2007. Classification based on natural breaks.




Figure 24. Change in mean coral cover from 2004-2007 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunaloa Bay and other adjacent open areas.

Results




Figure 25. Mean percent macroalgal cover by individual transects for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2007. Classification based on breaks.




Figure 26. Change in mean macroalgal cover from 2004-2007 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.

Results




Figure 27. Mean percent turf algal cover by individual transects for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2007.




Figure 28. Change in mean turf algal cover from 2004-2007 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.

Results

Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes

Average fish species richness per transect in Hanauma Bay MLCD ranged from 16.91 (± 5.08) in 2008 to 19.45 (± 5.21) in 2004 (Figure 29). This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 6.84 (± 6.06) in 2008 to 9.30 (± 8.24) in 2006. Richness averaged 2.54 (± 4.54) fewer species in the MLCD between 2004 and 2008 while richness declined by 1.16 (± 5.04) species on average in the open area during this same time period (Figure 30). The lowest overall richness was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 2.68 \pm 0.54$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 19.10 \pm 1.73$). These trends remained consistent over the five year study period (Figure 31a).




Figure 29. Fish species richness by individual transect for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2008. Classification based on natural breaks.




Figure 30. Change in fish species richness from 2004-2008 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.

Results




Figure 31. Temporal change in fish assemblages at Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Species Richness (b) Numerical Abundance (c) Biomass (d) Diversity.

Average number of individuals m^{-2} in the MLCD ranged from a high of $0.69 (\pm 0.33)$ in 2004 to a low of $0.50 (\pm 0.27)$ in 2007 (Figure 32). The highest average number of individuals per m^2 in the open area was recorded in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 0.38 \pm 0.54$) and the lowest occurred in 2008 ($\bar{x} = 0.18 \pm 0.27$). Average number of individuals declined by $0.17 m^{-2} (\pm 0.32)$ in the MLCD and $0.05 (\pm 0.27)$ in the open area between 2004 and 2008 (Figure 33). The lowest overall numerical abundance was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.08 \pm 0.01$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.69 \pm 0.11$). Trends were fairly consistent over time except for an increase in open CHB in 2006 due to the presence of several large schools (50-200+) of blackfin chromis (*Chromis vanderbilti*; Figure 31b).

Biomass ($t ha^{-1}$) in the MLCD ranged from $0.82 (\pm 0.50)$ in 2007 to $0.95 (\pm 0.81)$ in 2004 (Figure 34). In contrast, biomass in the open area was lowest in 2004 ($\bar{x} = 0.11 \pm 0.14$) and highest in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 0.17 \pm 0.29$). Between 2004 and 2008, biomass in the MLCD declined by $0.05 (\pm 0.68)$ and increased by approximately the same amount in the open area ($\bar{x} = 0.05 \pm 0.30$; Figure 35). Biomass was lowest in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.02 \pm 0.01$) and highest in the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.89 \pm 0.20$). Within the open area, biomass varied little among years while both UCH and CHB habitats within the MLCD tended to vary inversely with one another (Figure 31c).




Figure 32. Fish abundance by individual transect for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2008. Classification based on natural breaks.

Diversity varied little among years and between management strata. The highest diversity within the MLCD was observed in 2004 ($\bar{x} = 2.26 \pm 0.34$) and lowest in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 2.22 \pm 0.42$; Figure 36). In the open area, diversity ranged from 1.26 (± 0.82) in 2008 to 1.40 (± 0.69) in 2004. Diversity decreased by 0.03 (± 0.35) in the MLCD and 0.13 (± 0.59) in the open area between 2004 and 2008 (Figure 37). These trends remained consistent over the five year study period (Figure 31d).

Results




Figure 33. Change in fish abundance from 2004-2008 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas.




Figure 34. Fish biomass by individual transect for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2008. Classification based on natural breaks.

Results




Figure 35. Change in fish biomass from 2004-2008 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunaloa Bay and other adjacent open areas.




Figure 36. Fish diversity by individual transect for southeast Oahu study area including Hanauma Bay, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas from 2004-2008. Classification based on natural breaks.

Results




Figure 37. Change in fish diversity from 2004-2008 for the Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunaulua Bay and other adjacent open areas.

Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats

Overall, apex predators accounted for 0.9% of the numerical abundance in Hanauma Bay MLCD yet they were more than 23 times more abundance than in the adjacent open area where they only accounted for 0.08% of the individuals in that location. Numbers of apex predators were lower in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.004 \pm 0.006$) compared with the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.006 \pm 0.016$) but they were much more variable in this habitat (Figure 38a). Apex predators accounted for 11.4% of the total biomass in the MLCD but 0.3% in the open area. The difference in biomass of apex predators between the MLCD and open areas was more than 220%. Apex predator biomass was highest in the MLCD UCH and values in 2006 were more than fivefold higher than the average of the other three years in that habitat due to the presence of several schools of large (55-65 cm) bluefin trevally (*Caranx melampygus*; Figure 39a).

Benthic carnivores comprised 33% of the numerical abundance in the MLCD and 49% in the open area although density was 1.5 times higher in the MLCD. Numbers of benthic carnivores were similar between the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.24 \pm 0.14$) and the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.26 \pm 0.18$) habitat types. Little variation was observed in benthic carnivore numerical abundance among habitat types or management strata over time (Figure 38b). Benthic carnivores comprised 19% of the biomass in the MLCD and 52% in the open area. Despite this difference, biomass of benthic carnivores was more than two times higher in the MLCD. The highest biomass of benthic carnivores was observed in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.21 \pm 0.25$) and the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.18 \pm 0.32$) habitat types. High biomass of benthic carnivores in the MLCD CHB in 2004 was due to schools of yellowfin goatfishes (*Mulloidichthys vanicolensis*) and bonefish (*Albula glossodonta*). Large schools of yellowstripe goatfishes (*M. flavolineatus*) accounted for the high biomass in the open CHB in 2007 and 2008 (Figure 39b).

Planktivores accounted for 9% of the numerical density in the MLCD and 26% in the open area with density about 34% higher in the open area. Planktivore density was highest in the open CHB habitat ($\bar{x} = 0.19 \pm 0.36$) and ranged from a high of 0.39 (± 0.54) to a low of 0.04 (± 0.08) in 2008 (Figure 38c). The high value in 2006 was associated with large schools of blackfin chromis. Planktivores comprised 10% of the biomass in the open area, which was 68% higher than their biomass in the MLCD where they comprised 3% of the total biomass. High biomass of planktivores in the MLCD in 2004 resulted from high abundance of the endemic Hawaiian sergeant (*Abudefduf abdominalis*; Figure 39c).

Herbivores were the most conspicuous trophic group by number in the MLCD accounting for 58% of total abundance. In the open area, this trophic group was five times less abundance compared with the MLCD and comprised 25% of total numerical density in this management stratum. The highest densities were in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.36 \pm 0.30$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.29 \pm 0.15$) habitats and showed little variation among years (Figure 38d). Herbivores comprised 67% of the biomass in the MLCD and had 11 times greater biomass than the open area where herbivores accounted for 37% of the biomass. The highest densities of herbivores were in the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.63 \pm 0.39$) and CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.60 \pm 0.66$) habitats and showed little variation among years (Figure 39d).

Results




Figure 38. Temporal change in fish abundance by trophic level at Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.




Figure 39. Temporal change in fish biomass by trophic level at Hanauma Bay MLCD, Maunalua Bay and other adjacent open areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.

PUPUKEA MLCD AND NORTH SHORE OAHU

The north shore Oahu study area extended from Sunset Beach to Kawaiiloa Beach (ca. 6.5 km²) and included the Pupukea MLCD (Figure 40).

Sample Allocation

A total of 80 samples were collected in 2004 and 2006, in 2007 and 2008 only hardbottom habitat was sampled (n=51; Figure 41 and Table 13). The two levels of sampling stratification included major habitat types (CHB, MAC, UCH and sand) and fisheries management regime (open access and MLCD). Macroalgae habitat was not present at the one-acre minimum mapping unit within the MLCD, and CHB habitat was likewise not present in the open area at the one-acre minimum mapping unit.




Figure 40. Overview of Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas with sampling locations.




Figure 41. Sampling locations and benthic structure for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Table 13. Sample allocation at Pupukea MLCD by habitat (2002-2008).

	MLCD	CHB	UCH	UCS	Open	MAC	UCH	UCS	Total
2003	35	9	15	11	38	12	15	11	73
2006	35	9	15	11	38	12	15	11	73
2007	24	9	15		27	12	15		51
2008	24	9	15		27	12	15		51
Total	118	36	60	22	130	48	60	22	

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; UCS = Unconsolidated sediment; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae.

Results

Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration

The total seascape area within the Pupukeya MLCD was 0.11 km² in 1983 and was expanded to 0.71 km² in 2003, with the perimeter to area ratio decreasing from 27.9 to 7.34 and the fractal dimension also increasing from 1.35 to 1.79. (Tables 14 and 15, Figure 42). Based on the NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps the habitat diversity, represented by Shannon's diversity index and Shannon's evenness index was 0.91 and 0.65 respectively in 1983 and 1.45 and 0.81 respectively in 2003 (Table 14). Bathymetric grids were created from the LiDAR data within Hanauma Bay MLCD that represented an approximate depth range of 0 – 12.07 meters (\bar{x} = 3.59) in 1983 and increased to include a depth range up to 16.98 (\bar{x} = 8.09) in 2003. The average slope (\bar{x} = 8.55) and average rugosity (\bar{x} = 1.02) both increased slightly between the 1983 and 2003 boundary respectively (Table 16 and Figure 43).

Table 14. Summary of seascape metrics derived from 2007 NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps.

	1983 Boundary MLCD*	2003 Boundary MLCD*
Shannon's diversity index	0.91	1.45
Shannon's evenness index	0.65	0.81
Mean patch fractal dimension	1.35	1.79

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.

Table 15. Summary of marine reserve boundary analysis for Pupukeya MLCD.

	1983 Boundary MLCD*	2003 Boundary MLCD*
Reserve perimeter (km)	2.97	5.21
Reserve area (km ²)	0.11	0.71
Perimeter to area ratio	27.9	7.34

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.




Figure 42. Aerial imagery of Pupukeya MLCD with original (1983) and extended boundaries (2000).

Table 16. Summary of seascape structure derived from LiDAR bathymetric grids for Pupukeya MLCD.

	Depth			Rugosity			Slope (percent)		
	Average	Standard deviation	Depth range	Average	Standard deviation	Rugosity range	Average	Standard deviation	Deviation range
1983 Boundary MLCD*	3.59	2.62	0-12.07	1.02	0.04	1-1.52	8.55	9.65	0.02-94.04
2003 Boundary MLCD*	8.09	4.23	0-16.98	1.02	0.04	1-1.52	9.28	10.63	0.01 - 94.04

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.




Figure 43. Aerial imagery of Pupukeya and surrounding study region with other panels describing seascape characteristics (e.g. depth, slope, rugosity) derived from bathymetric LiDAR data.

Results

Evaluation of MLCD Boundary Expansion Using a Seascape Perspective

The total area within the Pupukea MLCD increased by 646% after the expansion of the boundaries (Table 15). Prior to expansion, the MLCD was dominated by rock/boulder habitat (74%). After boundary expansion, the geomorphic structure consisted of a mix of pavement (37%), sand (33%) and rock/boulder (26%). Before expansion the biological cover was dominated by macroalgae (63%), followed by uncolonized hard bottom (24%), and turf algae (11%; Figure 44). Following expansion, the biological cover consisted of a mixture of uncolonized hard bottom (33%), macroalgae (25%), turf algae (25%) and coral (12%; Figure 44). Habitat diversity and evenness increased by 59% and 25%, respectively, after boundary expansion. The mean perimeter-area ratio among habitat polygons increased by 24% and the mean patch fractal dimension increased by 33%. The total perimeter-area ratio decreased by 66%.




Figure 44: Sampling locations and benthic cover for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Large-scale Benthic Cover

Benthic coverage for the Pupukeya MLCD was derived from the NOAA benthic habitat maps with coral reef and hard bottom major structure accounting for 64% of the total habitat within the MLCD, followed by unconsolidated sediment (33%). The coral reef and hard bottom structure consisted mostly of pavement (37%), rock/boulder (26%), and with only 1% of scattered coral and rock. The remaining portion of the MLCD was characterized by sand (33%; Table 17). Biological cover was dominated by macroalgae 10-50% (26%). The remaining portion of the biological cover in the MLCD consisted of uncolonized (33%) and turf (26%; Table 18).

Table 17. Geomorphic structure for the Pupukeya MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Structure	Detailed Structure	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral Reef and Hardbottom	Pavement	0.26	37%
Coral Reef and Hardbottom	Rock/Boulder	0.18	26%
Coral Reef and Hardbottom	Scattered Coral/Rock	0.00	<1%
Other Delineations	Land	0.03	4%
Unconsolidated Sediment	Sand	0.24	33%
Unknown	Unknown	0.00	<1%

Table 18. Biological cover for the Pupukeya MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Cover	Percent Cover	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral	10% - 50%	0.09	12%
Macroalgae	10% - 50%	0.18	26%
Turf	10% - 50%	0.003	<1%
Turf	50% - 90%	0.18	25%
Unclassified		0.03	4%
Uncolonized	90%-100%	0.24	33%
Unknown	Unknown	0.002	<1%

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes

Average coral species richness per transect in Pupukeya MLCD was 1.6 times greater than the adjacent open area with a grand mean of 4.45(± 0.43) and 2.79 (± 0.49), respectively. Average species richness in CHB habitat in the MLCD ranged from 4.56 (± 0.50) in 2003 to 5.89 (± 0.35) in 2006 (Table 19). Patterns in coral richness from 2003-2007 increased slightly inside and outside of the MLCD (Figure 45). Patterns of change over time among management and habitat regimes were generally consistent over time with coral richness in the MLCD CHB habitat being the greatest overall, with all categories increasing in 2006. CHB habitat was not present outside of the MLCD (Figure 46). Coral richness outside of the MLCD was nearly equal among habitats in 2003 and 2006, although richness was slightly greater in the UCH habitat compared to the MAC habitat in 2007 (Figure 47a).

Table 19. Comparison of coral species richness in major habitats and among different management regimes at Pupukeya MLCD.

	2003		2006		2007	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
MLCD						
CHB	4.56	0.50	5.89	0.35	4.56	0.50
UCH	2.60	0.38	5.47	0.39	3.67	0.46
Open						
MAC	1.83	0.32	3.67	0.51	2.42	0.50
UCH	1.87	0.46	3.47	0.53	3.53	0.60

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae.

Results




Figure 45. Coral species richness by individual transects for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukeya Bay MLCD from 2003-2007.




Figure 46. Change in coral species richness from 2003-2007 for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 47. Temporal change in benthic communities at Pupukea MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2003-2007. (a) Mean species richness by year (b) Mean percent cover of coral (c) Mean percent cover of macroalgae (d) Mean percent cover of turf algae.

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes

Average percent coral cover over the sampling period was greater in Pupukea MLCD ($\bar{x} = 10.21$) compared to the adjacent area ($\bar{x} = 7.09$). Average percent coral cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 6.24% (± 1.30) in 2003 to 12.64% (± 1.79) in 2006. This compared to the adjacent open area where coral cover ranged from 3.26% (± 0.71) in 2003 to 9.95% (± 1.58) in 2007 (Figure 48). Patterns of percent change of coral cover on transects between 2004-2007 show an overall increase both inside Pupukea MLCD and in the adjacent open areas (Figure 49). Patterns of change among management and habitat regimes were generally consistent over time with MLCD CHB covering the greatest percentage in all years (Figure 47b).

Average percent macroalgal cover over the sampling period was greater in the open area ($\bar{x} = 6.32$) compared to the MLCD ($\bar{x} = 2.94$). Average percent macroalgal cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 1.55% (± 0.30) in 2003 to 5.97% (± 1.15) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where cover ranged from 5.66% (± 1.13) in 2006 to 7.11% (± 1.25) in 2007 (Figure 50). Patterns of percent change of macroalgal cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general increase to the north of Pupukea MLCD in hard bottom habitat with small decreases in adjacent open areas (Figure 51). Macroalgae is generally much greater in the open areas compared the MLCD, and higher on hard bottom habitats when examined over time among management and habitat regimes. Macroalgal cover is similar for both habitat types in the MLCD and follow consistent trends over time (Figure 47c).




Figure 48. Mean percent coral cover by individual transects for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukeya MLCD from 2003-2007.

Average percent turf cover over the sampling period was slightly greater in the open area (\bar{x} =47.74) compared to the MLCD (\bar{x} =43.00). Average percent turf cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 30.70% (\pm 4.01) in 2006 to 59.10% (\pm 2.03) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where cover ranged from 37.92% (\pm 4.38) in 2006 to 54.43% (\pm 2.62) in 2007 (Figure 52). Spatial patterns of percent change of turf cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general decrease in turf cover inside and outside of the MLCD (Figure 53). Patterns of change over time among management and habitat regimes were generally consistent over time with all categories being relatively similar and decreasing slightly over the sampling period (Figure 47d).

Results




Figure 49. Change in mean coral cover from 2003-2007 for the Pupukeya MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 50. Mean percent macroalgal cover by individual transects for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukea MLCD from 2003-2007.

Results




Figure 51. Change in mean macroalgal cover from 2003-2007 for the Pupkea MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 52. Mean percent turf algal cover by individual transects for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukea MLCD from 2004-2007.

Results




Figure 53. Change in mean turf algae cover from 2003-2007 for the Pupkea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes

Average fish species richness per transect in Pupukea MLCD ranged from 19.96 (± 5.45) in 2007 to 21.33 (± 5.58) in 2003 (Figure 54). This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 14.51 (± 6.22) in 2007 to 15.89 (± 6.28) in 2003. Richness averaged 3.04 (± 7.23) fewer species in the MLCD between 2003 and 2008 while richness declined by 0.96 (± 6.43) species on average in the open area during this same time period (Figure 55). The lowest overall richness was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 13.94 \pm 1.04$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 22.56 \pm 2.54$). Richness remained consistent over the six year study period within the open area and declined slightly in the MLCD (Figure 56a).




Figure 54. Fish species richness by individual transect for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukea from 2003-2008.

Results




Figure 55. Change in fish species richness from 2003-2008 for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 56. Temporal change in fish assemblages at Pupukea MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2003-2008. (a) Species Richness (b) Numerical Abundance (c) Biomass (d) Diversity.

Average number of individuals m² in the MLCD ranged from 0.75 (± 0.45) in 2007 to 1.18 (± 0.53) in 2006 (Figure 57). The highest average number of individuals per m² in the open area was recorded in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 0.73 \pm 0.43$) and the lowest occurred in 2007 ($\bar{x} = 0.56 \pm 0.39$). Average number of individuals increased by 0.28 m⁻² (± 0.62) in the MLCD and 0.08 (± 0.52) in the open area between 2003 and 2008 (Figure 58). The lowest overall numerical abundance was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.57 \pm 0.08$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 1.08 \pm 0.22$). Trends were fairly consistent over time except for a large decrease across all habitat types in 2007 due to a reduced number of small planktivores during that year, primarily blackfin chromis and oval chromis (*Chromis ovalis*; Figure 56b).

Biomass (t ha⁻¹) in the MLCD ranged from 0.75 (± 0.54) in 2003 to 0.86 (± 0.62) in 2008 (Figure 59). In the open area, biomass was lowest in 2008 ($\bar{x} = 0.18 \pm 0.18$) and highest in 2007 ($\bar{x} = 0.27 \pm 0.39$). Between 2003 and 2008, biomass in the MLCD increased by 0.11 (± 0.57) but decreased in the open area ($= 0.07 \pm 0.40$) during that same time period (Figure 60). Biomass was lowest in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.18 \pm 0.05$) and highest in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.81 \pm 0.10$). Within the open area, biomass declined within UCH and varied little within MAC (Figure 56c). In the MLCD, the increase in biomass was most pronounced in CHB.

The highest diversity within the MLCD was observed in 2003 ($\bar{x} = 2.41 \pm 0.40$) and lowest in 2008 ($\bar{x} = 1.92 \pm 0.48$; Figure 61). In the open area, diversity ranged from 1.90 (± 0.44) in 2008 to 2.16 (± 0.41) in 2003. Diversity decreased by 0.49 (± 0.45) in the MLCD and 0.26 (± 0.51) in the open area between 2003 and 2008 (Figure 62). Diversity declined sharply between 2003 and 2006 across all habitat types and management strata (Figure 56d).

Results




Figure 57. Fish abundance by individual transect for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukea from 2003-2008.




Figure 58. Change in fish abundance from 2003-2008 for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 59. Fish biomass by individual transect for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukeya from 2003-2008.




Figure 60. Change in fish biomass from 2003-2008 for the Pupukea MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 61. Fish diversity by individual transect for north shore Oahu study area including Pupukeya from 2003-2008.




Figure 62. Change in fish diversity from 2003-2008 for the Pupukeya MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results

Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats

Apex predators accounted for only 0.2% of the numerical abundance in Pupukea MLCD but were 3.3 times more abundance than in the adjacent open area where they accounted for 0.1% of the individuals in that location. Numbers of apex predators were low overall and varied greatly without trend among the management and habitat strata (Figure 63a). Apex predators accounted for 1.8% of the total biomass in the MLCD and 3.1% in the open area yet they comprised more than twice as much total biomass in the MLCD compared with the open area. Apex predator biomass was similar in the MLCD Open UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.014 \pm 0.050$) and CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.014 \pm 0.028$) habitats with slightly lower biomass in the open UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.012 \pm 0.062$). High biomass in 2007 in the MLCD and UCH habitats was associated with bluefin trevally (*Caranx melampygus*; Figure 64a).

Benthic carnivores comprised 30% of the numerical abundance in the MLCD and 48% in the open area with densities nearly equal. Numbers of benthic carnivores were similar among habitat and management combinations. Abundance declined across all strata from 2006 to 2007 but increased again in 2008 (Figure 63b). Benthic carnivores comprised 24% of the biomass in the MLCD and 43% in the open area. Biomass of benthic carnivores was nearly twice as high in the MLCD compared to the open area. The highest biomass of benthic carnivores was observed in the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.22 \pm 0.22$) and this trend was consistent over time (Figure 64b). The other strata fluctuated without trend over the study period.

Planktivores accounted for 47% of the numerical density in the MLCD and 33% in the open area with density more than two times higher in the MLCD. Planktivore density was highest in the MLCD CHB habitat ($\bar{x} = 0.53 \pm 0.52$) and MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.46 \pm 0.51$) habitats. Abundance across all strata (except open MAC) declined from 2006 to 2007 but increased again in 2008 (Figure 63c). Planktivores comprised 5% of the biomass in the MLCD and 6% in the open area although biomass was nearly three times higher in the MLCD. Planktivore biomass varied without trend among management and habitat strata (Figure 64c).

Herbivores accounted for 23% of total numerical abundance in the MLCD and 19% in the open area. Herbivore biomass was more than two times higher in the MLCD compared to the open area. The highest densities were in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.26 \pm 0.12$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.23 \pm 0.18$) habitats and showed modest declines over time (Figure 63d). Herbivores comprised 70% of the biomass in the MLCD and had five times greater biomass than the open area where herbivores accounted for 48% of the biomass. The highest densities were in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.63 \pm 0.55$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.52 \pm 0.52$) habitats and showed a modest increase over time (Figure 64d). Most of this increase was due to the increase in number and size of the ember parrotfish (*Scarus rubroviolaceus*).




Figure 63. Temporal change in fish abundance by trophic level at Pupukea MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.




Figure 64. Temporal change in fish biomass by trophic level at Pupukea MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.

Results

HONOLUA-MOKULEIA MLCD AND WEST MAUI

The west Maui study area extended from Kapalua Bay north to Honolua Bay (ca. 6.2 km²) and included the Honolua-Mokuleia Bays MLCD (Figure 65).

Sample Allocation

A total of 80 samples were collected in 2004 and 2006, in 2007 and 2008 only hardbottom habitat was sampled (n=75; Figure 66 and Table 20). The two levels of sampling stratification included major habitat types (CHB, MAC, UCH and unconsolidated sediment [UCS]) and fisheries management regime (open access and MLCD). Macroalgae habitat was not present at the one-acre minimum mapping unit within the MLCD.




Figure 65. Overview of Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas with sampling locations.




Figure 66. Sampling locations and benthic structure for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas.

Table 20. Sample allocation at Honolua-Mokuleia Bay MLCD by habitat (2002-2008).

	MLCD	CHB	UCH	UCS	Open	CHB	MAC	UCH	UCS	Total
2003	37	15	12	10	63	13	12	23	15	100
2006	37	15	12	10	63	13	12	23	15	100
2007	27	15	12		48	13	12	23		75
2008	27	15	12		48	13	12	23		75
Total	128	60	48	20	222	52	48	92	30	

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; UCS = Unconsolidated sediment; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae.

Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape and MLCD Configuration

The total seascape area within Honolua Bay was 0.11 km² and 0.08 km² in Mokuleia Bay, with a perimeter to area ratio of 12.23 and 16.79, respectively, with an overall mean fractal dimension of 1.43 (Tables 21). Based on the 2007 NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps the habitat diversity in Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD, represented by Shannon's diversity index and Shannon's evenness index was 0.83 and 0.76 respectively (Table 22). Bathymetric grids were created from the LiDAR data within Mokuleia Bay MLCD that represented an approximate depth range of 0 – 22.82 meters (\bar{x} = 4.27; Table 23 and Figure 67). Percent slope (ranging from 0 – 226.43, \bar{x} = 6.08) and rugosity (ranging from 0 – 2.79, \bar{x} = 1.01) were also derived from the bathymetric grids. Bathymetric grids within Honolua Bay MLCD represented an approximate depth range of 0 – 14.01 meters (\bar{x} = 5.27; Table 23 and Figure 67). Percent slope (ranging from 0 – 226.43, \bar{x} = 6.99) and rugosity (ranging from 0 – 2.79, \bar{x} = 1.01) were also derived from the bathymetric grids.

Large-scale Benthic Cover

Geomorphic structure for Honolua-Mokuleia Bay MLCD, derived from the NOAA benthic habitat maps, was characterized by sand (36%) with the hard-bottom areas dominated by pavement (29%) and rock/boulder structure (17%; Table 24). Biological cover in the MLCD consisted primarily of uncolonized volcanic rock 90-100% (36%), followed by turf 50-90% (35%) and coral 50-90% (11%; Table 25).

Table 21. Summary of seascape metrics derived from 2007 NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps.

Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD*	
Shannon's diversity index	0.83
Shannon's evenness index	0.76
Mean patch fractal dimension	1.43

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.

Table 22. Summary of marine reserve boundary analysis for Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD.

	Honolua Bay MLCD*	Mokuleia Bay MLCD*
Reserve perimeter (km)	1.30	1.26
Reserve area (km ²)	0.11	0.08
Perimeter to area ratio	12.23	16.79

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.

Table 23. Summary of seascape structure derived from LiDAR bathymetric grids for Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD.

	Honolua Bay MLCD*	Mokuleia Bay MLCD*
Depth (m)		
Average	5.27	4.27
Standard deviation	3.56	2.18
Depth range	0-14.01	0 – 22.82
Rugosity		
Average rugosity	1.00	1.01
Standard deviation	0.03	0.07
Rugosity range	0 – 1.36	0 – 2.79
Slope (percent)		
Average slope	6.99	6.08
Standard deviation	8.83	10.20
Slope range	0 – 81.01	0 – 226.43

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.

Table 24. Geomorphic structure for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Structure	Detailed Structure	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral Reef & Hard bottom	Aggregate Reef	0.02	10%
Coral Reef & Hard bottom	Pavement	0.05	27%
Coral Reef & Hard bottom	Pavement with Sand Channels	0.01	5%
Coral Reef & Hard bottom	Rock/Boulder	0.03	17%
Other Delineations	Land	0.01	5%
Unconsolidated Sediment	Sand	0.06	36%

Results

Table 25. Biological cover for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Cover	Percent Cover	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral	10% - 50%	0.01	8%
Coral	50% - 90%	0.02	11%
Turf	10% - 50%	0.01	5%
Turf	50% - 90%	0.06	35%
Unclassified		0.01	5%
Uncolonized	90%-100%	0.06	36%




Figure 67. Aerial imagery of Honolua-Mokuleia Bay MLCD and surrounding study region with other panels describing seascape characteristics (e.g. depth, slope, rugosity) derived from bathymetric LiDAR data.

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes

Average coral species richness per transect for CHB Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD was greater than the adjacent open area with a grand mean of 4.51 and 2.29, respectively (Table 26). Average species richness in CHB habitat in the MLCD ranged from 5.53 (\pm 0.29) in 2002 to 6.13 (\pm 0.49) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 3.38 (\pm 0.55) in 2006 to 4.77 (\pm 0.39) in 2007 (Figure 68). Overall, patterns of change in coral richness from 2002-2007 were variable, with relatively small increases to the south of the MLCD, and comparatively larger increases inside the MLCD

(Figure 69). Average coral richness over time was generally stable among management regimes and habitat types. Coral cover in the MLCD CHB was consistently greater than the other strata. Coral richness increased slightly from 2006-2007 across the study area (Figure 70a).

Table 26. Comparison of coral species richness in major habitats and among different management regimes at Honolua-Mokuleia Bay, Maui.

	2002		2006		2007	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
MLCD						
CHB	5.53	0.29	5.67	0.36	6.13	0.49
UCH	2.75	0.35	3.42	0.45	3.58	0.58
Open						
CHB	3.92	0.31	3.38	0.55	4.77	0.39
MAC	0.42	0.23	0.50	0.26	0.75	0.41
UCH	2.13	0.35	1.96	0.34	2.74	0.36

* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; Open = Area open to resource extraction; MAC = Macroalgae.

Results




Figure 68. Coral species richness by individual transects for west Maui study area including Honolulu-Mokuleia MLCD from 2002-2007.




Figure 69. Change in coral species richness from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 70. Temporal change in benthic communities at Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2002-2007. (a) Mean species richness by year (b) Mean percent cover of coral (c) Mean percent cover of macroalgae (d) Mean percent cover of turf algae.

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes

Average percent coral cover over the sampling period was about two times greater in Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD (\bar{x} = 15.98) compared to the adjacent area (\bar{x} = 8.09). Average percent coral cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 11.70% (\pm 2.15) in 2002 to 22.37% (\pm 3.07) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where coral cover ranged from 5.21% (\pm 0.98) in 2006 to 12.57% (\pm 2.26) in 2007 (Figure 71). Patterns of change in coral richness between 2002 and 2007 generally increased inside the MLCD, with a few transects decreasing over time. The areas adjacent to the MLCD followed similar trends with areas of increase, as well as decrease over the study period (Figure 72). Temporal patterns in percent coral cover across all management regimes and habitat types generally followed similar trends with the exception of open CHB which decreased slightly in 2006 and then increased again 2007 (Figure 70b).

Average percent macroalgal cover over the sampling period was about two times greater in the open area (\bar{x} = 14.14) compared to the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD (\bar{x} = 7.37). Average percent macroalgal cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 6.05% (\pm 1.36) in 2006 to 8.93% (\pm 1.82) in 2002. This compared to the adjacent open area where macroalgae cover ranged from 12.58% (\pm 1.62) in 2002 to 17.60% (\pm 2.25) in 2007 (Figure 73). Patterns of change in macroalgal cover between 2002 and 2007 generally decreased throughout the study area with the exception of transects furthest to the south which showed relatively large increases over the sampling period. Macroalgal cover decreased in most hard bottom habitats in the open access areas, and in several adjacent open areas in deeper sea grass bed habitats (Figure 74). Temporal patterns in percent macroalgae cover show increases in the open MAC habitat in all years sampled with the largest increase in 2007. Patterns across all habitats and sampling regimes indicate macroalgae is generally much greater in the open areas compared the MLCD, and higher on hard bottom habitats (Figure 70c).





Figure 71. Mean percent coral cover by individual transects for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD from 2002-2007.

Results






Figure 73. Mean percent macroalgal cover by individual transects for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD from 2002-2007.

Results




Figure 74. Change in mean percent macroalgal cover from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia and adjacent areas.

Results

Average percent turf cover over the sampling period was about the same in the open area (\bar{x} = 37.19) compared to the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD (\bar{x} = 39.99). Average percent turf cover per transect in the MLCD ranged from 32.80% (\pm 3.76) in 2006 to 48.74% (\pm 2.86) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where turf cover ranged from 32.01% (\pm 3.12) in 2006 to 42.67% (\pm 2.52) in 2007 (Figure 75). Patterns of percent change of turf algae cover on transects between 2004-2007 show an overall decrease in turf algae cover throughout the study site with particular areas both inside and outside of the MLCD demonstrating increases in turf cover (Figure 76). Temporal patterns in percent turf cover were consistent among all management regimes and habitat types with slight decreases from 2004-2006, and a slight increases from 2006-2007. Open MAC habitat consistently had the lowest percentage of turf cover, while the other categories were similar (Figure 70d).





Figure 75. Mean percent turf algal cover by individual transects for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD from 2002-2007.

Results



Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes

Average species richness per transect in Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD ranged from 19.18 (± 3.89) in 2007 to 22.78 (± 6.18) in 2002 (Figure 77). This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 11.94 (± 6.66) in 2007 to 14.19 (± 8.36) in 2003. Richness declined by 3.59 (± 7.52) species in the MLCD between 2002 and 2007 while richness declined by 2.25 (± 8.08) species on average in the open area during this same time period (Figure 78). The lowest overall richness was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 6.44 \pm 0.91$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 21.78 \pm 2.78$). The decline in richness was most pronounced in the MLCD CHB (Figure 79a).




Figure 77. Fish species richness by individual transect for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia from 2002-2007.

Results




Figure 78. Change in fish species richness from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 79. Temporal change in fish assemblages at Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2002-2007. (a) Species Richness (b) Numerical Abundance (c) Biomass (d) Diversity.

Average number of individuals per m² in the MLCD ranged from 1.07 (± 0.64) in 2006 to 1.20 (± 0.65) in 2002 (Figure 80). The highest average number of individuals per m² in the open area was recorded in 2002 ($\bar{x} = 0.61 \pm 0.56$) and the lowest occurred in 2007 ($\bar{x} = 0.48 \pm 0.45$). Average number of individuals decreased by 0.05 m⁻² (± 0.86) in the MLCD and 0.12 (± 0.48) in the open area between 2002 and 2007 (Figure 81). The lowest overall numerical abundance was observed in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.16 \pm 0.03$) and the highest was in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 1.33 \pm 0.17$). Trends were fairly consistent over time and habitat types except for a slight decline in 2007 in open UCH and CHB (Figure 79b).

Biomass (t ha⁻¹) in the MLCD ranged from 0.88 (± 0.79) in 2006 to 1.06 (± 0.80) in 2007 (Figure 82). In the open area, biomass was lowest in 2002 ($\bar{x} = 0.21 \pm 0.22$) and highest in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 0.26 \pm 0.36$). Between 2002 and 2007, biomass in the MLCD increased by 0.05 (± 1.16) and ($\bar{x} = 0.03 \pm 0.37$) in the open area during that same time period (Figure 83). Biomass was lowest in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 0.11 \pm 0.04$) and highest in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 1.02 \pm 0.15$). Within the open area, biomass varied little (Figure 79c). In the MLCD, biomass increased sharply in the UCH between 2006 and 2007.

The highest diversity within the MLCD was observed in 2002 ($\bar{x} = 2.32 \pm 0.35$) and lowest in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 2.02 \pm 0.49$; Figure 84). In the open area, diversity ranged from 1.77 (± 0.50) in 2006 to 1.92 (± 0.55) in 2002. Diversity decreased by 0.25 (± 0.45) in the MLCD and 0.07 (± 0.58) in the open area between 2002 and 2007 (Figure 85). Diversity was lowest in the open MAC ($\bar{x} = 1.43 \pm 0.08$) and highest in the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 2.14 \pm 0.18$). Diversity declined slightly between 2003 and 2006 across all habitat types and management strata but increased slightly in 2007 (Figure 79d).

Results




Figure 80. Fish abundance by individual transect for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia from 2002-2007.




Figure 81. Change in fish abundance from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 82. Fish biomass by individual transect for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia from 2002-2007.




Figure 83. Change in fish biomass from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 84. Fish diversity by individual transect for west Maui study area including Honolua-Mokuleia from 2002-2007.




Figure 85. Change in fish diversity from 2002-2007 for the Honolua-Mokuleia MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results

Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats

Apex predators accounted for only 0.6% of the numerical abundance in Honolua MLCD but were nearly 19 times more abundance than in the adjacent open area where they accounted for 0.07% of the individuals in that location. Numbers of apex predators varied little during the study period among all management and habitat strata (Figure 86a). Apex predators accounted for 4.7% of the total biomass in the MLCD and 1.7% in the open area and comprised nearly 12 times more biomass in the MLCD compared with the open area. Apex predator biomass was similar in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.047 \pm 0.072$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.046 \pm 0.011$) habitats and remained constant over time except for an increase in the MLCD UCH in 2007 due to bluefin trevally (Figure 87a).

Benthic carnivores comprised 29% of the numerical abundance in the MLCD and 42% in the open area with densities about 40% higher in the MLCD. Numbers of benthic carnivores varied little among years and management strata (Figure 86b). Benthic carnivores comprised 24% of the biomass in the MLCD and 43% in the open area. Biomass of benthic carnivores was more than two times higher in the MLCD compared to the open area. The highest biomass of benthic carnivores was observed in the MLCD UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.27 \pm 0.29$), followed by the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.22 \pm 0.29$). Trend was consistent over time except for an increase in benthic carnivores in the MLCD CHB in 2007 due to a mix of species including bigeye emperor (*Monotaxis grandoculis*) and yellowfin goatfish (Figure 87b).

Planktivores accounted for 37% of the numerical density in both the MLCD and open area although the overall density was more than two times greater in the MLCD. Planktivore density was highest in the MLCD CHB habitat ($\bar{x} = 0.50 \pm 0.57$) and open CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.42 \pm 0.56$) habitats. Abundance across all strata varied little among years (Figure 86c). Planktivores comprised 3% of the biomass in the MLCD but 13% in the open area although absolute biomass was nearly equal. Planktivore biomass varied little among years except for an increase in 2006 in the open CHB due to a school of 85 sleek unicornfish (*Naso hexacanthus*) that ranged in size from 20-30 cm (Figure 87c).

Herbivores accounted for 33% of total numerical abundance in the MLCD and 21% in the open area. Herbivore density was more than three times higher in the MLCD and the highest densities were in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.47 \pm 0.33$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.27 \pm 0.18$) habitats. Modest declines in numbers were observed between 2002 and 2007 (Figure 86d). Herbivores comprised 68% of the biomass in the MLCD and had 6.5 times greater biomass than the open area where herbivores accounted for 43% of the biomass. The highest densities were in the MLCD CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.71 \pm 0.76$) and UCH ($\bar{x} = 0.61 \pm 0.79$). Although the MLCD CHB showed a slight downward trend, the MLCD UCH trended upward slight (Figure 87d).




Figure 86. Temporal change in fish abundance by trophic level at Honolulu-Mokuleia MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2002-2007. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.




Figure 87. Temporal change in fish biomass by trophic level at Honolulu-Mokuleia MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2002-2007. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.

Results

KEALAKEKUA BAY MLCD AND SOUTH KONA

The south Kona study area extended from Nenué Point to Honaunau Bay (11.8 km²) and included the Kealakekua Bay MLCD (Figure 88).

Sample allocation

A total of 80 samples were collected in 2004 and 2006, in 2007 and 2008 only hardbottom habitat was sampled (n=64; Table 27). The two levels of sampling stratification included major habitat types (CHB, UCH and UCS) and fisheries management regimes (open access; fisheries replenishment area, or FRA; and MLCD). West Hawaii has regional fisheries management area (FMA) on the Kona Coast that is made up of nine FRAs that were developed to prohibit specific activities (e.g., aquarium fish collection, gill net).




Figure 88. Overview of Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas with sampling locations.

Table 27. Sample allocation at Kealakekua Bay MLCD by habitat (2002-2008).

	2004	2006	2007	2008	Total
FRA	29	29	29	29	116
CHB	29	29	29	29	116
MLCD	34	34	22	22	112
CHB	22	22	22	22	86
UCS	12	12			24
Open	13	13	13	13	52
CHB	13	13	13	13	52
Total	76	76	64	64	

* FRA = Fisheries Replenishment Area; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; UCH = Uncolonized hard bottom; UCS = Unconsolidated sediment; Open = Area open to resource extraction.

Characterization of Spatial Patterns of the Seascape within the MLCD

The total seascape area within Kealakekua Bay was 1.24 km², with a perimeter to area ratio of 4.30 and fractal dimension of 1.50 (Tables 28 and 29). Based on the 2007 NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps the habitat diversity in Kealakekua Bay MLCD, represented by Shannon's diversity index and Shannon's evenness index was 1.05 and 0.76 respectively (Table 28). Bathymetric grids were created from the LiDAR data within Kealakekua Bay MLCD that represented an approximate depth range of 0 – -37.70 meters (\bar{x} = 15.71; Table 30 and Figure 89). Percent slope (ranging from 0 – 1.79, \bar{x} = 9.94) and rugosity (ranging from 0 – 146.58, \bar{x} = 1.01) were also derived from the bathymetric grids.

Table 28. Summary of seascape metrics derived from NOAA Biogeography Branch benthic habitat maps for Kealakekua Bay and adjacent areas.

Kealakekua Bay MLCD*	
Shannon's diversity index	1.05
Shannon's evenness index	0.76
Mean patch fractal dimension	1.50
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.	

Table 29. Summary of marine reserve boundary analysis for Kealakekua Bay MLCD.

Kealakekua Bay MLCD*	
Reserve perimeter (km)	5.33
Reserve area (km ²)	1.24
Perimeter to area ratio	4.30
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.	

Table 30. Summary of seascape structure derived from LiDAR bathymetric grids for Kealakekua Bay MLCD.

Kealakekua Bay MLCD*	
Depth (m)	
Average	15.71
Standard deviation	9.98
Depth range	0 - 37.79
Rugosity	
Average rugosity	1.01
Standard deviation	0.04
Rugosity range	1 - 1.79
Slope (percent)	
Average slope	9.94
Standard deviation	11.61
Slope range	0 - 146.59
* MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District.	

Results




Figure 89. Aerial imagery of Kealakekua Bay and surrounding study region with other panels describing seascape characteristics (e.g. depth, slope, rugosity) derived from bathymetric LiDAR data.

Large-scale Benthic Cover

Geomorphic structure for Kealakekua Bay MLCD derived from the NOAA benthic habitat maps consisted primarily of sand (29%) followed by rock/boulder (20%) and aggregate Reef (18%; Table 31, Figures 90 and 91). Biological cover in the MLCD was characterized dominated by coral cover with a total of 34% and uncolonized bottom 90%-100% (29%), with only 4% biological cover of turf 50%-90% (Table 32, Figures 92 and 93).

Table 31. Geomorphic structure for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Structure	Detailed Structure	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral Reef and Hardbottom	Aggregate Reef	0.22	18%
Coral Reef and Hardbottom	Rock/Boulder	0.24	20%
Other Delineations	Land	0.01	1%
Unconsolidated Sediment	Sand	0.36	29%
Unknown	Unknown	0.40	32%

Table 32. Biological cover for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps.

Major Cover	Percent Cover	Area (km ²)	Percentage
Coral	10% - 50%	0.14	12%
Coral	50% - 90%	0.10	8%
Coral	90% - 100%	0.18	14%
Turf	50% - 90%	0.04	4%
Unclassified		0.01	1%
Uncolonized	90%-100%	0.36	29%
Unknown	Unknown	0.40	32%

Results




Figure 90. Sampling locations and benthic structure for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 91. Sampling locations and benthic structure for Honaunau Bay and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 92. Sampling locations and benthic cover for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 93. Sampling locations and benthic cover for Honaunau Bay and adjacent areas.

Results

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Coral Species Richness within the Management Regimes

Average coral species richness was similar Kealakekua Bay MLCD (\bar{x} =4.80), the FRA (\bar{x} =4.72), and the adjacent open area with (\bar{x} =4.99; Table 33). Average species richness in CHB habitat in the MLCD ranged from 3.86 (\pm 0.24) in 2004 to 5.36 (\pm 0.37) in 2006. Richness in CHB habitat in the FRA ranged from 4.00 (\pm 0.23) in 2004 to 5.41 (\pm 0.27) in 2006. This compared to the adjacent open area where richness ranged from 3.92 (\pm 0.38) in 2004 to 6.15 (\pm 0.55) in 2007 (Figure 94). Overall, spatial patterns of change in richness from 2004 to 2007 increased throughout the study area, with only a few transects declining slightly (Figure 95). When examined among management regimes and habitat types, coral richness was similar and trend the same in the MLCD and FRA. Coral richness measured in the open CHB area was similar, but increased in 2007 (Figure 96a).

Table 33. Comparison of coral species richness in major habitats and among different management regimes at Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii.

	2004		2006		2007	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
FRA						
CHB	4.00	0.23	5.41	0.27	5.00	0.28
MLCD						
CHB	3.86	0.24	5.36	0.37	4.95	0.24
Open						
CHB	3.92	0.38	4.92	0.33	6.15	0.55

* FRA=Fisheries Replenishment Area; CHB = Colonized hard bottom; MLCD = Marine Life Conservation District; Open = Area open to resource extraction.




Figure 94. Coral species richness by individual transects for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay MLCD from 2004-2007.




Figure 95. Change in coral species richness from 2004-2007 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 96. Temporal change in benthic communities at Kealakekua Bay MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2007. (a) Mean species richness by year (b) Mean percent cover of coral (c) Mean percent cover of macroalgae (d) Mean percent cover of turf algae.

Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Benthic Cover within the Management Regimes

Average percent coral cover was similar for Kealakekua Bay MLCD (\bar{x} =32.99), the FRA (\bar{x} =35.12), and the adjacent open area with (\bar{x} =31.57). Average percent coral cover in the MLCD ranged from 29.01% (\pm 4.45) in 2004 to 44.58% (\pm 3.55) in 2007. Coral cover in the FRA ranged from 30.81% (\pm 2.78) in 2006 to 37.48% (\pm 3.55) in 2004. This compared to the adjacent open area where coral cover ranged from 30.28% (\pm 3.20) in 2004 to 32.92% (\pm 3.66) in 2007 (Figure 97). Spatial patterns of percent change of coral cover on transects demonstrated an overall greater coral cover inside the protected embayments of Kealakekua and Honaunau. Overall, between 2004 and 2007 coral cover decreased in parts of Kealakekua Bay with northwest exposures and increased in the more protected shallow regions in the southeast of the Bay (Figure 98). Temporal patterns in percent coral cover across all management regimes and habitat types generally remained consistent from 2004-2006, with a small decrease from 2004-2006 in the FRA (Figure 96b).




Figure 97. Mean percent coral cover by individual transects for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay MLCD from 2004-2007.

Results




Figure 98. Change in mean percent coral cover from 2004-2007 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results

Average percent macroalgal cover was highest in the open area (\bar{x} =5.54), and lowest in Kealakekua Bay MLCD (\bar{x} =1.11) and moderate in the FRA (\bar{x} =3.46). Average percent macroalgal cover in the MLCD ranged from 0.45% (\pm 0.20) in 2004 to 1.67% (\pm 0.59) in 2007. Macroalgal cover in the FRA ranged from 2.23% (\pm 0.60) in 2004 to 4.17% (\pm 1.09) in 2007. This compared to the adjacent open area where macroalgal cover ranged from 2.28% (\pm 0.58) in 2004 to 7.38% (\pm 1.49) in 2007 (Figure 99). Patterns of percent change of macroalgae cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general increase in macroalgae cover in the open sites north of Kealakekua Bay MLCD and in Honaunau (Figure 100). Percent macroalgae cover increased over time for all management regimes with a slight decrease in the MLCD in 2007 (Figure 96c).




Figure 99. Mean percent macroalgal cover by individual transects for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay MLCD from 2004-2007.

Results




Figure 100. Change in mean percent macroalgal cover from 2004-2007 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results

Average percent turf cover was highest in the open area (\bar{x} =41.25), and lowest in Kealakekua Bay MLCD (\bar{x} =20.28) and moderate in the FRA (\bar{x} =39.09). Average percent turf cover in the MLCD ranged from 11.88% (\pm 2.20) in 2006 to 26.36% (\pm 2.59) in 2007. Turf cover in the FRA ranged from 32.14% (\pm 2.56) in 2007 to 46.43% (\pm 3.73) in 2004. This compared to the adjacent open area where turf cover ranged from 33.17% (\pm 3.17) in 2006 to 55.45% (\pm 3.04) in 2004 (Figure 101). Patterns of percent change of turf cover on transects between 2004-2007 show a general decrease throughout the study area, with a few transects increasing inside the MLCD (Figure 102). Temporal patterns in percent turf cover decreases overall among all management regimes and habitat types, with the exception of the MLCD where there was a slight increase from 2006 to 2007 (Figure 96d).




Figure 101. Mean percent turf algal cover by individual transects for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay MLCD from 2004-2007.

Results




Figure 102. Change in mean percent turf algal cover from 2004-2007 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Fish Assemblage Characteristics Among Habitat Types and Between Management Regimes

Average species richness per transect in Kealakekua MLC D ranged from 17.95 (± 5.07) in 2008 to 19.73 (± 5.08) in 2004 (Figure 103). In the adjacent open area richness ranged from 20.54 (± 2.93) in 2004 to 24.08 (± 3.07) in 2007 while in the FRA, richness ranged from 18.59 (± 4.60) in 2008 to 21.28 (± 4.52) in 2006. Richness declined by 1.77 (± 4.61) species in the MLC D between 2004 and 2008 while it declined by 1.14 (± 5.24) species on average in the FRA during this same time period (Figure 104). Richness increased in the open area by 0.62 (± 4.39) between 2004 and 2008. The lowest overall richness was observed in the MLC D CHB ($\bar{x} = 19.09 \pm 0.80$) and the highest was in the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 22.25 \pm 1.68$). There was an increase in richness in the open CHB between 2004 and 2007 with all three management strata showing declines between 2007 and 2008 (Figure 105a).

Average number of individuals m^{-2} in the MLC D ranged from 0.68 (± 0.26) in 2008 to 0.92 (± 0.65) in 2007 (Figure 106). The highest average number of individuals per m^{-2} in the open area was recorded in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 1.42 \pm 0.52$) and the lowest occurred in 2004 ($\bar{x} = 1.24 \pm 0.50$). Within the FRA, numerical abundance ranged from 0.88 (± 0.38) in 2004 to 1.10 (± 0.59) in 2007. Between 2002 and 2008, average number of individuals decreased by 0.14 m^{-2} (± 0.36) in the MLC D, but increase by 0.07 (± 0.43) in the FRA and 0.03 (± 0.33) in the open area (Figure 107). The lowest overall numerical abundance was observed in the MLC D CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.82 \pm 0.10$) and the highest was in the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 1.33 \pm 0.09$). Numerical abundance was fairly level between 2002 and 2007 for all management strata but all three showed slight declines between 2007 and 2008. (Figure 105b).

Biomass ($t\ ha^{-1}$) in the MLC D ranged from 0.82 (± 0.48) in 2004 to 0.97 (± 0.86) in 2007 (Figure 108). In the open area, biomass was lowest in 2002 ($\bar{x} = 0.54 \pm 0.20$) and highest in 2007 ($\bar{x} = 0.84 \pm 0.25$). Similar patterns and numbers were observed in the FRA with low biomass in 2004 ($\bar{x} = 0.54 \pm 0.32$) and high biomass in 2007 ($\bar{x} = 0.84 \pm 0.58$). Between 2002 and 2008, biomass increased across all management strata. The MLC D saw an increase of 0.06 (± 0.67), while the FRA and open areas was increases of 0.15 (± 0.34) and 0.13 (± 0.27), respectively (Figure 109). Overall, biomass was lowest in the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.70 \pm 0.13$) and highest in the MLC D CHB ($\bar{x} = 0.87 \pm 0.07$). All management strata showed increases in biomass between 2002 and 2007, with slight declines between 2007 and 2008 (Figure 105c).

Diversity within the MLC D varied little among years with the highest diversity observed in 2006 ($\bar{x} = 2.17 \pm 0.26$) and lowest in 2008 ($\bar{x} = 2.13 \pm 0.35$; Figure 110). Greater fluctuations were observed in the open area with a high in 2007 of 2.27 (± 0.32) and a low in 2004 of 2.01 (± 0.37). The FRA showed intermediate variability with a high of 2.25 (± 0.32) in 2006 and a low of 2.12 (± 0.33) in 2008. Diversity decreased in the FRA by 0.11 (± 0.33), by 0.32 (± 0.28) in the open area and 0.28 (± 0.35) in the MLC D between 2002 and 2007 (Figure 111). Lowest overall diversity was found in the open CHB ($\bar{x} = 2.08 \pm 0.13$) while the highest was observed in the FRA CHB ($\bar{x} = 2.20 \pm 0.06$). Diversity was stable among management strata between 2004 and 2007 with open CHB showing a slight decline in 2008 (Figure 105d).

Results




Figure 103. Fish species richness by individual transect for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay from 2004-2008.




Figure 104. Change in fish species richness from 2004-2008 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Results




Figure 105. Temporal change in fish assemblages at Kealakekua Bay MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Species Richness (b) Numerical Abundance (c) Biomass (d) Diversity.




Figure 106. Fish abundance by individual transect for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay from 2004-2008.

Results




Figure 107. Change in fish abundance from 2004-2008 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 108. Fish biomass by individual transect for south Kona study area including Kealakekua Bay from 2004-2008.

Results




Figure 109. Change in fish biomass from 2004-2008 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.




Figure 110. Fish diversity by individual transect for south Kona study area including Kealahou Bay from 2004-2008.

Results




Figure 111. Change in fish diversity from 2004-2008 for the Kealakekua Bay MLCD and adjacent areas.

Fish Trophic Structure Between Management Regimes and Among Habitats

Apex predators accounted for 0.8% of the numerical abundance in Kealakekua MLCD, 0.4% in the FRA, and 0.3% in the open area. Apex predator abundance was 68% greater in the MLCD compared to the FRA and 70% greater compared to the open area. Numbers of apex predators declined in all three management strata between 2004 and 2008 (Figure 112a). Apex predators accounted for 8.6% of the total biomass in the MLCD, 2.8% in the FRA, and 3.1% in the open area. Apex predator biomass was 3.8 times greater the MLCD compared to the FRA and 3.5 times greater compared to the open area. Apex predator biomass was similar over time in the FRA and open area but high biomass in 2007 in the MLCD was associated with one whitetip reef shark (*Triaenodon obesus*; Figure 113a).

Benthic carnivores comprised 39% of the numerical abundance in Kealakekua MLCD, 37% in the FRA, and 31% in the open area. Numbers of benthic carnivores were similar between the MLCD, FRA, and open areas. All management areas showed a slight increase in benthic carnivore abundance in 2007 followed by a drop in 2008 (Figure 112b). Benthic carnivores comprised 38% of the biomass in the MLCD, 39% in the FRA, and 37% in the open area. Biomass of benthic carnivores was 19% higher in the MLCD compared to the FRA and 25% than the open area. There was a slight upper trend in biomass between 2004 and 2008 with the greatest increase occurring in the MLCD (Figure 113b).

Planktivores accounted for 27% of the numerical density in the MLCD, 32% in the FRA, and 50% in the open area. Planktivore abundance was 28% lower in the MLCD compared to the FRA and 66% lower compared to the open area. Trends were fairly consistent over time (Figure 112c). Planktivores comprised 3% of the biomass in the MLCD, 7% in the FRA and 10% in the open area. Planktivore biomass was 52% lower in the MLCD compared to the FRA and 66% lower than the open area. There were slight upward trends over time in the MLCD and FRA while the open area showed a large spike in 2007 associated with several schools of sleek unicornfish (Figure 113c).

Herbivores accounted for 33% of total numerical abundance in the MLCD, 30% in the FRA, and 19% in the open area. Herbivore densities were similar among the three management areas. All three management areas showed large increases in numerical abundance of herbivores between 2004 and 2006 with subsequent declines, which were most pronounced in the MLCD and open areas (Figure 112d). Herbivores comprised 51% of the biomass in the MLCD, 51% in the FRA, and 50% in the open area. Herbivore biomass was 23% higher in the MLCD compared to the FMA and 27% higher compared to the open area. Biomass increased slightly between 2004 and 2007 and then declined slightly in 2008 (Figure 113d).

Results




Figure 112. Temporal change in fish abundance by trophic level at Kealakekua Bay MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.




Figure 113. Temporal change in fish biomass by trophic level at Kealakekua Bay MLCD and surrounding areas by habitat type from 2004-2008. (a) Apex predators (b) Benthic invertivores (c) Planktivores (d) Herbivores.

Discussion



Photo courtesy of Keoki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

The focus of this study was to 1) develop and implement a monitoring program of living marine resources (e.g., fishes, corals and other invertebrates, algae) within and adjacent to four representative MLCDs in Hawaii, 2) quantify the seascape using remotely sensed data to characterize the protected areas at a broader spatial scale, and 3) organize all of the associated spatial data sets in a GIS to better understand spatially-explicit ecosystem processes at the scale of the seascape.

Benthic Habitats

General benthic habitat types were similar inside and outside MLCDs (Friedlander et al. 2007b) although coral cover tended to be higher inside. Therefore, the focus of this study was to examine trends over time in each of these management regimes. The trends over time tended to be consistent with the level of protection (e.g. MLCD).

Coral species richness and coral cover were greater inside the Hanauma, Pupukeya and Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay MLCDs compared to adjacent open areas and the rank order in these metrics among these MLCDs did not change over the study period (Figure 114). Coral cover generally increased over time inside Hanauma, Pupukeya and Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay MLCDs and did not change within Kealakekua MLCD. These results highlight the benefits of protection from fishing to benthic communities.



Figure 114. MLCDs in Hawaii show a diverse mosaic of habitats such as this shallow, coral rich area. Photo: K. Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

Macroalgae cover was generally greater outside the MLCDs and increased over time, particularly adjacent to the Hanauma Bay MLCD (Maunaloa Bay, Oahu), Honolulu Bay MLCD (west Maui) and Kealakekua Bay MLCD (south Kona, Hawaii Island). Areas adjacent to the Hanauma, Honolulu and Kealakekua MLCDs all have varying degrees of human population and runoff associated with stream beds or freshwater springs that may facilitate increased macroalgae growth.

Seascape Metrics

Seascape metrics derived from NOAA benthic habitat maps were used to characterize the MLCDs. The NOAA benthic habitat maps released in 2007 were improved to include a hierarchical classification scheme and allowed for the quantification of seascape metrics based on zone, geomorphic structure, and biological cover classes. The seascape metrics used to characterize the MLCDs included: Shannon's habitat diversity and evenness indices, patch fractal dimensions, MLCD perimeter and area, and MLCD perimeter/area ratio. An increase in the area of the Pupukeya MLCD from 0.11 km² in 1983 to 0.71 km² in 2003, due to changes in regulations, resulted in a broader diversity of habitats within the new reserve boundaries. Sand habitat was absent from the 1983 protected area and the geomorphic structure within the new boundary was characterized by large sand habitats adjacent to rock/boulder habitats. The inclusion of these sand habitats within the reserve provides a corridor between hard bottom habitats for mobile organisms and also provides important feeding habitats for a number of organisms. In addition, fish and other mobile organisms that transit these sandy habitats benefit from the protection from fishing that was not provided in the older boundary configuration. Hanauma Bay and Kealakekua Bay MLCDs had small perimeter to area ratios (P/A), which are preferable for marine reserve design since fish and mobile invertebrates are less likely to spill over into open access areas

Discussion

where they are vulnerable to fishing pressure. This small P/A ratio also increases the core area within the protected area and reduces the amount of boundary perimeter that is available for fishing.

Several LiDAR-derived seascape metrics (e.g., depth, rugosity and slope) were quantified for each MLC D to better characterize the seascape within each protected area. In order for fisheries enhancement goals to be reached, marine protected areas should protect a range of structural complexities and habitat types in (Sladek-Nowlis and Friedlander, 2004). The Kealakekua Bay MLC D showed the highest overall seascape diversity among all protected areas. Hanauma Bay and Honolulu-Mokuleia Bay MLC Ds demonstrated comparable seascape-level diversity. Biological cover within the 1983 Pupukea MLC D was dominated mostly by macroalgae and turf algae in a shallow depth range, but following boundary expansion, biological cover showed a more representative diversity of cover types. Further, the boundary was expanded to include deeper habitats that were less impacted by wave disturbance, particularly during the winter months, and as a result the new boundary now protects approximately 8.5 hectares of coral habitat (10-50% coral cover) that was not included in the older design. With the inclusion of coral habitats, a greater depth range, and a broader diversity of habitats in the reserve, there was a greater diversity and biomass of fishes protected within this new reserve area (see discussion below). The application of landscape pattern analysis used in this study represents an effective way for scientists and resource managers to evaluate potential or current protected area design scenarios in the marine environment at spatial scales that are appropriate for conservation.

Fish Assemblages

Rank order of MLC Ds for various fish assemblage characteristic (species richness, numerical abundance, biomass, and diversity) remained the same between the 2002-2004 sampling period and the 2006-2008 sampling period. Species richness and diversity did not change appreciably in any of the MLC Ds over the monitoring period. Numerical abundance was highly variable and fluctuated without pattern among MLC Ds and areas open to fishing.

Biomass increased in three of the four MLC Ds from the initial sampling period. There was a 14% increase in Pupukea, a 7% increase Kealakekua, and a 5% increase in Honolulu Bay. Biomass within the Hanauma Bay MLC D declined by 5% during this same period. Hanauma Bay has been fully protected since 1967 and the small decline in biomass over the monitoring period is not statistically significant and is within the margin of sampling variability. Although overall biomass declined slightly, apex predator biomass in the Hanauma Bay MLC D increased as a result of increasing numbers and sizes of bluefin trevally jacks (omilu, *Caranx melamypgus*; Figure 115). A similar increase in apex predator biomass was observed in the Honolulu Bay MLC D over the same time period. Herbivore biomass increased by 17% within the Pupukea MLC D and this increase was driven mainly by large parrotfishes that are prized fisheries species and likely responded to the increased protection provided by the expansion of the protected area in 2003. The significant increase in apex predator biomass within the Pupukea MLC D is also likely a result of the increase in protected area size.



Figure 115. Protected areas in Hawaii harbor large apex predators, like this jack. Photo: K. Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

Biomass declined by 39% outside the Pupukea MLCD and may reflect increased fishing pressure outside the MLCD over time. Biomass outside the Hanauma Bay MLCD increased by 32% although the absolute increase ($+0.05 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$) was small. Because biomass was so low in this area, the presence of a few schools of larger fishes resulted in the large relative increase in biomass although the absolute biomass was still extremely low.

Management Implications

Combining seascape-scale habitat stratification with *in situ* ecological data allowed for the development of a statistically robust monitoring program of living marine resources (e.g., fishes, corals and other invertebrates, algae) within and adjacent to four representative MLCDs of marine protected areas in Hawaii. The results clearly show that areas with good habitat quality and management conserve fish populations and benthic communities within their boundaries while areas without protection are in poorer ecological health and continue to decline over time. The consistency of these patterns over time support the findings of the initial assessment conducted by Friedlander and colleagues (Friedlander et al. 2006, 2007a, 2007b) and increase confidence in the effectiveness of marine protected areas as a management tool for the conservation of nearshore marine resources in Hawaii.

Marine protected areas are spatially discrete forms of management and georeferenced data on seascape metrics can be integrated within a spatial framework to ensure MPA design scenarios are incorporating an appropriate range in depth, habitat complexity, and an interconnected mosaic of benthic habitat types. In this study, remotely sensed data allowed for the examination of MLCDs at spatial scales that are appropriate for management and provided valuable information on seascape metrics (e.g. rugosity, slope, depth, habitat type). Using a seascape approach controlled for differences in habitat by utilizing the NOAA benthic habitat maps and supported the development of a robust, spatially explicit monitoring program. This approach allows for the identification of spatial and temporal trends across the seascape to be highlighted and supports subsequent spatial planning and management actions. The findings from this study greatly contribute to the understanding of marine protected area design and function in Hawaii and are imperative to the development of comprehensive coastal and marine spatial planning.

References



Photo courtesy of Keoki Stender, www.marinelifephotography.com

References

- Battista T.A., Costa B.M., & Anderson S.M. (2007) Shallow-water benthic habitats of the main eight Hawaiian islands (DVD). NOAA Technical memorandum NOS NCCOS 61, Biogeography Branch, Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment. Silver Spring, MD.
- Bellwood D.R., Hughes T.P., Folke C., & Nystrom M. (2004) Confronting the coral reef crisis. *Nature* 429: 827-833.
- Birkeland C. (2004) Ratcheting down the coral reefs. *Bioscience* 54: 1021-1027.
- Brock R.E. (1982) A critique of the visual census method for assessing coral reef fish populations. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 32: 269-276.
- Brock V.E. (1954) A preliminary report on a method of estimating reef fish populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 18: 297-308.
- Bros W.E. & Cowell B.C. (1987) A technique for optimizing sample size (replication). *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 114: 63-71.
- Browman H. I., & Stergiou K.I. (2004) Marine protected areas as a central element of ecosystem-based management: defining their location, size and number. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 274: 271-272.
- Cesar H.S.J., & van Beukering P.J.H. (2004). Economic valuation of the coral reefs of Hawaii. *Pacific Science*, 58(2): 231-242.
- Christensen J.D., Jeffrey C.F.G., Caldow C., Monaco M.E., Kendall M.S., & Appeldoorn R.S. (2003) Cross-shelf habitat utilization patterns of reef fishes in southwestern Puerto Rico. *Gulf Caribb. Res.*, 14(2): 9-28.
- Coyne M.S., Battista T.A., Anderson M., Waddell J., Smith W., Jokiel P., Kendall M.S. & Monaco M.E. (2003) Benthic habitats of the main Hawaiian islands benthic habitats of the main Hawaiian islands. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS CCMA 152 (On-line) http://ccma.nos.noaa.gov/ecosystems/coralreef/main8hi_mapping.html
- FishBase (www.fishbase.org).
- Friedlander A.M. & DeMartini E.E. (2002) Contrasts in density, size, and biomass of reef fishes between the Northwestern and the main Hawaiian Islands: the effects of fishing down apex predators. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 230: 253-264.
- Friedlander A., Sladek Nowlis J., Sanchez J. A., Appeldoorn R., Usseglio P., McCormick C., Bejarano S., & Mitchell-Chui A. (2003) Designing effective marine protected areas in Seaflower Biosphere Reserve, Colombia, based on biological and sociological information. *Conservation Biology*, 17: 1769-1784.
- Friedlander A.M., Brown E.K., Monaco M.E., & Clark A. (2006) Fish habitat utilization patterns and evaluation of the efficacy of marine protected areas in Hawaii: Integration of NOAA digital benthic habitats mapping and coral reef ecological studies. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 23. 213 pp.
- Friedlander A.M., Brown E.K., & Monaco M. E. (2007a) Defining reef fish habitat utilization patterns in Hawaii: comparisons between MPAs and areas open to fishing. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 351: 221-233.
- Friedlander A.M., Brown E.K., & Monaco M.E. (2007b) Coupling ecology and GIS to evaluate efficacy of marine protected areas in Hawaii. *Ecological Applications*, 17: 715-730.
- Friedlander A., Aeby G., Brainard R., Brown E., Chaston K., Clark A., McGowan P., Montgomery T., Walsh W., Williams I., & Wiltse W. (2008a) The State of Coral Reef Ecosystems of the Main Hawaiian Islands. pp. 158-199. In: Waddell J.E. & Clarke A.M. (eds), *The state of coral reef ecosystems of the United States and Pacific Freely Associated States: 2008*. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 73. NOAA/NCCOS Biogeography Branch, Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment. Silver Spring, MD. 569 pp.
- Friedlander A., Maragos J., Brainard R., Clark A., Aeby G., Bowen B., Brown E., Chaston C., Kenyon J., Meyer C., McGowan P., Miller J., Montgomery T., Schroeder R., Smith C., Vroom P., Walsh W., Williams I., Wiltse W., & Zamzow J. (2008b) Status of coral reefs in Hawaii and the United States Pacific Remote Island areas (Baker, Howland, Palmyra, Kingman, Jarvis, Johnston, Wake) in 2008. pp. 213-224. In *Status of coral reefs of the world: 2008* (Wilkinson C., ed.). Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network and Rainforest Research Centre, Townsville, Australia.
- Greenfield D.W. & Johnson R.K. (1990) Community structure of western Caribbean blennioid fishes. *Copeia* 1990: 433-448. Hawaii Cooperative Fishery Research Unit unpublished data.
- Hoover J.P. (2002) Hawaii's sea creatures: a guide to Hawaii's marine invertebrates. Mutual Publishing. Honolulu, Hawaii. 366 pp.
- Irish J.L. & Lillycrop J.W. (1999) Scanning laser mapping of the coastal zone: the SHOALS system. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 54: 123-129.

References

- Jackson J.B.C., Kirby M.X., Berger W.H., Bjorndal K.A., Botsford L.W., Bourque B.J., Bradbury R.H., Coke R., Erlandson, J., Estes J.A., Hughes T.P., Kidwell S., Lange C.B., Lenihan H.S., Pandolfi J.M., Peterson C.H., Steneck R.S., Tegner M.J., & Warner R.R. (2001) Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. *Science*, 293: 629-638.
- Jenness J. (2004) Calculating landscape surface area from digital elevation models. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 32: 829-839.
- Jennings S. & Kaiser M.J. (1998) The effects of fishing on marine ecosystems. *Adv. Mar. Biol.*, 34: 201-352.
- Littler D.S. & Littler M.M. (2003) South pacific reef plants. Offshore Graphics, Inc., Washington, D.C. 331 pp.
- Lubchenco J., Palumbi S. R., Gaines S. D., & Andelman S. (2003) Plugging a hole in the ocean: The emerging science of marine reserves. *Ecological Applications*, 13: S3-S7.
- Ludwig, J. A. et Reynolds, J. F. 1988. *Statistical Ecology : A Primer on Methods and Computing*. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 337 pp.
- Lundblad E., Wright D.J., Miller J., Larkin E.M., Rinehart R.B., Anderson S.M., Naar D.F. & Donahue B.T. (2006) A benthic terrain classification scheme for American Samoa. *Marine Geodesy*, 29: 89-111.
- Monaco, M.E. M. Kendall, J. Higgins, C. Alexander, and M. Tartt. 2005 Biogeographic assessments of NOAA national marine sanctuaries: the integration of ecology and GIS to aid in marine management boundary delineation and assessment. pp. 2-13. In: D.J. Wright and D.J. Scholz, (eds.) *Place matters: geospatial tools for marine science, conservation, and management in the Pacific Northwest*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.
- Pandolfi J., Jackson J.B.C., Baron N., Bradbury R.H., Guzman H.M., Hughes T.P., Kappel C.V., Micheli F., Ogden J.C., Possingham H.P., & Sala E. (2005) Are US coral reefs on the slippery slope to slime? *Science*, 307: 1725-1726.
- Pittman S.J., Caldow C., Hile S.D. & Monaco M.E. (2007a) Using seascape types to explain the spatial patterns of fish in the mangroves of SW Puerto Rico. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series*, 348: 273-284.
- Pittman S.J., Christensen J.D., Caldow C., Menza C. & Monaco M.E. (2007b) Predictive mapping of fish species richness across shallow-water seascapes in the Caribbean. *Ecological Modelling*, 204: 9-21.
- Poepoe K., Bartram P., & Friedlander A. (2007) The use of traditional Hawaiian knowledge in the contemporary management of marine resources. pp.117-141. In: (Haggan N., Neis B., & Baird I., eds.) *Fishers' knowledge in fisheries science and management* . UNESCO, Paris.
- Randall, J.E. (1996) *Shore fishes of Hawaii*. Natural World Press. Vida, Oregon. 216 pp.
- Reed S.A. (1980) Sampling and transecting techniques on tropical reef substrates. *Environmental survey techniques for coastal water assessment*, 80: 71-89.
- Risk M.J. (1972) Fish diversity on a coral reef in the Virgin Islands. *Atoll Res. Bull.*, 193: 1-6.
- Sladek-Nowles J.S. and Friedlander A. (2004) Design and designation of marine reserves. pp. 128-163. In: (Sobel J. & Dahlgren C., eds.), *Marine reserves: A guide to science, design and use*. Island Press, Washington D.C., USA.
- Turner M.G. (2005) Landscape ecology in North America: Past, present and future. *Ecology*, 86: 1967-1974.
- Veron J.E.N. (2000) *Corals of the world*. Australian Institute of Marine Science. Wedding L and Friedlander A.M. 2008. Determining the influence of seascape structure on coral reef fishes in Hawaii using a geospatial approach. *Marine Geodesy*, 31: 246-266.
- Wedding, L., Friedlander A., McGranaghan M., Yost R., & M. Monaco M. (2008) Using bathymetric LiDAR data to measure benthic habitat complexity associated with coral reef fishes. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112: 4159-4165.
- Wedding L and AM Friedlander. 2008. Determining the influence of seascape structure on coral reef fishes in Hawaii using a geospatial approach. *Marine Geodesy* 31:246-266
- Williams I.D., Walsh W.J., Schroeder R.E., Friedlander A.M., Richards B.L. & Stamoulis K.A. (2008) Assessing the relative importance of fishing impacts on Hawaiian coral reef fish assemblages along regional-scale human population gradients. *Environmental Conservation*, 35: 261-272.

U.S. Department of Commerce

Gary Locke, Secretary

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Jane Lubchenco, Ph.D., Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere

National Ocean Service

David Kennedy, Acting Assistant Administrator for Ocean Service and Coastal Zone Management



The mission of the Center for Coastal Monitoring and Assessment's Biogeography Branch is to develop information and analytical capabilities through research, monitoring, and assessment of the distribution and ecology of living marine resources and their associated habitats for improved ecosystem-based management. For more information, visit:

<http://www.ccma.nos.noaa.gov/about/biogeography/welcome.html>

