Marine Protected Areas as a tool for long-term monitoring of marine biota: Separating climate from anthropogenic influence





A. Götz, R. Chalmers, R. Bennett, S. Kerwath and P. Cowley

Elwandle Node, South African Environmental Observation Network (SAEON)

Why Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)?

- Anthropogenic influence and natural variability (including climate change) are superimposed
 - \rightarrow Large and well established MPAs are mostly free of anthropogenic influence
 - → Measure of natural variability (short-term) and climate change (long-term) as baseline for exploited areas



















Why Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)?

- Anthropogenic influence and natural variability (including climate change) are superimposed
 - \rightarrow Large and well established MPAs are mostly free of anthropogenic influence
 - → Measure of natural variability (short-term) and climate change (long-term) as baseline for exploited areas
- Do MPAs work? (in South Africa)

 \rightarrow Movement behavior of species







Red Roman Chrysoblephus laticeps, SPARIDAE Protogynous Hermaphrodite

Movement behavior of Roman

Constall por in wear of The concer of the State

Outside spawning season:

Small home ranges (~1200 m² 95% fixed kernel)



റ്

Movement behavior of Roman

Spawning season:

- Females extend home range (~10000 m² 95% fixed kernel)
- Females engage in aggressive behavior (spawning related)
- No change in male home range, no male aggression







Marine reserves: Sizes

Goukamma MPA (40km²)



- habitat
- oceanopgraphy
- population

Sampling design

Oceanographic survey







Oceanography

Bathymetry





Sampling design

- Oceanographic survey
- Density
- Size

Controlled angling and UVC













Warm-temperate biogeographic region

Subtropical biogeographic region

Sample area size: fixed site vs. spatial sampling

- Low variability;
- Difficult to relocate (low visibility);
- Trampling effects (mortality, habitat destruction, behavior; Vos et al. 2000);
- Chance disturbances (pollution, sedimentation, wave action; Nowlis and Friedlander 2004);
- Lack of representativity (habitat complexity, benthos patchiness);
- Non-randomness (more biased&weaker statistical methods; Vos et al. 2000);
- Pseudo-replication (benthos and resident fish).

Randomly stratified approach



Strata: Depth & Profile Time of day & Season **Grid cell size & number:** Accuracy of targeting Power analysis

Selection & analysis: Random number generator Generalized Linear Models



Test of suitability of methods

Fish community:

- Controlled angling
- UW counts





Controlled angling

Two years of biannual (seasonal) fieldtrips Fishing on same site for up to 10 hours







UW counts:

Two years of biannual fieldtrips Survey of same site using transects and point counts





Test of additional methods

- Observer bias
- Noise over bias approach (Vos et al. 2000)
 - => digital UW footage: observer bias free & noise reduced



Digital UW footage







Baited Remote Underwater Video (BRUV)





Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV)





Benthic invertebrates (intertidal and subtidal)

Public participation (test of observers)







Develop a long-term monitoring strategy for South African near-shore reef biota

- ⇒Standardized protocols with tested & costeffective methods
- \Rightarrow Baseline sites in all biogeographic zones
- ⇒Network of sites for resource monitoring in exploited areas





Thanks!



