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## SUMMARY

This report addresses the question: has the operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) affected the total numbers of fish in nearby the San Onofre kelp forest (SOK, the Impact site) in the After period relative to the numbers in the more distant San Mateo kelp forest (SMK, the Control site)? We estimate these potential changes by combining information on changes in giant kelp (Macrocystis pyrifera) populations, the relationship between fish density and kelp density, and changes in the density of fish in areas where kelp density has remained constant.

We present results separately for groups of fish classified by their distribution in the water column. Those fish observed more than 1.5 meters above the bottom are called "water column", and those observed within 1.5 meters of the substrate are called "bottom" fish. While many species were found in both of these strata, generally an individual species was found much more abundantly in either one stratum or the other. For example, California sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher) were characteristically found near the bottom, while kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) were generally found in the water column.

The relative changes in total numbers and biomass of these groups of fish between Impact and Control locations, indicate different responses on the part of water column and bottom fishes to the operation of SONGS. Fish living near the cobble bottom in SOK showed a $70 \%$ relative reduction in numbers and a $73 \%$ reduction in biomass, when compared to SMK, during the two Operational years in which samples were taken (1985 and 1986). These numbers translate into a loss of
approximately 191,000 fish weighing 28 metric tons. In contrast, while there are indications that the total numbers and biomass of fish in the water column have also decreased in SOK relative to Control, these decreases are smaller ( $17 \%$ and $33 \%$ ), and the estimates cannot be held with statistical confidence.

The observed changes in total numbers of fish in SOK appear to arise both from both changes in the kelp populations (particularly the density of kelp and the area of the kelp forest) and from changes in the habitat unrelated to the kelp populations.

Samples from areas with a wide range of kelp densities in 1985 and 1986 indicated that bottom fish, although generally present on hard substrates in the absence of kelp, were more common in areas with kelp. Furthermore, fish densities (and biomass) of bottom fish increased as kelp density increased. These relationships argue that the fish populations are sensitive to the area and density of kelp, and that the smaller area and lower density of kelp in SOK in 1985 and 1986 probably contributed to the smaller numbers of fish in the bottom stratum.

However, decrease in the size of the kelp forest cannot entirely explain the loss of bottom fish. When Before and After densities of these fish were compared in areas where kelp density was constant from Before to After periods, several species of bottom fish exhibited relative decreases. Barred sand bass (Paralabrax nebulifer), rainbow seaperch (Hypsurus caryi), black seaperch (Embiotoca jacksoni) and California sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher) all exhibited relative decreases of 60 to $76 \%$ in density throughout SOK compared to SMK. Only one species, the senorita (Oxyjulis californica), displayed a relative increase (of over $100 \%$ ) in density
in the bottom stratum. These decreases, observed in areas in which kelp density changed little, argue that SONGS affected fish populations by altering the local habitat in ways other than altering kelp populations (e.g., reducing prey populations).

Unlike the bottom fishes, water column fishes are dependent on the presence of kelp and are virtually absent when kelp is absent. However, they share with bottom fish the characteristic of increasing in density as kelp density increases. While these two observations suggest that water column fish would be sensitive to the area and density of the kelp forest to a greater degree than bottom fish, they have responded to the loss of kelp in SOK by increasing in density in the remaining areas of kelp.

The density of several of these species also changed in those areas chosen to control for changes in the density of kelp. Among water column fish two species, senorita (Oxyjulis californica) and halfmoon (Medialuna californiensis), increased in density (both over 100\%) throughout SOK in the After period relative to the change observed in SMK. Two others, kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) and giant kelpfish (Heterostichus rostratus), exhibited a relative decrease in density in areas of SOK near the diffuser, but increased in areas of SOK further away. These changes in density reflect fish moving into areas of remaining kelp canopy from areas where kelp has been eliminated. As a consequence, the total numbers of water column fish have changed little in SOK in spite of the large reductions in kelp area.

Early MRC studies predicted a loss of fish in the kelp forest because fewer fish were found in areas where kelp was absent and SONGS was predicted to reduce
the area of kelp in SOK. This initial prediction has been found to be an oversimplification of the response of fish populations to the operation of SONGS. While, contributing to population changes of some species, the area and density of kelp is unlikely to be the sole determinate of the relative change in fish populations in SOK in the After period.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this report we assess the effects of the operation of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) on fish populations living in the San Onofre Kelp Forest (SOK). This forest of giant kelp (Macrocystis pyrifera) grows on a cobble seabed located between 0.5 and 2 km downcoast of the Unit 2 and 3 diffusers and between 1.5 and 3 km offshore (Figure 1). Since the diffuser lines of Units 2 and 3 extend to 2.5 km offshore and longshore current flow is directed downcoast approximately $60 \%$ of the time, the bed is often exposed to the plant's discharge waters (including water entrained by the discharge). The MRC study of SONGS' effects on these fish began in 1979 and was completed in 1987. The project was conducted under the direction of Dr. Edward DeMartini of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

As natural resources, forests of giant kelp, such as SOK, are of great value to both commercial and sport fishermen. They are structurally complex habitats which provide food and shelter for a diverse assemblage of fishes (Quast 1968a, b; Feder et al. 1974; Bray and Ebeling 1975; Hobson and Chess 1976; Bernstein and Jung 1979; Coyer 1979; Hobson et al. 1981; Ebeling and Laur 1985; Bodkin 1986). The density of some species of fish are higher in the presence of Macrocystis than in its absence (Bray and Ebeling 1975, Larson and DeMartini 1983, Ambrose 1987, Ebeling and Laur 1985, Bodkin 1988, Holbrook et al. 1989, Carr 1989, DeMartini and Roberts in prep.). In addition, populations of several species of reef fish are replenished at higher rates, via larval recruitment, in the presence of giant kelp (Larson and DeMartini 1983, Carr 1989). Populations of giant kelp are also thought to enhance the productivity of fishes, both by being a source of food for herbivorous fish, and
indirectly through invertebrate grazers that are prey of many fish (North 1971, Foster and Schiel 1985, but see MRC Final Technical Report H: Mitigation, for further discussion of this subject).

The basic question addressed in this report is: has the operation of SONGS caused changes in the total numbers or biomass of kelp bed fish in SOK?

In an early MRC study in SOK during the fall of 1979, DeMartini and Larson (1980a, b) first estimated the densities of fish in areas above rocky substrates with and without giant kelp. They found that fish were more abundant in areas with giant kelp than in areas without it. These and subsequent observations became the basis for their prediction that many fishes might exhibit decreases in density of $33 \%$ to $67 \%$ in areas where dense giant kelp becomes sparse (DeMartini and Larson 1980b; Larson and DeMartini 1983). The predicted effects of the operation of SONGS Units 2 and 3 on kelp bed fish have, therefore, been strongly tied to the predicted effects on kelp in SOK (Dean 1980). Thus, the maximum effect on kelp bed fish was expected in the upcoast and offshore portion of SOK, where giant kelp densities were predicted to decline by as much as $70 \%$ (Murdoch et al. 1980).

To test these predictions, the densities of fish (numbers per volume of water) and the densities of giant kelp (numbers per area of substrate) were estimated both before and after Units 2 and 3 became operational at various locations in SOK (the Impact site) and in the San Mateo Kelp forest (SMK, the Control site) located off San Mateo Point, 5-6 km upcoast of SONGS (Figure 1).

We use these data to test whether the density of fish changed in SOK from Before to After periods in areas where the kelp densities have remained relatively constant. Such changes might occur if the density of kelp bed fish are being affected by the power plant in ways other than directly through its effects on the density of giant kelp within SOK.

We also use these data to determine the relationship between fish density and giant kelp density. This relationship is then incorporated, with estimates of change in area of the kelp forest and the density of kelp within the forest, to estimate the total change in numbers or biomass of fish in SOK attributable to SONGS.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1 Field sampling of kelp bed fishes

Fish densities within kelp forests are based on underwater surveys conducted by a team of divers. We divide the kelp habitat into two strata (water-column and bottom). We estimate densities separately for these two strata, and combine them in our estimates of total number by taking into account the volumes of the two strata. Fish were counted along transects of known length and estimated volume. The water-column, or "canopy" areas were sampled with diver-held movie cameras (DeMartini et al. 1983 a, b; Larson and DeMartini 1983). These "cinetransects" were done at 3.1 m below the surface and were 75 m long ( $+/-2 \mathrm{~m}$ : Larson and DeMartini 1983), based on a 3-min swim at an average rate of $25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$. The average volume sampled by cinetransect was about $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, although the width and height of cinetransects varied as a function of underwater visibility (Appendix J in DeMartini et al. 1987). All density data were standardized to numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ before analysis. The estimates of density from the water column strata were assumed to apply to the water column extending from the surface to 1.5 m from the bottom. Using the densities from the 3.1 m depth as representative of densities throughout the water column is justified because fish densities at 7.7 m were indistinguishable from those in the standard "water column" depth (DeMartini et al. 1987). Because the 7.7 m depth was only sampled during 1985 and 1986 on a subset of surveys and stations we do not incorporate these data into our analyses.

Fishes in the bottom stratum were sampled visually by divers along transects 3 m wide, 1.5 m high, and 75 m long. The area surveyed by bottom transects was
$225 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$; the volume sampled was $337.5 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. The volume of this stratum is calculated assuming a 1.5 m depth.

Kelp bed fishes were surveyed only during the fall (October through December) of two Before years (1980 and 1981) and two After years (1985 and 1986). Sampling was restricted to the fall because underwater visibility was generally inadequate for fish observations during other seasons. Because sampling was dependent on sea state and underwater visibility, sampling occurred at irregular intervals throughout the fall periods. Visibility of more than 2.5 m was considered necessary in order to avoid grossly underestimating the numbers of fish. All transects were sampled between the hours of 0800 to 1600 . Surveys were done on 20 to 35 days each fall within the control (SMK) and Impact (SOK) kelp beds.

In order to estimate the spatial extent of any potential effects, samples were taken within two large subdivisions of SOK, an upcoast region nearer the diffusers (referred to as SOKU, Figure 2) and a downcoast region further away (SOKD, Figure 2). Originally, a fixed location within SMK, a location in upcoast SOK (SOKU) and a location in downcoast SOK (SOKD) were chosen (locations 1, 3, and 4, respectively, in Figure 2). These were the only stations sampled during the Before period, and they were also sampled in the After period. However, by Fall 1985 kelp densities at the original SOKD site had declined substantially relative to the other sites. Therefore a second SOKD site was sampled (location 6 in Figure 2). In our estimates of density (below) we use data from the original sites in the Before period, and replace site 4 with site 6 at SOKD during the After period. We make this change so that we test for relative changes in fish density in areas that have not showed marked relative changes in giant kelp density.

In addition to the stations described above, several other stations were sampled during the After period to help establish the relationship between fish and giant kelp density. These stations were chosen so that fish were sampled over a wide range of giant kelp densities. All the stations and the dates they were sampled are given in Appendix $A$.

On each sampling date, a team of four divers (one pair in the water column and one on the bottom) sampled a given location. In the water column stratum fishes were filmed on eight cinetransects per location. On the bottom (which had an average depth of 14.4 m ), counts were made on six transects at each site. Fishes were tallied by life stage (juvenile, subadult, and adult), based on length-maturity criteria (Appendix T in DeMartini et al. 1987). When cinetransects were viewed in the laboratory, fishes were scored for life stage using visual cues on film -- e.g., lengths of kelp blades, size-specific color patterns and behavior. On the bottom, fishes were counted as the transect line was paid out off a take-up spool. As the line was retrieved on the return swim, the divers counted all Macrocystis greater than one meter in height within the three meter width of the transect path. These counts of kelp were used to determine the relationship between fish and kelp densities. Details of these and other sampling protocols are provided in Appendix $J$ in DeMartini et al. 1987.

In addition to counts we estimated biomass of the fishes. The biomass of a species was calculated by multiplying the numbers in the various life-stages by the average weights of the life stages and summing over all life-stages. Determining the average weights of the life stages involved (1) determination of length-frequency distributions of the various life-stages in both water column and bottom strata, and
(2) converting the lengths to weights. These conversions were made with the use of directly measured and published relationships between length and weight. The procedures are described in detail in Appendix T of DeMartini et al. 1987. The average weights and densities of the various life-stages of the species used in the calculations are presented in Appendices B and C of this report.

As described below, we use estimates of the area of substrate either occupied by kelp populations (densities exceeding 4 plants per hundred $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) or not so occupied. These areas were estimated from areas enclosed by the 4 plants per 100 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ isopleths on maps generated from side-scan SONAR. Down-looking SONAR maps, which are more precise in determining kelp densities (Reitzel et al. 1987) were not used because surveys of this type did not begin until 1982. The total area with kelp was subtracted from the total area of hard substrate to give the area of the "kelpless" substrate. The specific maps used were from surveys taken in November 1980; December 1981-January 1982; December 1985; and December 1986-January 1987.

We also use estimates of the bed wide density of giant kelp in areas of hard substrate in SOK in the After period. These are estimated using down-looking SONAR records of kelp density (Reitzel et al. 1987), within areas classified as hard substrate based on side-scan SONAR following a procedure described in detail in Technical Report K. The specific down-looking SONAR surveys used were taken in December 1985 and December 1986-January 1987.

### 2.2 Analytical Methods

Our overall goal is to estimate changes in total numbers (and biomass) that can be attributed to the operation of SONGS. The sampling design used in the Before period was based on two main assumptions: (1) that the principal mechanism of impact would be through changes in kelp density, and not via a change in fish density for a given density of kelp, and (2) that changes in kelp density at the kelp bed fish sampling sites would be representative of changes throughout the bed. However, it became clear early in the After period, that both these assumptions might be violated, and that the change in the total fish population in SOK, relative to the changes in SMK, in the After period could potentially result from a combination of two principal factors. One, is a the relative change in numbers of fish per unit kelp in SOK versus SMK. For example, the amount of kelp could be unchanged from Before to After, but the numbers of fish per kelp plant could change, resulting in a change in total abundance. The second factor is the relative change in the area of kelp found in the two beds. The number of fish per kelp plant could remain the same, but the area of kelp plants could be disproportionately changed between the two beds resulting in a change in fish abundance, particularly if the density of fish is strongly affected by the absence of kelp. It is likely that any change in total fish abundance results from a combination of these two factors. Thus, to estimate the losses throughout SOK we needed information on changes in the density of fish when kelp density was held constant, estimates of changes in the density and areal extent of the kelp forest, and the relationship between fish density and the presence of kelp. As a consequence, the sampling program was expanded during the After period as described above.

Our procedure for estimating total losses (or gains) uses one set of information to estimate the relative change (i.e., percentage loss or gain) between SOK and SMK in numbers or biomass, and a second set of data to estimate the total number or biomass of fish in SOK during the After period. With these two pieces of information in hand it is a simple matter to estimate the number (or biomass) of fish that would be in SOK if SONGS did not exist, and from this the losses or gains.

### 2.2.1 Estimating Relative Changes in Numbers in SOK

We can estimate the relative change in the number of fish in SOK by using abundance indices that we take to be proportional to the actual abundance of fish in SOK and SMK. (We refer to the estimates used in the calculation of the relative percent change as indices because we believe that the data used result in an overestimation of the actual numbers in a bed at a particular time.) The derivation of these indices is described in Section 2.2.1.1 below. Once we have calculated these abundance indices we can calculate $S$, the multiplying factor representing SONGS' effect. The derivation of $S$ is as follows. In the following table, $L$ is the effect of location on abundance, $T$ is the effect of time, and $S$ is the effect of SONGS' operation. If A is the abundance (or some index proportional to the abundance) at SOK in the Before period, then the abundance at SMK in the Before, and at SOK and SMK in the After period can be expressed as multiples of $L, T$, and $S$ :

|  | SOK |  | SMK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Before | A | $L \mathrm{~A}$ |  |
| After | $T S \mathrm{~A}$ | $T L \mathrm{~A}$ |  |

We can factor out $S$,
$S \quad=[(T S \mathrm{~A})(L \mathrm{~A})] /[(\mathrm{A})(T L \mathrm{~A})]$.
or

$$
S=\left(\mathrm{SOK}_{\text {after }} \text { SMK }_{\text {before }}\right) /\left(\mathrm{SOK}_{\text {before }} \text { SMK }_{\text {after }}\right),
$$

where $\mathrm{SOK}_{\text {after, }}$, for example, is the abundance index calculated for SOK in the After period.
$S$ can also be expressed as the percent relative change where,
percent relative change $=(S-1) \times 100$

The formula for estimating $S$ is derived in more detail in Appendix I.

We now turn to estimating the abundance indices required to estimate $S$.

### 2.2.1.1 Estimation of Abundance Indices

The abundance index for a specific kelp bed during a given period, say SOK during the After period, is calculated as:

SOKU $_{\text {after }}=$ (average fish density in areas of kelp x the area of kelp) + (average fish density in areas without kelp x the area of hard substrate without kelp) found in SOK in the After period.

Note that in the following, abundance indices were calculated for water column and bottom fishes separately and combined to give the index of total numbers.

As described above we obtain the areas of kelp and non-kelp habitat from side-scan SONAR surveys. The average fish density associated with areas of kelp is taken to be the density within the areas used in our tests for changes in density of fish when kelp density is held constant (see Section 2.2.2, Relative changes in density). It is because these fish densities were measured in areas where the giant kelp densities were higher than the bed-wide average, and because there is positive relationship between fish density and kelp density (Section 3.4, Fish-kelp relations), that we believe the abundance indices over-estimate the number of fish (or biomass) in a kelp forest.

The density of fish in areas without kelp are derived by multiplying the fish density in areas with kelp by the estimated ratio of fish density in areas without kelp to fish density in areas with kelp. For the water column strata this was estimated as zero because fish were not seen on portions of cinetransects when kelp was absent (see Results). For bottom fish our ratio was estimated based on transects in SOK done during 1985 and 1986 where giant kelp was or was not present. This information was available because of the expanded sampling during the After period to determine a relationship between fish and kelp densities. The transects without kelp (location 2 for 1985, locations 2 and 9 for 1986) and with kelp (location 3,4, and 6 for both years) are given in Figure 2. We then estimate the ratio by averaging the ratio calculated for each year.

### 2.2.2. Relative changes in density

In addition to estimating densities in areas with kelp we tested for changes in densities of both water column and bottom fishes within SOKU, SOKD, and SMK that occurred from the Before period (1980 and 1981) to the After period (1985 and 1986). As described above we wished to detect changes in fish density that occurred independent of changes in kelp density, and care was taken to use data collected at locations within the three areas in the After period where kelp densities were similar to those sampled in the Before. The densities of kelp found at locations used in this analysis are presented in Table 1, and densities of kelp from all sampled locations are in Appendix D. The average density of kelp at both the SMK and SOKU sampling locations changed little from Before to After (Table 1). However, the average kelp density at the SOKD locations decreased from the Before to the After period (Appendix D). To reduce the influence of this Before-After change in kelp density on density changes of the associated fish, samples taken in 1981, when kelp density at this location was the highest, were excluded from the analysis. Excluding these samples resulted in a Before kelp density more similar to that found in the After (Table 1).

We take a significant ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) period-by-location interaction from an analysis of variance as evidence for a SONGS effect on density. The model employed was a two-factor fixed model with periods (Before-After) and location (SOKU, SOKD, and SMK) as the factors. The analysis was performed on the log $(x+1)$ transformation of the density estimates (both bottom and water column) from each of the sampling locations. As a check to see if the results of the analysis would change if a different log transformation was used, the analysis was also performed
on the $\log (x+0.1)$ transformation of the data. The results of the two tests differed only slightly, effects were found in the same suite of species. We report the results only for the $\log (x+1)$ transformation.

The taxa tested were selected on the basis of frequency of occurrence. To be tested we required that a taxon occur on more than $20 \%$ of the surveys at at least two of the sampling locations in both the Before and After periods.

The test was done on the combined life stages of the species. In general, we did not analyze individual life-stages of a species separately because differences in the habitat preferences among the life stages were not known to be sufficiently different. The one exception, however, is young-of-the-year kelp bass, which are known to inhabit a much more restricted habitat than do other life stages (they are much more closely associated with benthic algae). We therefore analyzed young-of-the-year in addition to all stages combined.

We used the two-factor ANOVA as the primary analytical design rather than the Before-After-Control-Impact-Paired (BACIP) design used by DeMartini et al. 1987, for several reasons. (See MRC Interim Technical Report 2: Sampling Design and Analytical Procedures, for a discussion of the rationale and design of the BACIP design.) The BACIP design requires that samples be paired by date. In part, this is to reduce any potential effect of seasonality on the observations. However, seasonality is not expected to strongly influence these data because all samples were taken within the same season of the year. Furthermore, for logistic reasons not all location could be sampled on each sampling date (DeMartini et al. 1987). The original SOKD location was sampled on the same days as the original

SMK and SOKU sites in the After period. Unfortunately this new site had to be replaced in the After period in our analyses in order to control for changes in giant kelp density (see above), and this site was not sampled on the same dates as the SOKU and SMK sites were.

As a secondary analysis, we performed a BACIP analysis only using the data from SMK (Control) and SOKU (Impact), where kelp density remained relatively constant and where samples were collected on the same days in both Before and After periods.

In addition to our statistical results we report percent changes (relative to the changes at SMK) at SOKU and SOKD in the After period. These are calculated in the same way as percent relative changes in total numbers, but now we replace the abundance indices with the densities in SMK and either SOKU or SOKD for the two periods in Equation 1 (Section 2.2.1).

### 2.2.3. Estimates of numbers of fish in SOK during the After Period

The numbers and biomass of fish in each strata (bottom or water column) in SOK in the After period were estimated by multiplying the average bed-wide density (or biomass density) of fish by the volume of each strata. Volumes are simply the vertical distance from the bottom to the top of a strata times the area of hard substrate. Bed wide fish densities were estimated by predicting them, using regression equations, from bed wide giant kelp densities obtained by down-looking SONAR.

Regressions of fish density against kelp density used measures of both as described in Section 2.1. In 1985 data are available from five locations (2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, Figure 2). Two more stations (numbers 7 and 9, Figure 2) were also sampled in 1986. The mean densities of kelp at the various stations are presented in Appendix D.

While bottom fish were counted along transects which had no kelp, water column fish were not. Instead, to estimate the numbers of water column fish in areas without kelp, the cinetransects were analyzed in the following manner. Fish observed on the films were counted and identified to species and classified according to the proximity of fish to kelp. There were two proximity categories: (1) kelp present in the same visual field as the fish, and (2) kelp not present in the visual field. Density estimates were then made by calculating the volume of water searched in the time each category occurred on the film. Thirty-two cinetransects taken during 1986 at location 5, Figure 2, were analyzed in this manner.

Water column and bottom fish densities were analyzed separately. In these regressions, fish densities were not log transformed. All transect counts were scaled to a number per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$.

Since the densities of water column fish in areas without kelp were close to zero (see Results), the regression line was fitted through the origin.

As described above we estimate the change in numbers and biomass of fish in SOK that can be attributed to the operation of SONGS by incorporating estimates of the relative change in total abundance between SMK and SOK (from Section 2.3) with an estimate of the absolute numbers of fish in SOK in the After period. The estimated numbers of fish in SOK during the After period uses the kelp-fish relationship described in the previous section. This number is the "observed" abundance in the equation:

No. of fish lost $=$ Expected abundance - Observed abundance
$=($ Observed abundance) $(1 / S)$ - Observed abundance, where $S$ is, again, the multiplicative effect of SONGS' effect on abundance (see above).

A detailed description of the method used to calculate the numbers of fish lost and of the method used to estimate confidence intervals around these numbers is given in Appendix I.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 The Kelp Bed Fish Assemblage

Table 2 ranks, by mean density (per transect), the species observed in the water column and near the bottom at the three sampling locations in both the Before and After periods. These densities are the average of the two Before and two After sampling years. Note that since these are the data used in the test for density changes (the ANOVA described in Section 2.2.2) independent of changes in kelp density, data collected at the SOKD site in 1981, where kelp density was abnormally high, are not included (means for the separate years are presented in Appendix E). Note too, that these are the densities of fish found in areas of the kelp beds where the average density of kelp is 10 or more per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (Table 1) and, therefore, are higher than then the true "bed-wide" averages. A complete list of the mean densities (and standard errors) of the various life-stages of all species observed during the study is presented in Appendix C. The frequency of occurrence for each species and for their various life-stages are presented in Table 3.

Several species found in the water column, which had high densities in the Before period, e.g., kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) were less dense in the After period at all locations. The occurrence of these changes at all sampling locations may reflect a response to the El Nino that occurred from 1982 to 1984, in the interval between the Before and After periods. However, contrary to the general pattern of decline among species in the water column, several species (e.g., rock wrasse, Halichoeres semicinctus) increased in density throughout the study area during the operational period.

While many species were found in both water column and bottom strata, some species were found predominantly in one of the strata. For example, California sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher), rock wrasse (Halichoeres semicinctus), barred sand bass (Paralabrax nebulifer), and black seaperch (Embiotoca jacksoni) appear to be tightly associated with the bottom, while halfmoon (Medialuna californiensis) and kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) were much more likely to be seen in the water column.

Some of the species listed in Table 2 are fish also found in open water areas away from kelp beds. Northern anchovy (Engraulis mordax), Pacific barracuda (Sphyraena argentea) and silversides spp. (an amalgam of three species of atherinids, primarily topsmelt (Atherinops affinis) but with some jacksmelt (Atherinopsis californiensis) and California grunion (Leuresthes tenuis) are all found in midwater areas away from SOK. It should be noted that these schooling, midwater fish were rarely found, on any given sampling day, at more than one sampling location. In fact, the high density of anchovy in the water column at SMK in the After period (Table 2) is due to observations of schools on only two sampling dates. These species and three others, jack mackerel (Trachurus symmetricus), Pacific mackerel (Scomber japonicus) and Pacific bonito (Sarda chiliensis) are not treated further in the present report (but see MRC Interim Technical Report 3: Midwater and Benthic Fish,), nor are they included in our estimates of "total" numbers or biomass of kelp bed fish.

In contrast to these species, several species appear to be tightly bound to kelp bed habitats in the San Onofre region. Kelp perch, kelp bass (Paralabrax clathratus), senorita, halfmoon, rock wrasse, and California sheephead, for example,
are all rarely found away from hard substrates, particularly those with kelp, in the study areas. DeMartini et al. 1987, present a detailed discussion of the habitats and affinities of this species assemblage.

### 3.2 Fish Density Changes in Areas of Constant Kelp Density

Changes in fish density in areas of relatively constant giant kelp density play an important part in our calculation of percent change in abundance (Section 2.2.1) and are also of interest in their own right. An ANOVA (described in Section 2.2.2) was performed on the densities of those species which passed our criterion of frequency of occurrence (Appendix E). We report the relative percent change observed from Before to After at SOKU and SOKD for those species which displayed a significant $(\mathrm{p}<0.05)$ period-by-location interaction in Table 4. The direction of the indicated change in density is presented for the species which did not have a significant interaction. Fish densities are summarized in Table 2 (yearly densities are presented in Appendix F). Complete ANOVA tables for those species with significant period-by-location interactions are presented in Appendix G.

In the water column stratum, two species showed statistically significant ( $p<0.05$ ) increases in density at both locations in SOK relative to the change in density observed in SMK. Senorita decreased in mean density from 21.5 (all densities are per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of water) to 18 in SMK, but increased at SOKU and SOKD from approximately 14 to over 35 . These changes result in relative increases of $224 \%$ and $185 \%$, respectively, at the two SOK stations. Halfmoon changed in a similar manner. While densities decreased in SMK, they increased at both locations
in SOK. These changes resulted in relative increases of $548 \%$ at SOKU and $529 \%$ at SOKD.

Two other species in the water column displayed significant period-bylocation interactions in which the densities showed a relative decline in upcoast SOK and a relative increase in downcoast SOK. Kelp perch decreased in density throughout the study area. However, relative to SMK, they decreased by $25 \%$ at SOKU but increased by $86 \%$ at SOKD. Giant kelpfish (Heterostichius rostratus) increased throughout the study area, but relative to SMK, it declined $42 \%$ at the location in SOKU and increased $85 \%$ at SOKD. The results of a second ANOVA on the densities of these fish in which samples from SOKU and SOKD were combined and tested for a period-by-location interaction against the densities at SMK indicate that the density of giant kelpfish increased $67 \%$ in SOK overall ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$, Appendix H). An overall change in kelp perch density in SOK, however, was not detected in this analysis.

In the bottom stratum, four species decreased significantly in density throughout SOK relative to SMK in the After period. Sheephead declined throughout the study area but density declined more in SOK so that relative to SMK they declined by $46 \%$ at SOKU and by $70 \%$ at SOKD. Rainbow seaperch (Hypsurus caryi) densities changed very little at SMK from Before to After. However, they declined in SOK so that relative to SMK they declined by $68 \%$ (SOKU) and $59 \%$ (SOKD). Barred sand bass (Paralabrax nebulifer) increased in density at SOKD and decreased slightly at SOKU in the After period. However, when compared to the large increase in density observed at SMK in the After period, these changes result in relative decreases of $74 \%$ near the diffusers and $43 \%$ at the SOKD location. The
mean densities of black perch (Embiotoca jacksoni) increased at SMK, but declined within SOK resulting in relative decreases of $85 \%$ at SOKU and $74 \%$ at SOKD.

Only one species, senorita, increased in density in the bottom stratum in SOK relative to SMK. The mean densities declined in SMK but increased in SOK resulting in relative increases of $580 \%$ at SOKU and $330 \%$ at SOKD.

As a secondary analysis, a BACIP analysis was performed on paired samples taken at the SMK and SOKU locations. (Recall that these stations were sampled on the same day but the SOKD station used in our analysis of density was not (see Methods).) The results (Appendix J) corroborate the results of the ANOVA, particularly those of the SMK-SOKU comparison.

### 3.3 Relative Change in Total Fish Abundance

We calculate the relative percent change in fish abundance so that we can estimate the numbers and biomass of the fish lost due to the operation of SONGS (Section 3.5, below). These changes in SOK relative to SMK are reported in Table 5. Estimates of relative percent change in numbers and biomass are presented for three categories of fish in both the bottom and water column strata: total kelp-bed fish, senorita only, and all non-senorita fish. Senorita were considered separately because they were the most abundant kelp bed fish and we wished to know if the results regarding total kelp bed fish were being dominated by the change in this one species. (Estimates of relative changes in other individual species are presented in Appendix K.)

As described in Section 2.2.1 the estimate of relative change between SOK and SMK in total abundance or biomass uses the products of fish density within a habitat type (substrate with kelp or substrate without kelp) times the area of that habitat type (i.e., the abundance index). These abundance indices were derived for both SMK and SOK in both sampling periods. The relative changes in the area of the substrate types, the relative changes in the densities of bottom fish, water column fish and biomass are presented in Table 6.

The fish densities, areas of habitat, volumes of strata and their products, the abundance indices, are presented in Appendix L. Recall that these indices are not unbiased estimates of the abundance. A more accurate estimate of the total number of fish is derived below for SOK in the After period (Section 3.5).

The densities of fish in areas without kelp are determined using a ratio based on the observed densities in area with and without kelp in the After period in SOK. The ratios are presented in Table 7.

### 3.3.1. Areas of kelp

Changes in areas of giant kelp are an important factor in helping determine the relative changes in fish abundance between the two kelp beds. The relative decrease in area of kelp in SOK in the After period at those times when kelp bed fish were sampled is approximately $76 \%$ (Table 6). At the Control site kelp was present on an average of $49 \%$ of available substrate during the Before period (Appendix L). During the After there was little change in this percentage as kelp was found on an average of $55 \%$ of the available substrate. In contrast, the
percentage of hard substrate with kelp decreased at the Impact site from $60 \%$ to $26 \%$ from Before to After.

### 3.3.2. Bottom fish

There has been a disproportionate decrease in the total number of bottom fish in SOK, compared to SMK, during the After period (Table 6). Relative to Control (SMK), the total number of bottom fish in SOK displayed a relative decrease of $70 \%$. When sorted into senorita and non-senorita a further pattern becomes apparent. Non-senorita fish decreased in abundance in SOK $82 \%$ relative to SMK. The abundance of senorita, on the other hand, increased in SOK $168 \%$ relative to SMK. (Estimates of the changes in other individual species are presented in Appendix K.)

The pattern of change in the biomass of bottom fish corresponds to the change seen in total numbers (Table 5). The biomass of all bottom fish combined displayed a relative decrease of $73 \%$ in SOK. The change observed in the biomass of non-senorita fish amounted to a relative decrease of $76 \%$ in SOK and corresponded to the decrease seen in numbers. Likewise, senoritas, which showed a relative increase in numbers in SOK, also displayed a relative increase in biomass (226\%).

### 3.3.3. Water column fish

The relative changes in abundance of fish in the water column were not as great as seen among the fish in the bottom stratum (Table 5). The total abundance
of all fish species in the water column in SOK declined relative to SMK, but the decline was small ( $17 \%$ ). When divided into senoritas and non-senoritas, the same pattern of relative changes occurred. In contrast to the relative increase in abundance seen in the bottom stratum, senorita exhibited a relative decrease of $27 \%$ in SOK. Non-senorita fish exhibited a small relative decline of $6 \%$. (Estimates of the relative changes in other individual species are presented in Appendix K.)

The changes in kelp area and water column fish density (in areas with kelp) were in opposite directions (Table 6). While the area of kelp in SOK exhibited a relative decrease of $76 \%$, the density of fish in the kelp areas of SOK increased by over $200 \%$ relative to the change observed in SMK (Again this estimate of change is based on areas where kelp density remained relatively constant). Thus while the area of kelp in SOK experienced a three-fold decrease relative to the change in SMK, the density of the water column fish in this area approximately tripled relative to that in SMK.

Although the numbers of water-column fish did not show large relative changes between Impact and Control, total biomass declined by $33 \%$ in SOK relative to SMK. Among non-senorita fish, the relative decrease in biomass in SOK was $36 \%$, which is considerably larger than the $6 \%$ relative decline in numbers. Senorita biomass declined by $27 \%$ in SOK relative to SMK just as did its abundance.

### 3.4 Fish-Kelp Relationships

### 3.4.1 Water Column fish

The importance of the presence of kelp to water column fish is apparent (Table 8). Fish found in the water column in kelp forests are rarely found in the water column away from kelp.

The relationship between total water column fish density and kelp density was evaluated in SOK in both 1985 and 1986 (Figure 3). Significant positive relationships between water column fish density and kelp density were obtained in both years (1985: $\mathrm{p}=0.02, \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.16 ; 1986: \mathrm{p}=0.03, \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.17$ ), although the variance explained by the relation is rather small. Note that the regression lines fit to these data pass through the origin because examination of the cinetransects indicated that water column fish were very rare away from kelp (Table 8). However, the significance of the regression is not dependent on the line passing through the origin. The slopes for the two years were not found to be significantly different from one another although there were differences in the kelp densities and overall fish abundances between the two years.

The regression of water column fish biomass against kelp density (Figure 4) also had a positive slope and was significant ( $\mathrm{p}=0.02 ; \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.18$ ) in 1985. The relationship was not as strong in 1986 ( $p=0.097 ; r^{2}=0.09$ ). The slopes of the regression lines from the two years did not differ significantly. As can be seen in Figure 4, the biomass regression for water-column fish was fitted through the origin.

### 3.4.2. Bottom fish

Significant positive relationships were also obtained between kelp density and bottom fish density in SOK during $1985\left(\mathrm{p}<0.01 ; \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.27\right)$ and $1986(\mathrm{p}<0.01$; $r^{2}=0.45$; Figure 3). Note that for fish in the bottom stratum we do not fit the regression line through the origin. Unlike fish in the water column, fish in the bottom stratum are present in areas of hard substrate where kelp is absent (Table 7). As was the case with the water column fish regression, the slopes of the regression for bottom fish were not found to differ significantly between years although there were differences in the kelp densities and overall fish abundances between the two years.

Significant positive relationships between biomass of bottom fish and kelp density were obtained in both $1985\left(\mathrm{p}<0.01 ; \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.18\right)$ and $1986\left(\mathrm{p} \ll 0.01 ; \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.52\right.$; Figure 4). The slopes of the two regression lines did not differ significantly.

### 3.5 Estimate of numbers of fish lost in SOK

We use the kelp-fish relationships (Section 3.4) to estimate numbers and biomass of fish in SOK in the After period (See Methods). These estimates are the "observed" values in Table 9. The "expected" values are the values we would expect if SONGS had no effect (see Section 2.2.1). The difference between observed and predicted values is our estimate of the losses (or gains) due to the operation of SONGS.

The estimated number of bottom fish in SOK in the After period is approximately 84,000 and their aggregate biomass is 9.3 metric tons. The expected values, however, are 275,000 fish weighing 34.4 metric tons. The loss in numbers $(191,000)$ and biomass ( 25 metric tons) in SOK has been quite marked.

The estimates for water column fish indicate that 133,000 fish totaling 10.6 metric tons were present in SOK in the After period. The expected values were 160,000 and 15.6 metric tons. The differences between the estimated and expected values are not as great as among bottom fish although there has been an appreciable loss in biomass.

To assess the strength of our estimates of the SONGS effect, ninety-five percent confidence intervals were calculated on the differences between expected and observed abundances (See Appendix I for their derivation). The difference and the confidence intervals are presented in Table 11. The confidence interval around the estimate of losses among bottom fish does not overlap zero and therefore we are confident that losses have indeed occurred. Although the confidence interval around the indicated difference among water column fish overlaps zero and therefore should be viewed cautiously, the indicated change is our best estimate of SONGS' effect.

In estimating the density of fishes (and subsequently abundance) we used the average bed-wide densities of kelp in SOK as determined by down-looking SONAR In 1985 the estimated density was 3.23 plants $/ 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and in 1986 it was 1.40 plants $/ 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. The fish densities and biomass predicted from the regression equations are tabulated in Table 10. These values were multiplied by the area of
small but abundant fish, did not account for much of the biomass of the kelp bed fish assemblage.

The reduction in water column fishes was less, a $17 \%$ decline in numbers in SOK. However, the decline in SOK was more pronounced in terms of total biomass (33\%). Again this pattern was more pronounced among non-senorita fish. In numbers, they expressed a slight ( $6 \%$ ) relative decrease in SOK, but a $36 \%$ decrease in biomass. This suggests that, while approximately the same number of fish were present in SOK in the After period, there were fewer large fish. This suggests, further, that while SOK may be still be an adequate habitat for recruitment and survival of younger, smaller fish, it may not as suitable as it once was for larger individuals. However, while the loss of total water column fish is estimated to translate into approximately 27,000 fish weighing 5 metric tons, this estimate, unlike that of the bottom fishes, cannot be held with statistical confidence. The relative changes in abundance of water column and bottom fish are somewhat surprising in light of the relationships between the density of each of the groups and the area and density of kelp.

### 4.1 Changes in abundance of water column fishes

Many fish found in the water column within the kelp bed are closely associated with the kelp plants themselves and are rarely found in the midwater even a short distance away from the kelp plant. Thus the absence of kelp in an area results in the absence of these fish in the water column. Furthermore, the density of these fish increases as the density of kelp increases. Both of these relationships suggest that the abundance of these fish would be very sensitive to kelp loss.

However, it appears that even in light of the large reduction in kelp observed at SOK during the sampling period (1985 and 1986), the total numbers of fish in the water column were not reduced to the same extent. This suggests that some fish species increased density in the smaller areas of remaining kelp habitat in the After period (although not all species behaved in this fashion).

Evidence of such "crowding" comes from the changes in densities, per unit kelp, of several species of fish which changed differentially among the sampling locations selected for constant kelp density from the Before to the After period. A number of species of water column fish which displayed these "location-by-period" interactions increased in relative density (numbers per unit kelp) in SOK. The most striking was the senorita. While its densities declined slightly at SMK, its densities in SOK increased dramatically, more than doubling its Before density. Several mechanisms may have resulted in this increase. Resident populations of senorita may be confined to smaller areas of available habitat (kelp) and the increased densities result from this "concentrating" of the population into relatively small areas. While the area of kelp in SOK decreased approximately $70 \%$ in relation to the change in SMK (this amounts to an approximate three-fold decrease), the relative increase in senorita density per kelp plant (in the water-column) was 180 $220 \%$, approximately a three-fold increase in SOK. These figures suggest the that change in fish density can be accounted for by the "concentrating" of population into a smaller area of habitat. Another process that may act to increase the number of fish per kelp plant in a kelp bed that has decreased in size is the fact that as patches of kelp within the bed become smaller, the amount of "edge" of the kelp bed increases. Some kelp bed fish have been observed to be more abundant near these edges (R. Bray, CSULB, pers. comm.)

However, we cannot discount other processes which may have increased senorita densities. Perhaps additional food, either material discharged by the generating station or material in bottom waters redistributed throughout the water column as a result of entrainment by the discharge water, is made available to the senorita. Although larger individuals primarily pick invertebrates off kelp blades and other objects, they and smaller individuals are known to pick plankton from the water column (Bray and Ebeling 1975; Hobson and Chess 1976; Bernstein and Jung 1979; Hobson et al. 1981) Since increased fouling on kelp blades was not found in SOK in the After period (Dixon et al. 1987), it is likely that a greater availability of waterborne prey in the diffuser plume has enhanced the attractiveness of this area for such an opportunistic forager (Hobson and Chess 1976; Bray and Ebeling 1975; Bernstein and Jung 1979).

Relative increases in density in another species, the halfmoon, were observed in the water column throughout SOK. While it declined in density in SMK, it increased at both locations in SOK. Again, this species may be "crowding" into smaller areas of dense kelp. However, the relative increase in density (approximately six-fold) is much greater than the three-fold decrease in kelp habitat. This suggests that other factors, such as food made available by the operation of SONGS, may be important in causing the increase in density in SOK.

Two species of fish, the giant kelpfish and the kelp perch, exhibited a relative decline in density at the Impact station nearest the diffusers and an increase at the more distant Impact site. The density of giant kelpfish increased at all locations sampled but increased the least in the upcoast portion of SOK. The relative decline in SOK near the diffusers is where the kelp population has been most reduced in the

After period (Technical Report K: Giant Kelp). The same pattern of density changes was observed in the kelp perch. Although this species declined throughout the study area, their density decreased, relative to SMK, near the diffusers and increased at the distant Impact site. These patterns cannot be explained simply by "concentrating" numbers of this species in smaller patches of habitat. Perhaps increased turbidity has made the areas nearer the diffusers a less attractive habitat to these species. The increases in density at the further Impact station suggests that the fishes may have redistributed themselves within the kelp bed and, in general, have moved from near the generating station, to areas further away. This pattern is suggested further by the observation that all of the indicated decreases in density (when considered regardless of statistical significance) among the water column fishes occurred at the nearer Impact location (SOKU) only.

It is important to keep in mind, in terms of predicting the future response of this group of fish, that we do not know if the higher densities resulting from the fish concentrating into smaller areas of habitat are sustainable.

### 4.2. Changes in relative abundance among bottom fishes

Unlike water column fish, which are essentially absent when kelp is absent, bottom fish do occur in areas without kelp, although they are less abundant there. Therefore, these fish were not expected to be affected by the loss of kelp as much as the water column fishes. However, large relative reductions did occur among these fishes, suggesting several possible effects of SONGS.

The loss of kelp habitat almost certainly accounted for some of the reduction in these fish. However, several observations indicate that kelp loss cannot account for all of the losses observed. Again, some of the strongest evidence for this comes from the relative changes in fish densities per unit kelp in the areas of SOK selected for constant kelp density.

In the bottom stratum the general patten of changes in density was a relative decline in density per kelp plant in SOK. Barred sand bass, black perch, rainbow seaperch, and California sheephead all declined significantly at both of the SOK locations relative to SMK. All of these species, which feed on benthic invertebrates, are capable of a great degree of habitat selection and may be responding to some alteration of habitat in SOK such as altered prey abundances.

The one species which demonstrated a relative increase in the bottom stratum in SOK was the senorita. Its density increased at both SOK sites while decreasing in SMK. This pattern corroborates that seen among the water column portion of the kelp beds and, again, may be due to the concentrating of the population in smaller areas of habitat or to additional food material made available in the water column.

Since the relative reduction of these fish (with the exception of the senorita) is greater than the relative reduction in the area of kelp, and as discussed above, the density of these fish have decreased in areas where the kelp density has remained constant, other mechanisms accounting for these reductions are suggested. There is evidence from MRC studies that other aspects of the benthic environment near the diffusers have changed during the After period. There have been changes in the
substrate types, some areas of cobble substrate have become covered with soft sediments (Final Technical Report B: Anomalous Sediments in the San Onofre Kelp Forest). There have been changes in populations of benthic invertebrates (e.g, several species of snails) which may indicate that other benthic prey items of the fish may also be reduced (Final Technical Report F). There have been changes, too, in the growth and survival of young kelp plants near the diffusers (Final Technical Report K). All of these patterns suggest that the benthic environment has been altered and it is likely that the fish found in this habitat would be affected as well.

### 4.3 Predicted long-term effects of SONGS

It is important to keep in mind that the estimates of SONGS' effects are in terms of relative changes in SOK compared to changes observed in SMK. The important variables used to estimate this relative change were the relative changes in area of kelp habitat and fish densities within the habitat in both SOK and SMK. To determine if the effect of SONGS changes in time, data on these variables must be gathered. For example, it will not be sufficient to determine any change in SONGS effects by monitoring the size of SOK only. A doubling of the extent of SOK does not necessarily mean that fish populations will double in size. Nor, if such an increase in fish does occur, that it is still not less than a corresponding increase in SMK.

On the other hand, while the relative effect of SONGS may remain constant, the estimated numbers of fish affected (and their biomass) over any one period are very much a function of the fish densities present in the study area during that
period. Fish abundances in the study area during a particular year are a function of a great many factors, many of which are exogenous to the study area. For example, our assessment of the effect of SONGS on the abundance of kelp bed fishes was set against several patterns of wide-scale changes in the abundances of fish observed throughout the study area. Perhaps the most striking pattern was the decrease in the densities of many species from Before to After at both Impact and Control. DeMartini et al. (1987) point out that many of the species that declined are primarily cold-temperate in terms of distribution, and their reductions may have been caused by the warm waters associated with the El Nino that occurred between the Before and After sampling periods. Conversely, several species increased in density throughout the general study area. These species, particularly senorita and rock wrasse, are considered warm-temperate species with respect to their distributions. Other studies (Patton 1985) observed similar increases in senorita and rock wrasse on a bightwide scale during 1983-84. It is expected that subsequent to 1986 (the end of the MRC sampling period), many fish populations adversely affected by El Nino, will grow again. Therefore, while the SONGS' effect in terms of percent change may stay the same, the numbers of fish affected are expected to change from year to year.
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## 6. TABLES

Table 1

AVERAGE KELP DENSITIES (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) AT SITES USED IN ANOVA ON FISH DENSITY.

Means (and standard errors) are presented. $\mathbf{N}=$ number of transects on which kelp was counted.

| PERIOD | SMK | SOKU | SOKD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Before | $40.3(2.5) \mathrm{n}=212$ | $12.8(0.4) \mathrm{n}=204$ | $11.4(0.4) \mathrm{n}=126$ |
| After | $44.8(3.0) \mathrm{n}=90$ | $16.3(0.8) \mathrm{n}=90$ | $16.2(0.8) \mathrm{n}=96$ |

## Table 2

# AVERAGE KELP BED FISH (IN WATER COLUMN AND BOTTOM STRATA) RANKED BY DENSITY AT SMK, SOKU, AND SOKD IN BOTH SAMPLING PERIODS. 

Densities in water column are per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, bottom densities are per $337 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. All life stages of each species are combined.
Table 2 (Continued)



Table 3

PERCENT FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH SPECIES AND LIFE STAGE AT SMK, SOKU, AND SOKD IN BOTH SAMPLING PERIODS.

Number of dates sampled are indicated in parentheses. Data are from samples used in the test for changes in density (ANOVA).

Table 3 (Continued)

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  | AFTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMK } \\ & (42) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (48) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (24) \end{aligned}$ | SMK (18) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (18) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & \text { (19) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 2.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 2.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 0.00 |
| NORTHERN ANCHOVY | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| KELP BASS | AD | 14.29 | 25.00 | 20.83 | 22.22 | 27.78 | 31.58 |
|  | JUV | 69.05 | 72.92 | 50.00 | 94.44 | 83.33 | 84.21 |
|  | OJ | 59.52 | 70.83 | 45.83 | 88.89 | 83.33 | 84.21 |
|  | SAD | 97.62 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 94.44 | 88.89 | 94.74 |
|  | TOTAL | 97.62 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 94.44 | 88.89 | 94.74 |
|  | YOY | 26.19 | 39.58 | 20.83 | 33.33 | 27.78 | 42.11 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 2.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.53 |
|  | TOTAL | 2.38 | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.53 |
| SILVERSIDES SPP. | AD | 52.38 | 52.08 | 37.50 | 50.00 | 16.67 | 10.53 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 52.38 | 52.08 | 37.50 | 50.00 | 16.67 | 10.53 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 11.90 | 10.42 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 44.44 | 21.05 |
|  | TOTAL | 11.90 | 10.42 | 4.17 | 5.56 | 44.44 | 21.05 |
| JACK MACKEREL | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 5.56 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | SAD | 26.19 | 18.75 | 12.50 | 5.56 | 33.33 | 15.79 |
|  | TOTAL | 26.19 | 20.83 | 12.50 | 11.11 | 33.33 | 15.79 |
| PACIFIC BONITO | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 5.26 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 5.26 |
| PACIFIC MACKEREL | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 2.38 | 6.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 2.38 | 6.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SARGO | AD | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SALEMA | AD | 7.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.78 | 26.32 |
|  | TOTAL | 7.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.78 | 26.32 |
| WHITE SEABASS | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 3 (Continued)
STRATUM=CANOPY

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  | AFTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (24) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMK } \\ & (18) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (18) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (19) \end{aligned}$ |
| KELP PERCH | AD | 97.62 | 97.92 | 66.67 | 100.00 | 66.67 | 42.11 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 97.62 | 97.92 | 66.67 | 100.00 | 66.67 | 42.11 |
| BLACK PERCH | AD | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| WALLEYE SURFPERCH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | AD | 52.38 | 79.17 | 29.17 | 5.56 | 44.44 | 31.58 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 14.29 | 27.08 | 16.67 | 27.78 | 50.00 | 36.84 |
|  | TOTAL | 52.38 | 85.42 | 37.50 | 27.78 | 55.56 | 47.37 |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PILE PERCH | AD | 30.95 | 20.83 | 8.33 | 5.56 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 2.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 5.56 | 26.32 |
|  | TOTAL | 33.33 | 20.83 | 8.33 | 22.22 | 5.56 | 31.58 |
| BLACKSMITH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 5.56 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 11.11 | 5.56 | 5.26 |
| ROCK WRASSE | $A D$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.56 | 5.56 | 10.53 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 5.56 | 10.53 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 11.11 | 21.05 |
| SENORITA | AD | 100.00 | 97.92 | 95.83 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | JUV | 33.33 | 10.42 | 4.17 | 50.00 | 38.89 | 31.58 |
|  | SAD | 9.52 | 2.08 | 4.17 | 50.00 | 38.89 | 36.84 |
|  | TOTAL | 100.00 | 97.92 | 95.83 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | AD | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 2.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| OPALEYE | AD | 59.52 | 20.83 | 8.33 | 16.67 | 5.56 | 5.26 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 2.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 61.90 | 20.83 | 8.33 | 16.67 | 5.56 | 5.26 |
| HALFMOON | AD | 97.62 | 70.83 | 41.67 | 55.56 | 38.89 | 47.37 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 11.90 | 10.42 | 8.33 | 16.67 | 27.78 | 15.79 |
|  | TOTAL | 97.62 | 72.92 | 50.00 | 66.67 | 66.67 | 52.63 |
| ROCKFISH SPP. | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

KELP BED
Table 3 (Continued)
PERCENT FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE
STRATUM=CANOPY

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  | AFTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMK } \\ & (42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (24) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (18) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (19) \end{aligned}$ |
| KELP ROCKFISH | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 |
|  | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
| OLIVE ROCKFISH | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PIPEFISH | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | AD | 9.52 | 8.33 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.26 |
|  | JUV | 19.05 | 18.75 | 0.00 | 33.33 | 27.78 | 47.37 |
|  | SAD | 16.67 | 4.17 | 0.00 | 66.67 | 38.89 | 52.63 |
| TOTAL KELP SPECIES | TOTAL | 38.10 | 29.17 | 16.67 | 77.78 | 44.44 | 63.16 |
|  | AD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | JUV | 78.57 | 72.92 | 50.00 | 100.00 | 94.44 | 84.21 |
|  | SAD | 97.62 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 94.74 |
| TOTAL INDIVIDUALS | TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | AD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | JUV | 78.57 | 72.92 | 50.00 | 100.00 | 94.44 | 84.21 |
|  | SAD | 97.62 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 94.74 |
|  | TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Table 3 (Continued)
STRATUM=BOTTOM

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  | AFTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (34) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & \text { (15) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ |
| HORN SHARK | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.50 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.50 |
| SMOOTHHOUND SPP. | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| LEOPARD SHARK | AD | 8.57 | 5.88 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.50 |
|  | SAD | 2.86 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
|  | TOTAL | 11.43 | 8.82 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 18.75 |
| THORNBACK | AD | 0.00 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SHOVELNOSE GUITARFISH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY | AD | 8.57 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 8.57 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| ROUND STINGRAY | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.25 |
| BAT RAY | AD | 5.71 | 2.94 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 5.71 | 2.94 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
| CA HALIBUT |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| TURBOT SPP. | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HORNYHEAD TURBOT | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 2.94 | 4.76 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| KELP BASS | AD | 34.29 | 58.82 | 85.71 | 26.67 | 53.33 | 43.75 |
|  | JUV | 97.14 | 100.00 | 85.71 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | 0 J | 71.43 | 100.00 |  | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | SAD | 91.43 | 97.06 | 100.00 | 93.33 | 73.33 | 100.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | YOY | 71.43 | 78.57 | . | 71.43 | 60.00 | 50.00 |

KELP BED
Table 3 (Continued)

BEFORE

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (34) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMK } \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ | SOKU (15) | $\begin{gathered} \text { SOKD } \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17.14 | 88.24 | 90.48 | 53.33 | 33.33 | 62.50 |
| 20.00 | 61.76 | 42.86 | 73.33 | 66.67 | 87.50 |
| 57.14 | 94.12 | 100.00 | 93.33 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 65.71 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| 0.00 | 8.82 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 26.67 | 13.33 | 12.50 |
| 14.29 | 17.65 | 4.76 | 13.33 | 13.33 | 12.50 |
| 14.29 | 26.47 | 4.76 | 33.33 | 20.00 | 25.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8.57 | 8.82 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 5.71 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 14.29 | 11.76 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
| 5.71 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |
| 5.71 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.25 |
| 0.00 | 5.88 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2.86 | 5.88 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 28.57 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 8.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 31.43 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 48.57 | 58.82 | 95.24 | 80.00 | 60.00 | 75.00 |
| 0.00 | 2.94 | 9.52 | 26.67 | 0.00 | 18.75 |
| 34.29 | 35.29 | 66.67 | 100.00 | 33.33 | 87.50 |
| 54.29 | 70.59 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 66.67 | 93.75 |
| 11.43 | 32.35 | 80.95 | 6.67 | 13.33 | 31.25 |
| 2.86 | 0.00 | 4.76 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 22.86 | 23.53 | 47.62 | 20.00 | 13.33 | 31.25 |
| 25.71 | 47.06 | 85.71 | 20.00 | 26.67 | 56.25 |
| 45.71 | 55.88 | 9.52 | 6.67 | 60.00 | 18.75 |
| 5.71 | 17.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 |

Table 3 (Continued)


KELP BED
Table 3 (Continued)
PERCENT FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE
STRATUM=BOTTOM

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  | AFTER |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & \text { (34) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (21) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SMK } \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKU } \\ & (15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKD } \\ & (16) \end{aligned}$ |
| OLIVE ROCKFISH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PAINTED GREENLING | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CABEZON | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| PIPEFISH | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
|  | Juv | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| GIBBONSIA SPP. | AD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | AD | 5.71 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | JUV | 5.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | SAD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 18.75 |
|  | TOTAL | 11.43 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 0.00 | 18.75 |
| TOTAL KELP SPECIES | AD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | JUV | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | SAD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| TOTAL INDIVIDUALS | AD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | JUV | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | SAD | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
|  | TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

## Table 4

## SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ON DENSITIES OF KELP BED FISHES.

The alpha level ( $\mathbf{P}$ ) of the period-by-location interaction from the two-factor ANOVA is given. The relative percent change in mean densities from Before period to After at each location relative to the San Mateo kelp forest (SMK) are given for those taxa which displayed a significant ( $p<0.05$ ) location-by-period interaction. Indicated directions of the change ( $d=$ decrease; $\mathbf{i}=$ increase) are given for the other species. Locations are: SOKU = upcoast portion of San Onofre kelp forest; SOKD = downcoast portion of San Onofre kelp forest.

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TAXA | P | RELATIVE \% CHANGE |
|  |  | SOKU |

## WATER COLUMN STRATUM

| Kelp Perch | 0.03 | -25 | 86 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Senorita | $<0.01$ | 224 | 185 |
| Halfmoon | 0.01 | 548 | 529 |
| Giant kelpfish | 0.00 | -42 | 85 |
| Kelp bass | - | d | i |
| Kelp bass YOY | - | i | i |
| White perch | - | d | i |
| Pile perch | - | i | i |

## BOTTOM STRATUM

| Barred sand bass | $<0.01$ | -74 | -43 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Black perch | 0.04 | -85 | -74 |
| Rainbow perch | 0.04 | -68 | -59 |
| Senorita | $<0.01$ | 580 | 330 |
| California sheephead | $<0.01$ | -46 | -70 |
| White seaperch | - | d | i |
| Kelp bass | - | d | d |
| Kelp bass YOY | - | d | i |
| Pile perch | - | d | i |
| Rock wrasse | - | i | i |

## Table 5

ESTIMATED PERCENT RELATIVE CHANGE AT SOK IN NUMBERS AND BIOMASS.

Percent change in SOK relative to SMK based on abundance indices presented in Appendix H .

## WATER COLUMN STRATUM

Total

$$
-17.2
$$

-32.7
Senorita
-27.3
-26.8
Non-Senorita
$-6.0$
-35.8

## BOTTOM STRATUM

| Total | -69.6 | -72.9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Senorita | 167.5 | 225.8 |
| Non-Senorita | -82.3 | -76.4 |

Table 6

## RELATIVE PERCENT CHANGE OF BOTTOM SUBSTRATES, AND FISH DENSITIES AND BIOMASS IN THE WATER COLUMN AND BOTTOM STRATA SOK.

"Cobble" substrate has < 4 kelp plants $/ 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Percent change relative to SMK based on values presented in Appendix $L$.

## RELATIVE \% CHANGE

BOTTOM SUBSTRATES

| Cobble | 46 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Kelp | -75.7 |

RELATIVE \% CHANGE
NUMBERS BIOMASS

## FISH DENSITIES IN WATER COLUMN

Total ..... 272254
Senorita ..... 214 ..... 218
Non-senorita 309 ..... 270
RELATIVE \% CHANGE
Cobble KELP
BIOMASS

FISH DENSITIES IN BOTTOM STRATUM

| Total | -39 | -53 | -21 | -32 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senorita | 447 | 847 | 501 | 522 |
| Non-senorita | -65 | -59 | -65 | -40 |

## Table 7

# RATIOS OF BOTTOM FISH DENSITY IN AREAS WITHOUT KELP TO DENSITY IN AREAS WITH KELP. 

Densities are per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$.

|  | MEAN DENSITY <br> WITH KELP | MEAN DENSITY <br> WITHOUT KELP | RATIO |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985 | 62.6 | 38.2 | 0.61 |
| 1986 | 119.4 | 28.6 | 0.24 |

## Table 8

## MEAN DENSITIES OF FISH NEAR (KELP PLANT IN VISUAL FIELD ON

 CINETRANSECT) AND AWAY (KELP NOT IN VISUAL FIELD) FROM KELP.Standard error of the mean is in parentheses. 32 cinetransects examined. Counts scaled to number per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ searched.

|  | NEAR KELP |  | AWAY FROM KELP |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MEAN | SE | MEAN | SE |
| KELP FOREST FISH |  |  |  |  |
| Kelp bass | 2.57 | $(0.67)$ | 0.01 | $(0.01)$ |
| Rock wrasse | 0.03 | $(0.03)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ |
| Senorita | 6.95 | $(1.96)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ |
| Halfmoon | 12.80 | $(4.85)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ |
| Giant kelpfish | 0.05 | $(0.05)$ | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ |

## PELAGIC FISH

| Silversides spp. | 1.73 | $(1.32)$ | 5.86 | $(4.88)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pacific barracuda | 8.03 | $(5.65)$ | 9.16 | $(6.25)$ |
| Jack mackerel | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ | 0.01 | $(0.01)$ |
| Pacific bonito | 0.00 | $(0.00)$ | 3.60 | $(2.83)$ |

Table 9
THE EFFECT OF SONGS ON ABUNDANCES AND BIOMASS (IN KGS) IN SOK IN THE AFTER PERIOD.

|  | ToTal Fish | Biomass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH IN WATER COLUMN |  |  |
| Observed | 132,600 | 10,600 |
| Expected | 160,000 | 15,600 |
| Difference | $-27,400$ | $-5,000$ |
|  |  |  |
| FISH IN BOTTOM STRATUM |  | 9,300 |
| Observed | 83,500 | 34,400 |
| Expected | 275,200 | $-25,100$ |
| Difference | $-191,700$ |  |

Table 10
ESTIMATED 95\% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS AROUND THE EFFECT OF SONGS ON ABUNDANCES AND BIOMASS (IN KGS).

Estimated change due to songs Confidence interval

## FISH IN WATER COLUMN

| Numbers | $-27,400$ | $\pm 142,000$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Biomass | $-5,000$ | 25,900 |

## FISH IN BOTTOM STRATUM

| Numbers | $-191,700$ | $\pm 157,000$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Biomass | $-28,100$ | $\pm 23,000$ |

## Table 11 REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS AND PREDICTED DENSITIES.

 Densities (numbers/ $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) ; Biomass ( $\mathrm{gms} / \mathbf{1 0 0 0} \mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ )|  | WATER COLUMN |  | BOTTOM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 1986 | 1985 | 1986 |
| Predicted Densities |  |  |  |  |
| All fish | 5.1 | 11.2 | 34.2 | 53.4 |
| $\quad$ senorita | 3.2 | 8.2 | 14.3 | 15.5 |
| $\quad$ non-senorita | 1.91 | 3.04 | 19.88 | 37.9 |
| $\quad$ biomass | 301.2 | 1021.2 | 4096.8 | 5671.1 |
| Regression coefficients |  |  |  |  |
| All fish | 1.58 | 7.91 | 2.49 | 7.75 |
| senorita | 0.99 | 5.78 | 0.75 | 0.73 |
| non-senorita | 0.59 | 2.14 | 1.75 | 7.63 |
| biomass | 92 | 719 | 220 | 966 |
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7. FIGURES

Figure 1: $\quad$ Map of the San Onofre area.


Figure 2:
LOCATIONS OF SAMPLING SITES. Areas of hard substrate in SMK and SOK are outlined. Upper map is of San Onofre kelp forest, lower map is San Mateo kelp forest. Subregions sampled are indicated by boxes. SMK=San Mateo Kelp, SOKU=Upcoast portion of San Onofre Kelp Bed; SOKD=Downcoast portion of San Onofre Kelp Bed. Numbers indicate locations where kelp bed fish densities were sampled (referred to throughout the report). Location 1 is in SMK; locations 2, 3, and 5 are in SOKU; locations 4, 6 and 9 are in SOKD. Note that the axes of the maps are marked in meters from a common reference point (the outfall of Unit 1). Locations of the diffuser lines of Units 2 and 3 are shown on the upper map.


Figure 3: $\quad$ The regression of kelp bed fish density (per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) against kelp density (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ).

Separate regressions for water column and bottom strata for both 1985 and 1986 are presented. Numbers in plot represent locations (see Figure 2) where data were gathered.

## KELP BED FISHES



Figure 4:
The regression of kelp bed fish biomass (kg per 1000 $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) against kelp density (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ).

Separate regressions for water column and bottom strata for both 1985 and 1986 are presented. Numbers in plot represent locations (see Figure 2) where data were gathered.

## KELP BED FISHES
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## APPENDIX A

## KELP BED FISH SAMPLING DATES.

The dates the various locations (designated by number, see Figure 2) and strata were sampled are listed.

KELP BED
SAMPLING DATES 1980

|  |  | SMK | SOK-U | SOK-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE | STRATUM | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 070CT80 | CANOPY |  | X | X |
| 100 CT 80 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | X |
| $200 C$ T80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 200CT80 | BOTTOM | $x$ |  |  |
| 220CT80 | CANOPY | X | $x$ | $x$ |
| 2400 T80 | CANOPY | X | X | $x$ |
| 2400 T80 | BOTTOM | X | X | x |
| 2700 T80 | CANOPY |  | X | X |
| 2700180 | BOTTOM |  | X | X |
| 2900 T80 | BOTTOM | $x$ | X | X |
| 3100 T80 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | X |
| 310 CT 80 | BOTTOM | $x$ | $x$ | x |
| 03NOV80 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | x |
| 10NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 12N0V80 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | X |
| 14NOV80 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ | $x$ |
| 17NOV80 | BOTTOM | $x$ | X | X |
| 19NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 19NOV80 | BOTTOM | X |  | X |
| 20NOV80 | CANOPY | X | $x$ | X |
| 20NOV80 | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| 21NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 21N0V80 | BOTTOM | X | X | $x$ |
| 24NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 24NOV80 | BOTTOM | x | X | X |
| 25NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X | x |
| 25NOV80 | BOTTOM | X | X | $x$ |
| 26NOV80 | CANOPY | X | X |  |
| 26NOV80 | BOTTOM | X | X | $x$ |
| 02DEC80 | CANOPY | $\chi$ | X | x |
| 02DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | X | $x$ |
| 03DEC80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 03DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| 08DEC80 | CANOPY |  | X | X |
| 08DEC80 | BOTTOM |  | X | X |
| 10DEC80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| $100 \mathrm{EC80}$ | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| 110 C 80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 11 DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | $x$ | X |
| $120 \mathrm{EC80}$ | CANOPY | $X$ | $x$ | X |
| $12 \mathrm{DEC80}$ | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| 150EC80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 15DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| $17 \mathrm{DEC80}$ | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 17DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | X | X |
| 18DEC80 | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 18DEC80 | BOTTOM | X | X | X |

KELP BED
SAMPLING DATES 1981

|  |  | SMK | SOK-U | SOK-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE | STRATUM | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 0700181 | CANOPY | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| 070CT81 | BOTTOM | $X$ | $X$ | $x$ |
| 090CT81 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | $x$ |
| 090 CT81 | BOTTOM | $X$ | X | $x$ |
| 120CT81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| 120 CT 81 | BOTTOM | $X$ |  |  |
| 1400781 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | $x$ |
| 160CT81 | CANOPY |  | $X$ | $x$ |
| 190CT81 | CANOPY | $x$ | $x$ | $X$ |
| 190CT81 | BOTTOM | $X$ | $x$ | $x$ |
| 210 CT81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| 2100781 | BOTTOM | $X$ | $x$ | X |
| 2300 T 81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| 230 CT 1 | BOTTOM | $X$ | X | X |
| 280 CT 1 | CANOPY |  | X | $X$ |
| 02N0V81 | BOTTOM | $x$ | $x$ | $X$ |
| 04NOV81 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | X |
| $04 N 0 V 81$ | BOTTOM | $X$ |  |  |
| 06 NOV81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| $09 N 0 V 81$ | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| $09 N 0 V 81$ | BOTTOM | X | $X$ | X |
| 11 NOV81 | BOTTOM | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| 13 NOV81 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | X |
| 23 NOV81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| $30 N O V 81$ | CANOPY |  | $X$ | $X$ |
| $30 N 0 V 81$ | BOTTOM |  | $X$ | X |
| $01 \mathrm{DEC81}$ | CANOPY |  | X | $X$ |
| 02DEC81 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | $X$ |
| $040 \mathrm{EC81}$ | CANOPY | $x$ |  |  |
| $07 \mathrm{DEC81}$ | CANOPY | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| $09 \mathrm{DEC81}$ | CANOPY |  | X | $x$ |
| 11 DEC81 | CANOPY | $x$ | X | $X$ |
| 140EC81 | CANOPY | X | X | $x$ |
| $140 \mathrm{EC81}$ | BOTTOM | X | X | $X$ |
| $150 \mathrm{EC81}$ | CANOPY | X | X | X |
| 150EC81 | BOTTOM | X | X | $x$ |
| 16DEC81 | CANOPY |  | $X$ | $x$ |
| $160 \mathrm{EC81}$ | BOTTOM | $x$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| $17 \mathrm{DEC81}$ | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| $17 \mathrm{DEC81}$ | BOTTOM | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| 18DEC81 | CANOPY | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| $180 \mathrm{EC81}$ | BOTTOM | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |


|  |  | SMK |  | SOK |  | SOK-D |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE | STRATUM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| 090CT85 | CANOPY | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| 110 CT85 | CANOPY | X |  | X |  | $x$ |  |
| 1100 T85 | BOTTOM | $\times$ |  | X |  | X |  |
| 170 CT85 | CANOPY | X |  | X |  | X |  |
| 170 CT85 | BOTTOM | X |  | X |  | X |  |
| 180CT85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | X |  | $x$ |
| 180CT85 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  | X |  | X |
| 220CT85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | X |  | $X$ |
| 250CT85 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |
| 250CT85 | BOTTOM | X |  | X |  | X |  |
| 280 CT 85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | X | X | X |
| 04NOV85 | CANOPY | x |  | X |  | X |  |
| 06NOV85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | X |  | $X$ |
| 14NOV85 | CANOPY |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| 14NOV85 | BOTTOM |  | X |  | X |  | X |
| 19NOV85 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |
| 19NOV85 | BOTTOM | $x$ |  | X |  | x |  |
| $20 N 0 V 85$ | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |
| $20 N 0 V 85$ | BOTTOM |  | X |  | $x$ |  | X |
| $22 N 0 V 85$ | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | X |  |
| 22NOV85 | BOTTOM | x |  | X |  | x |  |
| $27 \mathrm{NOV85}$ | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |
| 27NOV85 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | X |
| 02DEC85 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  | X |  | X |
| 06DEC85 | CANOPY |  |  |  |  | X | $x$ |
| $12 \mathrm{DEC85}$ | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | X |
| 12DEC85 | BOTTOM |  | X |  | $X$ |  | X |
| 160EC85 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |
| $16 \mathrm{DEC85}$ | BOTTOM | $x$ |  | X |  | X |  |
| 17DEC85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |
| $17 \mathrm{DEC85}$ | BOTTOM |  | X |  | X |  | X |
| $18 \mathrm{DEC85}$ | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |
| $18 \mathrm{DEC85}$ | BOTTOM | $x$ |  | X |  | X |  |
| 19DEC85 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | x |
| $190 \mathrm{EC85}$ | BOTTOM |  | $\chi$ |  | X |  | X |
| 20DEC85 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | X |  | $x$ |  |
| 20DEC85 | BOTTOM | $x$ |  | X |  | $x$ |  |

KELP BED
SAMPLING DATES
1986

|  |  | SMK | SOK-U |  |  | SOK-D |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE | STRATUM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 |
| 030CT86 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 030CT86 | BOTTOM | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 140 CT 86 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | X |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 160CT86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| 07N0V86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |  |
| 07NOV86 | BOTTOM |  | X |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |
| 11 NOV86 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  |
| 11NOV86 | BOTTOM | $X$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  |
| 12NOV86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ | $X$ |  |
| 12 NOV 86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| 13NOV86 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13NOV86 | BOTTOM | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14NOV86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |
| 14NOV86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  | $X$ |  | X |  | $x$ |
| 19NOV86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |
| 19NOV86 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |
| 26 NOV86 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  |
| 26NOV86 | BOTTOM | X |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 02DEC86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $x$ | $X$ |  |
| 02DEC86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $X$ | $X$ |  |
| 03DEC86 | CANOPY | $X$ |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 03DEC86 | BOTTOM | X |  | $X$ |  | X |  |  |  |
| 04DEC86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |  |
| 04DEC86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | X |
| 05DEC86 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  |
| 05DEC86 | BOTTOM | X |  | X |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 090EC86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |
| O9DEC86 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $x$ |  |  |
| 100EC86 | CANOPY | $x$ |  | $x$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 10DEC86 | BOTTOM | X |  | $X$ |  | $X$ |  |  |  |
| 11DEC86 | CANOPY |  |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ |  |
| 11DEC86 | BOTTOM |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  | $X$ | $x$ |
| 12DEC86 | CANOPY |  |  |  | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |  |  |
| 12DEC86 | BOTTOM |  |  |  | X | $X$ | X |  |  |
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## APPENDIX B

## MEAN WEIGHTS (IN GRAMS) OF THE LIFE STAGES OF FISH USED IN BIOMASS CALCULATIONS.

(from Appendix T in DeMartini et al. 1987)

KELP BED
FISH WEIGHTS (GRAMS)

| SPECIES | JUVENILE | SUBADULT | ADULT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HORN SHARK | 235.426 | 783.24 |  |
| LEOPARD SHARK | 444.987 | 2200.90 | 12732.1 |
| THORNBACK |  | 230.15 | 2416.6 |
| SHOVELNOSE GUITARFISH | 324.846 |  |  |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY |  | 8962.14 |  |
| ROUND STINGRAY |  | 271.61 | 587.2 |
| BAT RAY |  | 2721.03 | 11613.5 |
| NORTHERN ANCHOVY |  | 3.96 |  |
| CA HALIBUT |  | 364.18 | 6619.3 |
| KELP BASS | 47.967 | 202.09 | 670.3 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 79.431 | 219.88 | 644.9 |
| SILVERSIDES SPP. |  |  | 37.3 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | 56.611 | 245.86 |  |
| JACK MACKEREL | 15.312 | 30.55 |  |
| PACIFIC BONITO | 244.523 |  | 465.7 |
| PACIFIC MACKEREL | 28.673 |  |  |
| SARGO | . |  | 419.7 |
| SALEMA |  | 36.98 | 73.1 |
| WHITE SEABASS |  |  | 936.8 |
| KELP PERCH | 1.439 | 11.62 | 24.3 |
| BLACK PERCH | . | 85.60 | 189.0 |
| WALLEYE SURFPERCH |  |  |  |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | - | 82.47 | 177.6 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH |  | 48.93 | 110.0 |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | 29.348 | 163.24 | 512.3 |
| PILE PERCH |  | 110.11 | 322.6 |
| BLACKSMITH | 1.502 | 35.45 |  |
| GARIBALDI | 27.744 | 76.46 |  |
| ROCK WRASSE | 10.377 | 65.12 | 176.0 |
| SENORITA | 1.397 | 26.57 | 67.3 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | 107.675 | 452.00 | 1290.5 |
| OPALEYE |  | 300.37 | 764.6 |
| HALFMOON |  | 127.61 | 227.2 |
| CA SCORPIONFISH |  | 518.51 | 745.7 |
| KELP ROCKFISH | 5.862 | 133.69 | 222.5 |
| OLIVE ROCKFISH | 42.274 | 126.75 |  |
| PAINTED GREENLING | 29.006 |  |  |
| PIPEFISH |  |  | 29.5 |
| GIBBONSIA SPP. |  | 9.08 | 122.6 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | 4.359 | 56.44 | 207.2 |
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## APPENDIX C

MEAN DENSITIES (per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ for fish in water column fish, per $337 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ for fish in bottom stratum) OF ALL LIFE STAGES OF FISH AT SAMPLING LOCATIONS USED IN THE ANOVA.

Maturity stages are $\mathrm{ad}=$ adult, juv=juvenile, sad=subadult and total $=$ all life stages combined. Standard errors of the mean are also presented. Sampling locations: SMK $=$ location 1, figure 2 in both Before and After periods, $\mathrm{SOKU}=$ location 3, figure 2 in both Before and After periods, $\mathrm{SOKD}=$ location 4, figure 2 in the Before period, location 6, figure 2, in the After period.

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  |  |  |  | AFTER |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SMK |  | SOKKU |  | SOKD |  | SMK |  | SOKU |  | SOKD |  |
|  |  | DENS | $\overline{S E}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | $\bar{S} \bar{E}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | SE | OENS | SE |
| $\overline{\mathrm{ROCKFFISH}} \overline{\mathrm{SPP}}$. | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |  |  |
|  | total | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |  |  |
| KFLP ROCKFISH | $A D$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | total | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| OL. IVE ROCKFISH | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |  |
|  | Juv | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PIPEFISH | $A D$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.04 | 0.02 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Juv | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | 0.02 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | total |  | -- | -- |  | -- | -- | 0.04 | 0.02 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| GIANT KELPFISH | $A D$ | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | JUV | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | -- | -- | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
|  | SAD | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | 0.28 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.17 | 0.06 |
|  | total | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.45 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.08 |
| total kelp species | AD | 60.15 | 3.80 | 30.19 | 2.68 | 24.56 | 4.46 | 20.86 | 3.85 | 42.64 | 7.93 | 38.76 | 6.73 |
|  | JUV | 2.77 | 0.87 | 1.28 | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.13 | 3.57 | 0.94 | 3.77 | 1.63 | 3.73 | 1.10 |
|  | SAD | 4.17 | 0.84 | 6.31 | 0.95 | 7.31 | 1.19 | 3.64 | 1.04 | 12.35 | 6.12 | 9.35 | 3.01 |
|  | total | 67.09 | 4.15 | 37.78 | 2.94 | 32.25 | 5.00 | 28.06 | 4.61 | 58.76 | 8.81 | 51.84 | 8.02 |
| TOTAL INDIVIDUALS | AD | 68.08 | 5.33 | 33.62 | 2.56 | 26.84 | 4.80 | 24.11 | 4.18 | 43.68 | 7.88 | 38.84 | 6.73 |
|  | JUV | 2.77 | 0.87 | 1.31 | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.13 | 3.57 | 0.94 | 4.59 | 1.75 | 4.42 | 1.16 |
|  | SAD TOTAL | 13.61 84.46 | 3.57 6.69 | 18.65 53.59 | 4.98 6.66 | 10.68 37.89 | 3.08 6.91 | 33.52 | 29.39 | 15.78 | 7.27 | 10.98 | 3.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29.17 | 64.05 | 9.83 | 54.24 | 8.14 |

STRATUM=BOTTOM MEAN FISH DENSITIES


 BEFORE
SOKD


| SPECIES | MATURITY |  |  | KELP BEDMEAN FISH DENSITIESSTRATUM=BOTTOMBEFORE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SMK |  | SOKU |  | SOKD |  |
|  |  | DENS | $\overline{S E}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | SE |
| BARRED SAND BASS | YOY | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.37 | 0.08 |  |  |
|  | AD | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.62 | 0.08 | 0.44 | 0.08 |
|  | JUV | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.06 |
|  | SAD | 0.33 | 0.07 | 1.34 | 0.21 | 1.21 | 0.21 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.40 | 0.08 | 2.21 | 0.28 | 1.80 | 0.28 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | --- | -- |
|  | Juv | -- | - - | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | - - | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| JACK MACKEREL | A0) | -- | -- | 0.19 | 0.12 | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | 0.25 | 0.25 | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | 2.05 | 1.18 | 0.88 | 0.45 | 4.76 | 4.76 |
|  | TOTAL | 2.05 | 1.18 | 1.32 | 0.51 | 4.76 | 4.76 |
| PACIFIC MACKEREL | $A D$ | -- | - | , | - | . | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | - | --. | - - | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SARGO | $A D$ | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | , | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.04 | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.04 | -- | -- |
| SAIEMA | $A D$ | 0.81 | 0.64 | 0.25 | 0.25 | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | 0.81 | 0.64 | 0.25 | 0.25 | -- | -- |
| BLACK CROAKER | AD | -- | -- | 1.96 | 1.54 | 3.49 | 2. 13 |
|  | JUV |  |  | -- | -- | -- | --- |
|  | SAD | 0.95 | 0.95 | , | 5 | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.96 | 1.54 | 3.49 | 2.13 |
| WHITE SEABASS | AD | -- | -- | . | -- | 3.43 | . |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | - | - | -- | -- | -- |
|  | total | -- | -- | -- | - - | -- | -- |
| QUEENFISH | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| KELP PERCH | AD | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | , | , | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | 0.03 | 0.02 | -- | -- | -- | $\cdots$ |
|  | TOTAL | 0.24 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- |
| BLACK PERCH | AD | 0.95 | 0.32 | 3.57 | 1.48 | 8.79 | 2.25 |
|  | JUV |  |  |  |  | 0.09 | 0.08 |
|  | SAD | 0.43 | 0.14 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 2.54 | 1.19 |
|  | TOTAL | 1.38 | 0.36 | 3.90 | 1.49 | 11.42 | 3.19 |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | $A D$ | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 1.17 | 0.35 |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | 0.07 | -- | 0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | SAD | 0.20 | 0. 12 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.20 |
|  | TOTAL | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.11 | 1.56 | 0.47 |

KELP BED
MEAN FISH DENSITIES
STRATUM=BOTTOM
BEFORE


| MATURITY | SMK |  | SOKU |  | SOKD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DENS | S $\bar{F}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | SE |
| $A D$ | 0.73 | 0.26 | 6.81 | 1.80 | 0.41 | 0.40 |
| JUV | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.4 | 0.40 |
| SAD | 1.02 | 0.44 | 8.06 | 2.85 | 0.22 | 0.20 |
| TOTAL | 1.82 | 0.59 | 14.97 | 4.00 | 0.63 | 0.59 |
| $A D$ | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.10 | 0.82 | 0.39 |
| Juv | , 20 | 0. | 0.21 | - 10 | 0.82 | 0.39 |
| SAD | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.07 |
| TOTAL. | 0.25 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.90 | 0.41 |
| AD | 0.57 | 0.22 | 0.45 | 0.14 | 1.20 | 0.46 |
| JUV | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0. | - | , 20 | 0.46 |
| SAD | 0.51 | 0.19 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 0.60 | 0.30 |
| TOTAL | 1.09 | 0.31 | 0.96 | 0.28 | 1.80 | 0.75 |
| AD | , |  |  |  | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| JUV | 1.09 | 0.89 | 0.23 | 0.16 | -- | -- |
| SAD | -- | -- | 0.23 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| TOTAL | 1.09 | 0.89 | 0.23 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| AD | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.03 |
| JUV | -- | -- |  | 0.01 | -. | 0.0 |
| SAD | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| TOTAL | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| AD | 1.21 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 0.06 | 0.69 | 0.13 |
| JUV | 0. 16 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  | 0.1 |
| SAD | 0.16 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.08 |
| TOTAL | 1.37 | 0.17 | 0.36 | 0.06 | 0.86 | 0.13 |
| AD | 5.90 | 1.10 | 2.51 | 0.74 | 2.67 | 0.84 |
| JUV | 3.90 | 0.92 | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| SAD | 1.70 | 0.41 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.19 | 0.08 |
| TOTAL | 11.50 | 1.91 | 3.36 | 0.78 | 2.97 | 0.88 |
| AD | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.91 | 0.17 | 0.78 | 0.14 |
| JUV | 0.85 | 0.15 | 2.08 | 0.44 | 2.06 | 0.42 |
| SAD | 1.60 | 0.31 | 4.36 | 0.60 | 5.06 | 0.64 |
| TOTAL | 2.61 | 0.33 | 7.35 | 0.85 | 7.90 | 0.68 |
| AD | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| JUV | -- | -- | --- | . | , | . 0 |
| SAD | --1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |
| TOTAL | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| AD | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| JUV | --- | --- | , | . | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| SAD | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| toral | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.04 |
| AD | -- | -- | . | -- |  | 0.04 |
| JUV | -- | -- | -- | - - | - - |  |
| SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| TOTAL | -- | -- | 0.07 | 0.01 | -- |  |
| AD | -- | -- | -- | , |  |  |
| JUV | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- |  |
| SAD | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- |
| TOTAL | -- | -- | 0.03 | 0.02 | -- | -- |
| AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

WHITE SEAPERCH
RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH

## PILE PERCH <br> BLACKSMITH

## GARIBALDI

## ROCK WRASSE

SENORITA
OPALEYE
HALFMOON
CA SCORPIONFISH
KELP ROCKFISH
gRASS ROCKFISH
KELP BED
MEAN FISH DENSITIES

| SPECIES | MATURITY | BEFORE |  |  |  |  |  | After |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SMK |  | SOKU |  | SOKD |  | SMK |  | SOKU |  | SOKD |  |
|  |  | DENS | $\overline{S E}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | $\overline{\mathrm{SE}}$ | DENS | SE | DENS | SE. | DENS | $\overline{\mathrm{SE}}$ |
| OLIVE ROCKFISH | Juv | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | -- |  | -- |
|  | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | -- |
|  | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Juv | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |  |  |  |
|  | SAD | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PAINTED GREENI ING | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | -- | -- | -- |
| CABEZON | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | JUV | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| PIPEFISH | TOTAL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | JUV | - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  |
|  | total. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| GIBBONSIA SPP. | AD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Juv | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | total | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | -- |  | -- |  |
| GIANT KELPFISH | AD | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | -- |  |
|  | JUV | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
|  | SAD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | total | 0.02 | 0.01 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.01 | 0.01 | -- | -- | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| TOTAL KELP SPECIES | AD | 11.37 |  | 18.19 |  | 21.60 | 4.55 | 6.08 | 0.66 | 10.28 | 2.17 | 8.90 | 1.39 |
|  | JUV | 8.64 9.16 | 1.56 | 7.22 | 1.33 | 5.37 | 1.11 | 6.02 | 0.95 | 4.48 | 0.66 | 9.00 | 1.11 |
|  | SAD | 9.16 | 1.50 | 19.61 | 3.47 | 20.13 | 3.47 | 15.10 | 2.22 | 14.53 | 2.14 | 19.87 | 2.42 |
|  | total | 29.17 | 3.25 | 45.01 | 5.83 | 47.10 | 7.75 | 27.20 | 2.77 | 29.29 | 3.89 | 37.77 | 4.12 |
| TOTAL INDIVIDUALS | AD | 11.37 8.64 | 1.35 1.56 | 18.38 7.46 | 3.52 | 21.60 | 4.55 | 6.08 | 0.66 | 10.28 | 2.17 | 8.90 | 1.39 |
|  | SAD | 8.64 11.21 | 1.56 2.30 3.77 | 7.46 20.50 | 1.34 | 5.37 24 | 1. 11 | 15.60 | 0.88 | 4.82 | 0.77 | 9.19 | 1.15 |
|  | total | 31.22 | 3.77 | 46.33 | 5.95 | 51.86 | 10.72 | 28.10 | 2.81 | 30.07 | 4.09 | 39.10 | 2.43 4.20 |

## APPENDIX D

KELP DENSITIES (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) AT SAMPLING LOCATIONS.
Means (and standard errors) are presented. $\mathrm{N}=$ number of transects on which kelp was counted. Locations are designated by number. Number 1 is in SMK; numbers 2, 3 and 5 are in SOKU; numbers 4, 6, and 9 are in SOKD (see Figure 2).

| MEAN DENSITY |  | KELP BED FISHES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MACROCYS | PER 1 | SQUARE | TERS |
| LOCATION | TYPE | 1980 | 1981 | 1985 | 1986 |
| 1. | MEAN | 18.27 | 70.05 | 33.12 | 58.07 |
|  | N | 125.00 | 90.00 | 48.00 | 42.00 |
| 2 | SE | 0.55 | 4.02 | 1.05 | 5.60 |
|  | MEAN | . | . | 0.46 | 0.00 |
|  | N |  | - | 48.00 | 24.00 |
| 3 | SE |  |  | 0.10 | 0.00 |
|  | MEAN | 13.35 | 12.13 | 21.36 | 10.51 |
|  | N | 120.00 | 84.00 | 48.00 | 42.00 |
| 4 | SE | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.99 | 0.56 |
|  | MEAN | 11.12 | 42.03 | 10.55 | 3.98 |
|  | N | 132.00 | 84.00 | 48.00 | 36.00 |
| 5 | SE | 0.42 | 2.67 | 0.53 | 0.38 |
|  | MEAN | . | . | 8.54 | 2.53 |
|  | $\stackrel{N}{\text { N }}$ | . | . | 48.00 | 48.00 |
| 6 | SE | . | - | 0.64 | 0.35 |
|  | MEAN | . | . | 21.97 | 10.35 |
|  | N | . | . | 48.00 | 48.00 |
| 7 | SE |  | . | 1.01 | 0.56 |
|  | MEAN |  | . |  | 13.53 |
|  | ${ }_{\text {N }}$ |  | . |  | 18.00 |
| 9 | SE | - | - | - | 1.37 |
|  | MEAN | . | . |  | 0.37 |
|  | N N | . | - |  | 24.00 |
|  | SE | - | - | - | 0.24 |
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## I

## APPENDIX E

# TAXA TESTED FOR DENSITY CHANGES WITH AN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE. 

Tests were performed on all life stages combined.

WATER COLUMN<br>Kelp bass (Paralabrax clathratus) (plus young-of-the-year) Kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) White seaperch (Phanerodon furcatus) Senorita (Oxyjulis californica) Halfmoon (Medialuna californiensis) Giant kelpfish (Heterostichus rostratus) Pile perch (Rhacochilus vacca)<br>\section*{BOTTOM}<br>Kelp bass (Paralabrax clathratus) (plus young-of-the-year) Barred sand bass (Paralabrax nebulifer) Black perch (Embiotoca jacksoni) Rainbow perch (Hypsurus caryi) White seaperch (Phanerodon furcatus)<br>Pile perch (Rhacochilus vacca)<br>Rock wrasse (Halichoeres semicinctus)<br>Senorita (Oxyjulis californica) California sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher)
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## APPENDIX F


#### Abstract

MEAN DENSITIES (per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) FOR FISH IN WATER COLUMN AND IN BOTTOM STRATUM AT THE SITES USED IN ANALYSIS OF DENSITY CHANGES IN AREAS OF CONSTANT KELP DENSITY.


Dates are presented by year at each site. Sites are designated by number. Location $1=$ SMK; location $3=$ SOKU; locations 4 and 6 $=\operatorname{SOKD}$ (see Figure 2) .

## KELP BED FISHES -- 1980

## MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM $=$ BOTTOM

|  | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPECIES | 1 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| KELP BASS | 11.7 | 21.5 | 39.2 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | 6.9 | 26.4 | 23.4 |
| BLACK PERCH | 2.4 | 17.5 | 33.8 |
| SENORITA | 30.1 | 11.1 | 8.8 |
| BLACK CROAKER | $<.1$ | 9.9 | 10.3 |
| WITE SEAPERCH | 1.3 | 16.7 | 1.9 |
| JACK MACKEREL | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | 14.1 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 1.2 | 7.3 | 5.3 |
| PILE PERCH | 2.2 | 0.9 | 5.3 |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | 0.8 | 0.9 | 4.6 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 2.4 | 1.0 | 2.5 |
| SALEMA | 3.2 | 1.2 | $<.1$ |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | 0.4 | 0.6 | 2.7 |
| OPALEYE | $<.1$ | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| HALFMOON | 0.2 | $<.1$ | 0.3 |
| GARIBALDI | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | 0.4 |
| LEOPARD SHARK | 0.1 | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| BLACKSMITH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | 0.1 |
| SARGO | $<.1$ | 0.2 | $<.1$ |
| BAT RAY | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| GIANT KELPFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| ROUND STINGRAY | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| KELP PERCH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| CA SCORPIONFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| TURBOT SPP. | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| THORNBACK | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| SMOOTHHOUND SPP. | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| HORNYHEAD TURBOT | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
|  | $===$ |  |  |
|  | 63.3 | 115.7 | 153.6 |
|  |  |  |  |

## KELP BED FISHES -- 1980

MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS
STRATUM $=$ CANOPY

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| SENORITA | 26.4 | 10.6 | 13.2 |
| KELP PERCH | 31.3 | 8.7 | 7.5 |
| KELP BASS | 4.5 | 7.1 | 6.3 |
| JACK MACKEREL | 1.0 | 8.1 | 4.0 |
| SILVERSIDES SPP. | 3.2 | 5.0 | 2.2 |
| HALFMOON | 3.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 5.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| OPALEYE | 0.4 | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| GIANT KELPFISH | 0.1 | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PILE PERCH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| CA SHEEHEAD | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| BARRED SAND BASS | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
|  | $===$ | $===$ | $===$ |
|  | 75.3 | 41.2 | 34.9 |

KELP BED FISHES -- 1981
MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM $=$ BOTTOM

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 10.8 | 83.8 | 57.9 |
| SENORITA | 39.4 | 8.3 | 16.8 |
| KELP BASS | 18.5 | 32.1 | 8.0 |
| JACK MACKEREL | 14.2 | 9.5 | 33.8 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | 8.8 | 15.1 | 9.1 |
| BLACK PERCH | 6.3 | 3.0 | 7.1 |
| PILE PERCH | 4.6 | 5.6 | 2.0 |
| SALEMA | 1.3 | <. 1 | 8.2 |
| BLACKSMITH | 7.4 | 1.6 | <.1 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 6.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | 1.3 | 0.8 | 6.5 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 1.2 | 5.4 | 1.3 |
| BLACK CROAKER | 6.6 | <. 1 | <. 1 |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | 1.0 | 0.6 | 4.5 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | <. 1 | <. 1 | 2.7 |
| KELP PERCH | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 |
| HALFMOON | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| OPALEYE | 0.7 | <. 1 | <. 1 |
| SARGO | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| GARIBALDI | 0.4 | 0.1 | <.1 |
| KELP ROCKFISH | <.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| LEOPARD SHARK | <.1 | <.1 | 0.2 |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY | <.1 | <. 1 | <.1 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | <.1 | <. 1 | <.1 |
| SMOOTHHOUND SPP. | <.1 | <. 1 | <. 1 |
| ROUND STINGRAY | <. 1 | <. 1 | $<.1$ |
| HORNYHEAD TURBOT | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | <. 1 |
| WHITE SEABASS | <.1 | <. 1 | <. 1 |
|  | 131.4 | 168.1 | 161.4 |

KELP BED FISHES -- 1981
MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM = CANOPY

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| KELP PERCH | 37.4 | 14.6 | 7.8 |
| SENORITA | 17.5 | 15.4 | 9.7 |
| JACK MACKEREL | 19.3 | 4.5 | 10.8 |
| SILVERSIDES SPP. | 20.1 | 4.2 | 9.5 |
| KELP BASS | 4.9 | 9.4 | 6.2 |
| HALFMOON | 5.6 | 3.0 | 4.9 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | 3.5 | 0.3 | 6.4 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | $<.1$ | 4.8 | 1.1 |
| OPALEYE | 3.7 | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| SALEMA | 1.3 | $<.1$ | 1.3 |
| BLACKSMITH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | 0.4 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | $<.1$ | 0.1 | $<.1$ |
| PILE PERCH | $<.1$ | 0.1 | $<.1$ |
| PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAY | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| BLACK PERCH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| WHITE SEABASS | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PACIFIC MACKEREL | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
|  | $====$ |  |  |
|  | 113.5 | 56.6 | 58.0 |

KELP BED FISHES -- 1985
MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM $=$ BOTTOM

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| SENORITA | 21.4 | 25.4 | 24.8 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 34.6 | 14.2 | 30.4 |
| KELP BASS | 12.2 | 6.9 | 9.7 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 4.3 | 7.3 | 4.6 |
| BLACK PERCH | 5.6 | 1.4 | 8.2 |
| PILE PERCH | 1.5 | 0.3 | 10.6 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 0.2 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| BLACKSMITH | 6.0 | 2.3 | 0.1 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | <. 1 | <. 1 | 7.5 |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | 0.5 | <. 1 | 1.0 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | <. 1 | <. 1 | 1.2 |
| LEOPARD SHARK | <.1 | <. 1 | 0.2 |
| HORN SHARK | <.1 | <. 1 | 0.1 |
| BAT RAY | <. 1 | <. 1 | . 1 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | <.1 | <.1 | <. 1 |
| THORNBACK | <.1 | <.1 | $<$. |
| ROUND STINGRAY | <.1 | <. 1 | <. 1 |
| CA HALIBUT | <. 1 | <. 1 | <.1 |
| CA SCORPIONFISH | $<.1$ | <. 1 | <.1 |
| GIBBONSIA SPP. | <.1 | <.1 | <.1 |
| SHOVELNOSE GUITARFISH | <. 1 | <.1 | < |
| SALEMA | <.1 | <.1 | <.1 |
| PAINTED GREENLING | <.1 | <.1 | <.1 |
| PIPEFISH | <. 1 | <. 1 | <.1 |
|  | 88.3 | 62.9 | 101.1 |

KELP BED FISHES -- 1985
MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM = CANOPY

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| SENORITA | 23.2 | 21.0 | 20.5 |
| KELP BASS | 4.4 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| KELP PERCH | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| SALEMA | 0.0 | 21.5 | 9.3 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 0.02 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| GIANT KELPF ISH | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.06 |
| BLACKSMITH | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| HALFMOON | 0.04 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| PILE PERCH | $\underline{\underline{0.02}}$ | $\underline{\underline{0.0}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\leq 0.01}}$ |
|  | 31.61 | 44.22 | 31.47 |

KELP BED FISHES -- 1986
MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS STRATUM $=$ BOTTOM

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 37.8 | 31.7 | 32.3 |
| SENORITA | 9.7 | 38.9 | 10.6 |
| KELP BASS | 5.1 | 15.4 | 33.9 |
| BLACK PERCH | 5.8 | 3.5 | 16.5 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 1.8 | 7.1 | 3.6 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 4.3 | 4.6 | 17.3 |
| JACK MACKEREL | 5.7 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
| PACIFIC BARRACUDA | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PILE PERCH | 1.6 | 1.1 | 3.8 |
| CA SHEEPHEAD | 3.1 | 6.0 | 3.3 |
| RAINBOW SEAPERCH | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.5 |
| HALFMOON | 0.4 | $<.1$ | 0.8 |
| RUBBERLIP SEAPERCH | 1.3 | 1.6 | $<.1$ |
| SALEMA | $<.1$ | 2.7 | $<.1$ |
| BLACSMITH | $<.1$ | 1.1 | $<.1$ |
| GIANT KELPFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | 0.2 |
| OLIVE ROCKFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| ROUND STINGRAY | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| PACIFIC MACKEREL | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| LEOPARD SHARK | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| SARGO | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| GIBBONSIA SPP. | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| CA SCORPIONFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| THORNBACK | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
| SHOVELNOSE GUITARFISH | $<.1$ | $<.1$ | $<.1$ |
|  | $===$ | $====$ | $===$ |
|  | 77.5 | 119.0 | 130.6 |

## KELP BED FISHES -- 1986

MEAN DENSITY OF FISHES PER 1000 CUBIC METERS
STRATUM $=$ CANOPY

| SPECIES | LOC | LOC | LOC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| SENORITA | 17.8 | 66.9 | 54.4 |
| KELP BASS | 2.6 | 5.0 | 11.5 |
| KELP PERCH | 5.6 | 2.0 | 4.1 |
| SALEMA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| WHITE SEAPERCH | 0.06 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| GIANT KELPFISH | 0.29 | 0.22 | 0.50 |
| BLACKSMITH | 0.0 | 0.08 | 0.0 |
| HALFMOON | 2.4 | 12.7 | 7.3 |
| ROCK WRASSE | 0.0 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| PILE PERCH | 0.1 | 0.03 | 0.14 |
| OPALEEE | 0.1 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| BARRED SAND BASS | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.06 |
| BLACK PERCH | 0.07 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| PIPEFISH | $\underline{\underline{0.08}}$ | $\underline{0.0}$ | $\underline{0.0}$ |
|  | 29.10 | 87.38 | 78.48 |

## APPENDIX G

ANOVA TABLES FOR THOSE SPECIES WHICH DISPLAYED A SIGNIFICANT ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) PERIOD-BY-LOCATION INTERACTION.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { MOOEI } \\
& \text { ERROR } \\
& \text { CORRECIED TOTAL } \\
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { LOC } \\
& \text { PERIOD } \\
& \text { LOC*PERIOD }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { KELP BED } \\
\text { TWO FACTOR FIXED EFFECTS ANOVA } \\
\text { PERFORMED ON LOGIO(X + 1) FISH DENSITIES } \\
1981 \text { DATA TAKEN AT SOKD EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS } \\
\text { CANOPY STRATUM }
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COT SENORITA STRATUM } \\
& \text { MEAN SQUARE } \\
& 0.89516246 \\
& 0.17274309 \\
& \\
& \text { F VALUE } \\
& 0.44 \\
& 10.82
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{PR}>\mathrm{F} \\
0.0002 \\
\text { ROOT MSE } \\
0.41562374 \\
\text { TYPE } 111 \mathrm{SS} \\
0.10000208 \\
2.02280808 \\
2.45292196
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { SUM OF SQUARES } \\
4.47581231 \\
28.15712356 \\
32.63293587 \\
\text { TYPE } 1 \mathrm{SS} \\
0.15351954 \\
1.86937081 \\
2.45292196
\end{array}
$$

$$
\underset{\Delta}{\Delta} \operatorname{in}_{\square}^{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\Delta} \sim-N
$$

$$
\mathrm{G}-2
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { MODEL } \\
& \text { ERROR } \\
& \text { CORRECTED TOTAL } \\
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { LOC } \\
& \text { PERIOD } \\
& \text { LOC*PERIOD }
\end{aligned}
$$


TAKEN AT SOKD EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS
CANOPY STRATUM
TOT HALFMOON
(Continued)
SUM OF SQUARES
2.71697989
23.75022997
26.46720986
TYPE $15 S$
1.05011134
0.38635512
1.28051343

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { R-SQUARE } \\
0.102655 \\
\\
\text { F VAL.UE } \\
1.52 \\
2.23 \\
4.39
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\stackrel{\Delta}{\square} \backsim \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\underline{\infty}}{\infty} \sim \sim-N
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sim
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\pm \text { in } \underset{\sim}{\underline{0}} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \omega N-N
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { MODEL } \\
& \text { ERROR } \\
& \text { CORRECTED TOTAL } \\
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { LOC } \\
& \text { PERIOD } \\
& \text { LOCHPERIOD }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1000 \cdot 0 \\
& 88 \angle 5^{\circ} 0 \\
& 0 \angle 90^{\circ} 0 \\
& 1<\mathrm{Vd} \\
& 19869059 \cdot 1 \\
& N \forall 3 W \text { SNG0901 } \\
& 8206^{\circ} 02 \\
& \cdot \wedge \cdot 0
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { MODEL } \\
& \text { ERROR } \\
& \text { CORRECIED IOIAL } \\
& \text { SOURCE } \\
& \text { IOC } \\
& \text { PERIOD }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { KELP BED } \\
\text { TWO FACTOR FIXED EFFECTS ANOVA } \\
\text { PERFORMED ON LOG1O }+1) \text { FISH DENSITIES } \\
1981 \text { DATA TAKEN AT SOKD EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS }
\end{gathered}
$$

fiom mimat roto

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { VALUE } \\
6.60
\end{array}
$$

$$
\stackrel{u}{a}
$$

$$
n-\infty
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { MEAN SQUARE } \\
0.78533699 \\
0.11905286
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \circ \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\
& \hat{0} \\
& \stackrel{0}{-} \\
& \vdots \\
& 0
\end{aligned}
$$

SUM OF SQUARES
3.92668497
19.40561692
23.33230189
TYPE $1 S S$
1.56377096
0.07319813
2.28971588

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CANOPY STRATUM } \\
& \text { TOT TOTAL INDIVIDUALS }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { F VALUE } \\
6.57 \\
0.61 \\
9.62
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{ll} 
& 0.0018 \\
0.4341 \\
0.0001
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
P R>F \\
0.0001 \\
\text { ROOT MSE } \\
0.34504038 \\
\text { TYPE } 111 \mathrm{SS} \\
0.65431402 \\
0.03683803 \\
2.28971588
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\underset{0}{\omega} \underset{-}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\infty} \underset{\sim}{\circ} N-N
$$

$$
\text { G- } 6
$$

(Continued)

$$
\begin{array}{r} 
\\
\\
0 . V \\
148.6828 \\
10 G \mathrm{OFNS} \text { MEAN } \\
0.10997915 \\
\text { PR }>\mathrm{r} \\
0.0001 \\
0.0036 \\
0.0446
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { PR }>f \\
0.0001 \\
\text { ROOT MSE } \\
0.36669675 \\
\text { TYPE } 111 \mathrm{SS} \\
4.33021319 \\
0.07784586 \\
0.91310948
\end{gathered}
$$

| SUM OF SQUARES | MEAN SQUARE | F VALUE |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.83881961 | 1.96776392 | 47.18 |  |
| 5.42178548 | 0.04170604 |  |  |
| 15.26060508 | $F V A L U E$ | PR >F | DF |
| TYPE 1 SS | 21.71 | 0.0001 | 2 |
| 1.81068863 | 167.52 | 0.0001 | 1 |
| 6.98643024 | 12.49 | 0.0001 | 2 |

SOURCE
MODEL
ERROR
CORRECTED TOTAL
SOURCE
LOC
PERIOD
LOC*PERIOD

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { KELP BED } \\
& \text { TWO FACTOR FIXED EFFECTS ANOVA } \\
& \text { PERFORMED ON LOGIO }(X+1) \text { FISH DENSITIES } \\
& 1981 \text { DATA TAKEN AT SOKD EXCLUDED FROM ANALYSIS }
\end{aligned}
$$

BOTTOM STRATUM
TOT CA SHEEPHEAD
1.04170074

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {-square } \\
& .614720 \\
& \\
& \text { F VALUE } \\
& 13.47 \\
& 173.71 \\
& 12.49
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
P R>F \\
0.0001 \\
\text { ROOT MSE } \\
0.20422057 \\
\text { TYPE } 111 \mathrm{SS} \\
1.12339277 \\
7.24479050 \\
1.04170074
\end{gathered}
$$
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## APPENDIX H

## CHANGES IN DENSITY OF KELP BED FISHES IN SOK RELATIVE TO SMK.

Alpha levels ( P ) of the period-by-location interactions from the two-factor ANOVA are presented. In this analysis samples from both the SOKU and SOKD locations in SOK are combined. Relative percent change is presented for those species with a significant ( $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) period-by-location interaction and the indicated direction of change ( $\mathrm{d}=$ decrease, $\mathrm{i}=$ increase ) is presented for the others. YOY = young-of-the-year.

| TAXA | P | Relative \% Cilange SOK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WATER COLUMN FISH |  |  |
| Senorita Halfmoon Giant kelpfish Kelp Perch Kelp bass Kelp bass YOY White seaperch Pile perch | $\begin{array}{r} <0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.14 \\ 0.19 \\ 0.22 \\ 0.82 \\ 0.93 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 204 \\ 541 \\ 67 \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{~d} \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} \end{gathered}$ |
| BOTTOM FISH |  |  |
| Barred sand bass <br> Black perch <br> Senorita <br> California sheephead <br> Rainbow seaperch <br> White seaperch <br> Pile perch <br> Rock wrasse <br> Kelp bass <br> Kelp bass YOY | $\begin{array}{r} 0.04 \\ 0.05 \\ <0.01 \\ <0.01 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.82 \\ 0.43 \\ 0.89 \\ 0.40 \\ 0.75 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -60 \\ -76 \\ 462 \\ -59 \\ \mathrm{~d} \\ \mathrm{~d} \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{i} \\ \mathrm{~d} \\ \mathrm{~d} \end{gathered}$ |
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## APPENDIX I

## ESTIMATING THE CONFIDENCE INTERVAL FOR CHANGES IN ABUNDANCE DUE TO SONGS

We estimate confidence intervals for Changes in Abundance to help determine if the estimated Changes in Abundance (presented in Section 3.4.4) are significantly different than zero.
In Section 2.2.4 we present a formula for computing the Change in Abundance due to SONGS:
(1) Change in Abundance
= Expected Abundance - Observed Abundance
$=($ Observed Abundance $)(1 / S)$ - Observed Abundance,
where $S$ is the multiplicative effect of SONGS' operation, discussed in the following.

The Observed Abundance is the product of a regression estimate of density (y) and the volume of water. Volume is the product of surface area and depth :
(2) $\quad$ Observed Abundance $=y$ (surface area) $($ depth $)$.

The estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ is the predicted density from the regression of fish density on kelp density. We use the regression coefficients given in Table $X$ and the average kelp density to estimate $y$. As discussed in the report, we did not use the average density of fish from the transects used in the BACIP analysis because kelp densities on these transects were higher than average, and there was a positive relationship between fish density and kelp density.

For surface area and density we use the following subscripts to indicate time and location:

|  | Subscript |
| :--- | ---: |
| SOK, before | 1 |
| SMK, before | 2 |
| SOK, after | 3 |
| SMK, after | 4 |

We use the symbol "a" to denote the surface area within the canopy and " $c$ " for the surface area over cobble, outside the canopy. Thus $\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right)$ is the total surface area at SOK in the After period. Using "d" for depth, equation (2) becomes
(3) Observed Abundance $=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d$,
and then from equation (1),
(4) Change in Abundance $=$
$y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d(1 / S)-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d$, or
$=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d[(1 / S)-1]$

We use a multiplicative model, shown in the following table, to estimate $S . L$ is the location effect, $T$ is the time effect, and $S$ is the effect of SONGS' operation. If A is the abundance at SOK in the Before period, then the abundance at SMK in the Before, and at SOK and SMK in the After period can be expressed as multiples of $L, T$, and $S$ :

|  | SOK | SMK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Before | A | L A |
| After | $T S \mathrm{~A}$ | $T L \mathrm{~A}$ |

Thus our model assumes that SMK abundance remains the same multiple $(L)$ of SOK abundance for Before and After periods. The multiple of change in
abundance from Before to After $(T)$ is the same for SOK and SMK. Again, $S$ is the multiplicative effect of SONGS' operation.

We can factor out $S$,
(5) $S=[(T S \mathrm{~A})(L \mathrm{~A})] /[(\mathrm{A})(T L \mathrm{~A})]$.
or
$S \quad=\left(\right.$ SOK $_{\text {after }}$ SMK $\left._{\text {before }}\right) /\left(\right.$ SOK $_{\text {before }}$ SMK $\left._{\text {after }}\right)$,
where $\mathrm{SOK}_{\text {after }}$ is the abundance at SOK in the After period, etc.

Using $x_{i}$ to denote density at location and time, indexed the same as $a_{i}$ and $c_{i}$, we estimate abundances in terms of density $\left(x_{i}\right)$, area ( $a_{i}$ and $c_{i}$ ) and a proportion (p), where (p) is the estimated proportion of the density of fish over cobble (no canopy) to the density of canopy fish on the bottom.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { SOK }_{\text {beforc }} & =x_{1} a_{1}+x_{1} p c_{1} & =x_{1}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right) \\
\text { SMK }_{\text {before }} & =x_{2} a_{2}+x_{2} p c_{2} & =x_{2}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right) \\
\text { SOK }_{\text {after }} & =x_{3} a_{3}+x_{3} p c_{3} & =x_{3}\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right) \\
\text { SMK }_{\text {after }} & =x_{4} a_{4}+x_{4} p c_{4} & =x_{4}\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right)
\end{array}
$$

Note, the $x_{i}$ are averages of fish density from transects used in the BACIP analysis and therefore are from areas of higher than average kelp and fish densities. Even though from higher than average kelp and fish densities the $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ are appropriate for estimating $S$ since the relative densities of kelp were held constant for BACIP between SOK and SMK for Before and After.
$S$ (equation 6) now can be written in terms of estimable parameters,

$$
\begin{align*}
S \quad & =\left[x_{3}\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right) x_{2}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\right] /  \tag{7}\\
& {\left[\left(x_{1}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right) x_{4}\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right)\right]\right.}
\end{align*}
$$

And now the Change in Abundance (equation 4) can be written, Change in Abundance $=$

$$
\begin{align*}
& y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d\left[\left(x_{1}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right) x_{4}\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right)\right) /\right.  \tag{8}\\
& \left.\left(x_{2}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right) x_{3}\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right)-1\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

We use the delta method (Seber 1973), a commonly used procedure for estimating the variance of products and quotients, to estimate the variance of Change in Abundance:
(9) $\quad \operatorname{Var}($ Change in Abundance $)=\Sigma\left(\partial / \partial z_{i}\right)^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(z_{i}\right)$,
where $z_{i}=y, x_{1} . . x_{4}, a_{1} . . a_{4}, c_{1} . . c_{4}$ and $p$.

We show partial derivatives in Table I-1.

Note that the equations for computing Change in Abundance and its variance, equation (8) and (9), work for both canopy and bottom fish: for canopy fish set $p$ equal to zero.

In Tables I-2 through I-7 we present estimated confidence intervals and the parameter estimates needed to compute them. Surface area for canopy ( $a_{i}$ ) and cobble ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) were estimated without replication. Rather than treat them as constants we gave them estimates of variance of $10 \%$ of their estimated densities. Thus for a surface area of 100 HA , we believe that nearly all estimates of mean area would fall between 105 and 95 HA , essentially two standard errors. We treated depth (d) as a constant.

Covariances were not estimable. Covariance between surface area and fish density may exist. Covariance between $a_{i}$ and $c_{i}$ also likely exist since the total area
of the kelp bed remains relatively constant. These covariances would reduce the estimated variance and tighten estimates of confidence intervals.

## Table I-1

Partial derivatives for computing the variance of Change in Abundance, equation (8).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \partial / \partial y=\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d\left[x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right)-1\right] \\
& \partial / \partial x_{1}=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial x_{4}=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial x_{2}=-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2}^{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial x_{3}=-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}^{2}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial a_{1}=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial a_{4}=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial a_{2}=-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)^{2}\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial a_{3}=y d\left[x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right)-1\right]-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4} \\
& \left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)^{2}\right) \\
& \partial / \partial c_{1}=p y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial c_{4}=p y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right) \\
& \partial / \partial c_{2}=p\left(-y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d\left[x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)^{2}\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right)\right)\right. \\
& \partial / \partial c_{3}=y d\left[x_{1} x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)\right)-1\right]-p y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d x_{1} \\
& x_{4}\left(a_{1}+p c_{1}\right)\left(a_{4}+p c_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\left(a_{2}+p c_{2}\right)\left(a_{3}+p c_{3}\right)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

to differentiate with respect to p , let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=y\left(a_{3}+c_{3}\right) d \\
& B=\left(x_{1} x_{4}\right) /\left(x_{2} x_{3}\right) \\
& C=c_{1} c_{4} \\
& E=a_{1} a_{4} \\
& F=c_{2} c_{3} \\
& G=a_{2} c_{3}+a_{3} c_{2} \\
& H=a_{2} a_{3} \\
& J=a_{1} c_{4}+a_{4} c_{1} \\
& \partial / \partial p=A B\left((J-G C / F) /\left(F p^{2}+G p+H\right)\right)-((J-G C / F) p+E-H C / F)(2 F p+G) /\left(\left(F p^{2}\right.\right. \\
&\left.+G p+H))^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Table I-2

All canopy fish: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

## Expected Values

|  | SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK <br> after | SMK <br> after |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 8.2 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 38 | 71 | 60 | 30 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 88 | 50 | 32 | 74 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depth | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |

Variances

Reg. estimate (y)
Proportion (p)
n/a

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { SOK } \\ \text { before }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { SMK } \\ \text { before }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { SOK } \\ \text { after }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { SMK } \\ \text { after }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Density ( $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )
0

Area of canopy ( $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )
Area of cobble ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) Depth

| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 32 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 48 | 59 | 57 |
| 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Percent Change $=(S-1) 100 \%=-17.2 \%$
Expected Abundance $=160 \times 10^{3}$
Observed Abundance $=132.6 \times 10^{3}$
Change in Abundance $=27.4 \times 10^{3}$
Std $($ Change in Abundance $) \approx 71.1 \times 10^{3}$
$95 \%$ C.I. (Change in Abundance) $\approx 27.4 \times 10^{3}+/-142.2 \times 10^{3}$

## Table I-3

All bottom fish: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

|  | Expected Values |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK <br> after | SMK <br> afer |
| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 44 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.33 | 0.43 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 143 | 90 | 100 | 80 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 88 | 50 | 32 | 74 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 58 | 52 | 93 | 60 |
| Depth | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

Variances

| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 43 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 467 | 172 | 129 | 133 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 |
| Depth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Percent Change }=(S-1) 100 \%=-69.6 \% \\
& \text { Expected Abundance }=275.2 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Observed Abundance }=83.5 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Change in Abundance }=191.7 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Std }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 78.6 \times 10^{3} \\
& 95 \% \text { C.I. }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 191.4 \times 10^{3}+1-157.2 \times 10^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Table I-4

Senorita canopy: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

|  | Expected Values |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOK } \\ & \text { after } \end{aligned}$ | SMK <br> after |
| Reg. estimate (y) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | 5.2 | n/a |
| Proportion (p) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Density ( $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) | 14 | 22 | 40 | 21 |
| Area of canopy ( $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) | 88 | 50 | 32 | 74 |
| Area of cobble ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depth | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
|  | Variances |  |  |  |
|  | SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK <br> after | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMK } \\ & \text { after } \end{aligned}$ |
| Reg. estimate (y) | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 17 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Proportion (p) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Density ( $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) | 10 | 13 | 26 | 44 |
| Area of canopy ( $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) | 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Area of cobble (ci) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Change $=(S-1) 100 \%=-27.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Expected Abundance $=126.8 \times 10^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Observed Abundance $=92.3 \times 10^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Change in Abundance $=34.5 \times 10^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Std $($ Change in Abundance $) \approx 73.0 \times 10^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ C.I. (Change in Abundance) $\approx 34.5 \times 10^{3}+/-146.0 \times 10^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table I-5
Senorita bottom: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

Expected Values

Reg. estimate (y)
Proportion (p)
Density ( $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )
Area of canopy ( $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )
Area of cobble ( $c_{i}$ ) Depth

| SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK <br> after | SMK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n/a | afer |  |  |
| 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.39 | $\frac{15}{n / a}$ |
| 9 | 15 | 24 | 0.43 |
| 88 | 50 | 32 | 35 |
| 58 | 52 | 93 | 74 |
| 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 60 |
|  |  |  | 1.5 |

Variances

| SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK | SMK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{\text { after }}$ | after |  |


| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 15 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 4 | 70 | 40 | 87 |
| 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Percent Change $=(S-1) 100 \%=167.6 \%$
Expected Abundance $=10.7 \times 10^{3}$
Observed Abundance $=28.7 \times 10^{3}$
Change in Abundance $=18.0 \times 10^{3}$
Std (Change in Abundance) $\approx 9.2 \times 10^{3}$
$95 \%$ C.I. (Change in Abundance) $\approx 18.0 \times 10^{3}+/-18.4 \times 10^{3}$

## Table I-6

Non-Senorita canopy: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 2.5 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 24 | 49 | 20 | 19 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 88 | 50 | 32 | 74 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depth | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |

Variances

| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 10 | 34 | 20 | 19 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Depth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Percent Change }=(S-1) 100 \%=-6.01 \% \\
& \text { Expected Abundance }=43.1 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Observed Abundance }=40.5 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Change in Abundance }=2.6 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Std }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 26.3 \times 10^{3} \\
& 95 \% \text { C.I. }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 2.6 \times 10^{3}+1.52 .6 \times 10^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Table I-7

Non-Senorita bottom: computation of standard deviation and confidence intervals. Densities are in numbers per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, areas in hectare, depth in meters.

Parameter estimates used in estimating partial derivatives and variance:

|  | Expected Values |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SOK <br> before | SMK <br> before | SOK <br> after | SMK <br> afer |
| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 29 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.36 | 0.43 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 134 | 55 | 76 | 64 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 88 | 50 | 32 | 74 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 58 | 52 | 93 | 60 |
| Depth | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

Variances

| SOK | SMK <br> before | $\underline{\text { before }}$ | SOK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$| SMK |
| :---: |
| after |$\quad$| after |
| :--- |


| Reg. estimate $(\mathrm{y})$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 26 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportion $(\mathrm{p})$ | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Density $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 400 | 105 | 98 | 106 |
| Area of canopy $\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| Area of cobble $\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ | 6 | 5 | 9 | 6 |
| Depth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Percent Change }=(S-1) 100 \%=-82.5 \% \\
& \text { Expected Abundance }=312.7 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Observed Abundance }=54.8 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Change in Abundance }=257.9 \times 10^{3} \\
& \text { Std }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 93.7 \times 10^{3} \\
& 95 \% \text { C.I. }(\text { Change in Abundance }) \approx 257.9 \times 10^{3}+1-187.4 \times 10^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## APPENDIX J

SUMMARY OF BACIP RESULTS COMPARING DENSITIES OF KELP BED FISHES AT SMK AND SOKU.

Those taxa which displayed a significant $(\mathrm{P}<0.05) \mathrm{BACIP}$ result are listed. Also listed are the alpha level of the test result, the log transformation used in the analysis and the relative percent change in mean densities from Before period to After.
TAXA $\mathrm{P} \quad$ TRANSFORMATION $\quad$ \% CHANGE

## BOTTOM FISH

| Barred sand bass | $<0.01$ | $\log (x+1)$ | -69 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black perch | $<0.01$ | $\log (x+1)$ | -79 |
| Senorita | $<0.01$ | $\log (x+1)$ | 12.53 |
| California sheephead | 0.02 | $\log (x+1)$ | -51 |

## WATER COLUMN FISH

| Halfmoon | 0.01 | $\log (x+1)$ | 142 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kelp perch | 0.03 | $\log (x+0.01)$ | -76 |
| Senorita | $<0.01$ | $\log (x+1)$ | 232 |
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## APPENDIX K

## ESTIMATED RELATIVE PERCENT CHANGE IN SOK OF TOTAL ABUNDANCE OF INDIVIDUAL SPECIES OF WATER COLUMN AND BOTTOM FISHES.

Estimates were made on all life-stages combined. Calculation of estimates follows procedure for Total Water Column and Total Bottom Fishes described in Section 3.5. Substrate areas and strata volumes are as in Appendix L. The density value used for an individual species is the Total Fish density (Appendix L) times the proportion of total fish that species represents. Neither confidence intervals nor statistical significance of these estimates are calculated.

## WATER COLUMN

Kelp bass (Paralabrax clathratus) -79
(plus young-of-the-year) $\quad-72$
Kelp perch (Brachyistius frenatus) -70
White seaperch (Phanerodon furcatus) 101
Senorita (Oxyjulis californica) -25
Halfmoon (Medialuna californiensis) 57
Giant kelpfish (Heterostichus rostratus) -74
Pile perch (Rhacochilus vacca) -77

BOTTOM
Kelp bass (Paralabrax clathratus) -68
(plus young-of-the-year) -74
Barred sand bass (Paralabrax nebulifer) -77
Black perch (Embiotoca jacksoni) -93
Rainbow perch (Hypsurus caryi) -88
White seaperch (Phanerodon furcatus) -72
Pile perch (Rhacochilus vacca). -43
Rock wrasse (Halichoeres semicinctus) -19
Senorita (Oxyjulis californica) 166
California sheephead (Semicossyphus pulcher) -73
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## APPENDIX L

DATA USED IN THE CALCULATIONS OF PERCENT RELATIVE CHANGE IN BOTTOM AREA, FISH DENSITY, TOTAL NUMBERS, AND TOTAL BIOMASS.

The entries in the right-hand block of the tables are the areas (in hectares) of the "cobble" portions ( $<4$ kelp plants/ $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) and "kelp" portions (areas with higher densities of kelp) of the hard substrate in SMK and SOK in each of the two Before (1980 and 1981) and the two After years (1985 and 1986). Entries in the center block of the tables are either fish densities (per $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) or fish biomass ( $\mathrm{kg} / 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) for each of three categories of fish (Total, senorita and non-senorita) in each of two strata (bottom and water column, or "canopy") in each of the two kelp beds in each of the four years. The entries in the left hand block of the tables are the products, or "abundance indices", of the area of substrate x the density x times the depth of the stratum ( 12.9 m for canopy, 1.5 m for bottom).

KELP BED
NUM ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE
SPECIES = TOTAL
STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SMK


AREAL EXTENT OF BEDS BASED ON SIDESCAN SONAR SURVEYS FISH/KELP REGRESSION NOT USED TO MAKE FISH DENSITY ESTIMATES REQUEST DR56 SAS KBABU883

KELP BED
NUM ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE SPECIES = SENORITA

STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SMK

BOTTOM AREA
(HA)

FISH DENS
$1000 * * 3 M$

ABUNDANCE

| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | 1 | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 32.40 | 69.00 | 12.93 | 30.07 |  | 6284.7 | 31126 | 37410 |
| 1981 | 72.10 | 31.10 | 16.96 | 39.44 |  | 18341 | 18398 | 36739 |
| 1985 | 65.60 | 69.10 | 9.18 | 21.36 |  | 9036.3 | 22136 | 31172 |
| 1986 | 54.70 | 79.50 | 4.19 | 9.74 |  | 3434.7 | 11609 | 15044 |

STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SOK

BOTTOM AREA
(HA)

FISH DENS 1000**3M

ABUNDANCE

| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 47.20 | 94.50 | 4.27 | 9.92 | 3021.4 | 14068 | 17089 |
| 1981 | 68.60 | 81.00 | 5.39 | 12.54 | 5548.3 | 15235 | 20784 |
| 1985 | 96.70 | 40.50 | 8.21 | 24.71 | 11908 | 15009 | 26917 |
| 1986 | 97.90 | 22.70 | 10.99 | 20.77 | 16135 | 7072.6 | 23207 |

STRATUM=CANOPY BED=SMK
$\underset{(H A)}{\text { BOTTOM AREA }} \quad$ FISH DENS $\quad$ ABUNDANCE
(HA) 1000**3M

ABUNDANCE

| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 |  | 69.00 |  | 26.37 |  | 234723 | 234723 |
| 1981 |  | 31.10 |  | 17.51 |  | 70235 | 70235 |
| 1985 |  | 69.10 |  | 23.24 |  | 207185 | 207185 |
| 1986 |  | 79.50 | . | 17.79 |  | 182489 | 182489 |

STRATUM=CANOPY BED=SOK

| BOTTOM AREA | FISH DENS |
| :---: | :---: |
| (HA) | $1000 * * 3 M$ |$\quad$ ABUNDANCE


| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 |  | 94.50 |  | 11.92 |  | 145303 | 145303 |
| 1981 |  | 81.00 |  | 12.56 |  | 131209 | 131209 |
| 1985 |  | 40.50 |  | 15.55 |  | 81240 | 81240 |
| 1986 |  | 22.70 |  | 43.49 |  | 127362 | 127362 |

AREAL EXTENT OF BEDS BASED ON SIDESCAN SONAR SURVEYS FISH/KELP REGRESSION NOT USED TO MAKE FISH DENSITY ESTIMATES REQUEST DR56 SAS KBABU883

KELP BED
BIOMASS ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE (KG) SPECIES = TOTAL

STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SMK


STRATUM=CANOPY BED=SMK
BOTTOM AREA
(HA)
FISH DENS
ABUNDANCE


AREAL EXTENT OF BEDS BASED ON SIDESCAN SONAR SURVEYS FISH/KELP REGRESSION NOT USED TO MAKE FISH DENSITY ESTIMATES REQUEST DR56 SAS KBABU883

KELP BED
BIOMASS ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE (KG)
SPECIES = SENORITA
STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SMK

BOTTOM AREA
(HA)

FISH DENS 1000**3M

ABUNDANCE

|  | BOTTOM AREA (HA) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FISH DENS } \\ & 1000 * * 3 \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ |  | ABUNDANCE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| 1980 | 32.40 | 69.00 | 0.39 | 1.38 | 187.55 | 1426.5 |  |
| 1981 | 72.10 | 31.10 | 0.35 | 1.26 | 382.07 | 588.59 | 970.67 |
| 1985 | 65.60 | 69.10 | 0.17 | 0.62 | 169.91 | 639.19 | 809.10 |
| 1986 | 54.70 | 79.50 | 0.06 | 0.21 | 49.36 | 256.22 | 305.58 |
| STRATUM=BOTTOM BED=SOK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { BOTTOM AREA } \\ (\mathrm{HA}) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FISH DENS } \\ & 1000 * * 3 \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ |  | ABUNDANCE |  |  |
| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| 1980 | 47.20 | 94.50 | 0.17 | 0.61 | 119.98 | 857.93 | 977.91 |
| 1981 | 68.60 | 81.00 | 0.12 | 0.44 | 125.82 | 530.59 | 656.41 |
| 1985 | 96.70 | 40.50 | 0.32 | 0.81 | 467.53 | 489.22 | 956.75 |
| 1986 | 97.90 | 22.70 | 0.54 | 0.88 | 794.75 | 299.62 | 1094.4 |

STRATUM=CANOPY BED=SMK

| BOTTOM AREA | FISH DENS |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(\mathrm{HA})$ | $1000^{* * 3 M}$ |$\quad$ ABUNDANCE


| YEAR | COBBLE | KELP | COBBLE | KELP | 1 | COBBLE | KELP | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 |  | 69.00 |  | 1.66 |  |  | 14741 | 14741 |
| 1981 |  | 31.10 |  | 1.09 |  |  | 4363.5 | 4363.5 |
| 1985 |  | 69.10 |  | 1.34 |  |  | 11944 | 11944 |
| 1986 |  | 79.50 |  | 1.14 |  |  | 11688 | 11688 |

STRATUM=CANOPY BED=SOK
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { BOTTOM AREA } & \text { FISH DENS } \\ (H A) & \text { ABUNDANCE }\end{array}$


AREAL EXTENT OF BEDS BASED ON SIDESCAN SONAR SURVEYS FISH/KELP REGRESSION NOT USED TO MAKE FISH DENSITY ESTIMATES REQUEST DR56 SAS KBABU883
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#### Abstract

APPENDIX M COMMENTS ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT AND THE CONTRACTOR'S FINAL REPORT.


#### Abstract

While the same databases were used in the analyses performed in the two reports, the analyses did differ and, therefore, some of the results presented differ between the two reports. The major differences are discussed below.


One of the principal subjects addressed in both reports was the kelp density-fish density relationship. In general, similar results were found. However, the differences between the two reports arise primarily from the fact that the contractor (FISH) used the density of fish integrated over the entire water column as the variate regressed against kelp density. In the MRC report we treat the two depth strata separately. When combining the strata, which have very different volumes, the contribution of the density of fish in the water column greatly outweighs and obscures any effect on fish in the bottom strata.

A second difference between the reports concerns the estimate of fish abundance in the kelp beds in the vicinity of SONGS. FISH makes estimates of the total numbers in SOK in both the Before and After period. And, in doing so, follows the procedure outlined in the MRC report. However, the estimates in the two reports differ due to the use of different fish density-kelp density regression equations.

Unlike the MRC, FISH did not attempt to estimate the numbers lost (or gained) in SOK as a result of SONGS' operation. Nor did they estimate the changes in total numbers and biomass that occurred in SOK relative to those in SMK.

Another difference between the reports was the analysis of changes in fish density. FISH employed the BACIP design in their analysis. They sampled fish densities at the same locations in SOK and SMK in both the Before and After periods. They used only data collected at the sampling sites on the same day. However, since it was not possible to sample all three locations (SOKU, SOKD, and SMK) on the same day, BACIP comparisons were made as follows: A SOKU site was compared to SMK. The SOKD site was not compared to SMK but was compared to a second SOKU site. Therefore the subset of fish density data used by FISH was somewhat different from that used in the ANOVA presented in the MRC report. The data used in the SOKU-SMK comparison is virtually the same in both reports.

Another factor that enters into the analysis is that the kelp density changed from Before to After at several of the sites. This was particularly apparent at the sites used by FISH in the SOKU-SOKD comparison of densities. Kelp density at the SOKD site went from $27 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in the Before to $16 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in the After, while at the SOKU site the density changed from 13 to $5 / 100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Thus the within SOK comparisons in fish density are confounded with pronounced changes in kelp density. In the MRC report, we have strived to compare fish densities between sites where kelp populations have behaved similarly.

