



STATUS OF THE SHALLOW-WATER SEAGRASS COMMUNITIES AND CONCH POPULATIONS WITHIN THE LUIS PEÑA CHANNEL NO-TAKE NATURAL RESERVE, CULEBRA ISLAND, PUERTO RICO

Edwin A. Hernández-Delgado^{1*}, Mary Ann Lucking², Jovino Márquez³, Keyla García¹, Clarissa Martínez-Rubio¹, Diana Martínó¹, Jean Lassus¹, Catherine López¹, and Edgardo Acosta³

¹University of Puerto Rico, Department of Biology, Coral Reef Research Group, P.O. Box 23360, San Juan, P.R. 00931-3360. e-mail: coral_giac@yahoo.com *corresponding author; ²Coralations, Inc., P.O. Box 750, Culebra, P.R. 00775; ³Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, P.O. Box 9066600, San Juan, P.R. 00906-6600.

**Technical Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Commerce
Caribbean Fishery Management Council
San Juan, Puerto Rico**

October 11, 2002

Special contribution No. 01-2002 of the Coral Reef Research Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	pages
Introduction	1-4
Methods	5-14
Study sites.	5-8
Benthic components cover.	8-9
Benthic components density.	9-10
Epibenthic components standing crop biomass.	10
<i>Thalassia testudinum</i> mean leaf length and width.	11
Leaf Area Index (LAI).	11-12
Multivariate analysis of seagrass bed communities.	12
Conch densities and size class distribution.	13
Relationships between maximum shell length and lip width.	14
Status of conch populations before and after the LPCMFR designation.	14
Water transparency.	14
Results	14-84
Benthic components cover.	14-20
Benthic components density.	20-24
Epibenthic components standing crop biomass.	24-36
<i>Thalassia testudinum</i> parameters.	36-44
Multivariate analysis of seagrass bed communities.	44-52
Conch densities and size class distribution.	52-71
Status of conch populations before and after the LPCMFR designation.	72-77
Water transparency.	77
Regression analyses.	77-84
Discussion	84-107
Seagrass bed communities.	84-99
Conch populations.	99-107
Conclusions	107-108
Acknowledgments	109
Cited literature	109-118
Appendix	119-121

LIST OF FIGURES

- FIGURE 1. Benthic habitat map of Culebra Island (modified after NOAA, 2001). Black lines identify the Luis Peña Channel Marine Fishery Reserve boundaries.
- FIGURE 2. Study sites: A) Luis Peña Channel Marine Fishery Reserve: BTMN-R= Bahía Tamarindo (North); BTMS-R= Bahía Tamarindo (South); BTA-R= Bahía Tarja. B) Control sites outside the Reserve: BMO-C= Bahía Mosquito; PMA-C= Puerto de Manglar.
- FIGURE 3. Percentage of seagrass cover at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 4. Percentage of algal cover at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 5. Percentage of other benthic components cover at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 6. *Thalassia testudinum* shoot density ($\#/m^2$) at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 7. *Syringodium filiforme* shoot density ($\#/m^2$) at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 8. *Halodule wrightii* shoot density ($\#/m^2$) at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 9. Calcareous algae stalk density ($\#/m^2$) at each study site (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 10. Total seagrass standing crop biomass (g/m^2).
- FIGURE 11. *Thalassia testudinum* standing crop biomass (g/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 12. *Syringodium filiforme* standing crop biomass (g/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 13. *Halodule wrightii* standing crop biomass (g/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 14. Calcareous algae standing crop biomass (g/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 15. Macroalgal standing crop biomass (g/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 16. *Thalassia testudinum* Leaf Area Index (m^2/m^2). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 17. *Thalassia testudinum* leaf length (mm). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 18. *Thalassia testudinum* size class distribution based on leaf length (mm).

- FIGURE 19. *Thalassia testudinum* leaf width (mm). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 20. *Thalassia testudinum* size class distribution based on leaf width (mm).
- FIGURE 21. Cluster analysis of the community structure of seagrass beds based on the relative proportion of major benthic categories.
- FIGURE 22. Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) analysis plot of the community structure of seagrass beds based on the relative proportion of major benthic categories (Stress level =0.02).
- FIGURE 23. Density of *Strombus gigas* (#/ha). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 24. Density of *Strombus pugilis* (#/ha). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 25. Density of *Strombus costatus* (#/ha). Mean±one standard error.
- FIGURE 26. Maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus gigas* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 27. Lip width (mm) in *Strombus gigas* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 28. Size class distribution of maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus gigas*.
- FIGURE 29. Size class distribution of lip width (mm) in *Strombus gigas*.
- FIGURE 30. Maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus pugilis* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 31. Lip width (mm) in *Strombus pugilis* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 32. Size class distribution of maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus pugilis*.
- FIGURE 33. Size class distribution of lip width (mm) in *Strombus pugilis*.
- FIGURE 34. Maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus costatus* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 35. Lip width (mm) in *Strombus costatus* (Mean±one standard error).
- FIGURE 36. Size class distribution of maximum shell length (mm) in *Strombus costatus*.
- FIGURE 37. Size class distribution of lip width (mm) in *Strombus costatus*.
- FIGURE 38. Major changes in conch densities (#/ha) between years 1998 and 2002 within BTMN-R and BTA-R, before and after the designation (1999) of the LPCMFR.
- FIGURE 39. Horizontal Secchi disk water transparency (m). Mean±one standard error.

- FIGURE 40. Linear regression plot of *Thalassia testudinum* standing crop biomass as a function of the horizontal water transparency.
- FIGURE 41. Linear regression plot of *Thalassia testudinum* leaf area index as a function of the horizontal water transparency.
- FIGURE 42. Quadratic polynomial regression plot of *Thalassia testudinum* leaf area index as a function of standing crop biomass.
- FIGURE 43. Tridimensional regression plot of the *Thalassia testudinum* % cover and leaf area index as a function of the horizontal water transparency.
- FIGURE 44. Polynomial 2nd order inverse regression plot of the % of total algal cover as a function of the horizontal water transparency.
- FIGURE 45. Tridimensional regression plot of the % of total algal cover and standing crop biomass as a function of the horizontal water transparency.

LIST OF TABLES

- TABLE 1. Comparison of major seagrass bed parameters among sites.
- TABLE 2. Percentage cover of major epibenthic categories at each study site.
- TABLE 3. Density of major epibenthic categories at each study site (# shoots/m²).
- TABLE 4a. Standing stock biomass (g/m²) of major epibenthic categories at each study site.
- TABLE 4b. Standing stock biomass (kg/ha) of major epibenthic categories at each study site.
- TABLE 4c. Standing stock biomass (ton/acres) of major epibenthic categories at each study site.
- TABLE 5. Comparison of *Thalassia testudinum* parameters among sites.
- TABLE 6. Summary of *Thalassia testudinum* leaf parameters at each study site.
- TABLE 7. Size class distribution (leaf length % relative frequency) of *Thalassia testudinum*.
- TABLE 8. Size class distribution (leaf width % relative frequency) of *Thalassia testudinum*.
- TABLE 9. Results of the global ANOSIM-1 multivariable analysis of the seagrass community based on the proportion of major epibenthic categories.
- TABLE 10. Results of the pairwise ANOSIM-1 multivariable analysis of the seagrass community based on the proportion of major epibenthic categories.
- TABLE 11. Results of the SIMPER multivariable analysis of the seagrass community based on the proportion of major epibenthic categories.
- TABLE 12. Comparison of Conch parameters among sites.
- TABLE 13. Conch abundance per site.
- TABLE 14. Summary of Conch parameters.
- TABLE 15a. Comparison of Conch densities (#/ha) at BTMS-R before and after the designation of the LPCMFR in 1999.
- TABLE 15b. Comparison of Conch densities (#/ha) at BTA-R before and after the designation of the LPCMFR in 1999.
- TABLE 16. Comparison of Conch densities at BTMS-R between years 1998 and 2002.

TABLE 17. Comparison of Conch densities at BTA-R between years 1998 and 2002.

TABLE 18. Mean horizontal water transparency (m) at each site.

TABLE 19. Summary of linear regression analysis of Conch density and several seagrass bed community parameters.

SUMMARY

The Luis Peña Channel No Take Natural Reserve (LPCNR), Culebra Island, Puerto Rico, is the only Natural Reserve under State jurisdiction where fishing is permanently prohibited since year 1999. The eastern coast of Puerto Rico, including Culebra Island, is one of the most important fishing grounds for Conch. However, there is a lack of information concerning the status of spawning stocks and juvenile stocks of these species in the region. From the essential fish habitat (EFH) standpoint, there is also a lack of information regarding the status of their habitats. One of the most important tasks of the CFMC in relation to EFH for each of the life stages of Conch species is to identify the location and distribution of individuals, as well as to assess the condition of these habitats. The role of MFRs to help restore Conch populations has been poorly documented and where adequate management and enforcement is lacking, there have been mixed or negative results. The 475 hectares of the LPCNR is the only location under the Puerto Rican state waters jurisdiction that Queen Conch fishing is permanently prohibited. Therefore, the LPCNR can become a permanent control monitoring station to address natural fluctuations of Conch populations. Also, it can be used as a model management tool to help restore shallow water populations of the Queen Conch within the U.S. Caribbean. However, it still lacks a management plan. Thus, it is important to establish a baseline data bank regarding the status of Conch populations and their EFHs within the LPCNR to which future stock and EFH assessments can be compared. This study was aimed at producing that baseline data bank. There were highly significant differences in the three major benthic components cover among study sites, including the % of seagrass, algal cover, and biomass. The highest % of seagrass cover, and *Thalassia testudinum* density, leaf area index (LAI), leaf length and width, and in the standing crop biomass were documented within the LPCNR, with the lowest at Puerto de Manglar control site (PMA-C). This site showed the highest % of algal cover and macroalgal standing crop biomass. There was also a significant correlation between biomass and LAI of *T. testudinum*, and the horizontal water transparency. The higher the transparency, the higher the biomass and LAI. But there was a strong negative correlation between % algal cover and biomass, and horizontal water transparency. The lower the water transparency, the higher the algal parameters. PMA-C is showing early signs of rapid seagrass declines due to water quality degradation associated to a combination of natural changes, land clearing activities, non-point

source pollution, recreational boating activities and anchoring. Geographically-based clusters were more clearly distinguished using multivariate analysis by means of cluster analysis (Bray-Curtis Ordination) and by a MDS ordination. PMA-C, and in a minor degree Bahía Mosquito control site (BMO-C) and Bahía Tarja reserve site (BTA-R) were clustered separately from the core seagrass bed habitats from the LPCNFR. The global ANOSIM-1 test revealed a highly significant difference (0%) of the seagrass bed community structure among sites. The pairwise ANOSIM-1 test revealed highly significant differences in the seagrass bed community structures within LPCNR sites, within control sites, and among LPCNR and control sites. Therefore, although seagrass habitats within the LPCNR are generally in better shape than controls, this was not completely clear for some sampling sites within and outside the Reserve. SIMPER analysis revealed that the % of relative seagrass cover was the most important benthic component for discriminating among all groups of sites in 8 out of the 10 comparisons of sites. Conch populations through all of the shallow-water study sites were depleted. There were no significant differences in the densities, maximum shell length or lip width of Conch populations within and outside the LPCNR. Only a total of 71 Conch were counted during the present study, which surveyed a total of 94 replicate 200 m² belt transects. These figures included 58 individuals of *Strombus pugilis*. The remaining Conch individuals included 12 *S. gigas*, and only a single individual of *S. costatus*. Conch show deterministic growth, thus, there were no relationships between shell length and lip width, suggesting that most of the shallow-water *S. gigas* and *S. pugilis* populations are juveniles. Conch populations suffered also a major collapse (85-99%) within the LPCNR between year 1998 (1 year before designation) and 2002 (3 years after designation). These differences could be the result of natural fluctuations in conch recruitment patterns, a possible spatial and/or temporal shift in their aggregation behavior or the result of overfishing. It also suggests that lack of adequate enforcement and management by the PR Department of Natural and Environmental Resources enforcing personnel could have resulted in major overfishing of the LPCNR stocks. Several recommendations are presented to address the problem of seagrass bed habitat conservation in Culebra, lack of enforcement within the LPCNR, and to monitor seagrass bed communities and conch populations. But, given the threatened status of shallow-water conch fisheries in Culebra, the CFMC should evaluate: 1) the status of deep-water conch populations and habitats; 2) the alternative of expanding the seasonal closure to include the Fighting Conch, *Strombus pugilis*, and the Milk Conch, *S. costatus*, in

order to avoid “accidental” catches of juvenile *S. gigas*; and 3) the alternative of expanding the seasonal closure from March to September. A stronger effort should be put to restore conch populations within the LPCNR.