Clionid sponge surveys on the Florida Reef Tract suggest land-based nutrient inputs
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IN PRESS: MARINE POLLUTION BULLETIN

ABSTRACT: Bioerosion by Cliona delitrix and Cliona lampa was assessed at 43 sites along the Florida Reef Tract, USA, in the summer of 2001. Sponge abundances were estimated using rapid visual assessment. Tissue samples of sponges were taken for analysis of δ¹⁵N. Comparison samples were taken from Belize. Annual trends in sponge abundance were estimated from archived videos covering the period from 1996-2001. Sites with the greatest boring sponge size and cover were in the Backcountry and Lower Keys, where total nitrogen, ammonium, and δ¹⁵N levels were highest. The sites with the largest relative increase of C. delitrix and C. lampa over the 5 year period were in the Upper Keys, where the greatest relative decline in stony coral cover has occurred. Florida sponge δ¹⁵N values were 5.2 (±0.1) ‰, suggesting the influence of human waste; in comparison, offshore Belize samples were 2.1 (±0.1) ‰. These results suggest sewage contamination of the Florida Reef Tract, shifting the carbonate balance from construction to destruction.
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1. Introduction

The Florida reef tract is the third largest barrier reef in the world and the most extensive coral reef system in the continental United States. The reef extends 354 km from the southern tip of the Florida mainland, southwest to Key West and to the Dry Tortugas (25˚17, 80˚13 to 24˚40, 82˚48). The Florida Keys is home to more than 78 000 permanent, year round residents, plus 25 000 winter residents. More than 3 million people travel to the Keys each year, generating more than $1.3 billion annually, mostly from marine activities. Another $68 million is generated annually from the sale of commercial marine organisms (Kruczynski, 1999). Despite the value of coral reefs to the local economy, the reefs are under pressure from land-based pollution (e.g.: Lapointe and Matzie, 1996; Lipp et al., 2002; Lapointe et al., 2004).

The negative effects of land-based sources of pollution on coral reefs worldwide have been known and well documented for more than 20 years (Hallock and Schlager, 1986; Edinger et al., 1998), including the Florida Keys (Dustan, 1977; Porter et al., 1999; Kruczynski 1999). Significant (up to 5000 fold) nutrient enrichment in groundwaters contiguous to onsite sewage disposal systems (OSDS), was found in the nearshore waters of the Florida Keys with ammonium being the dominant nitrogenous species (Lapointe et al., 1990). There are approximately 25 000 septic tank systems, and about 4000 “unknown systems” (probably cesspits; Kruczynski, 2002, pers. comm.) in the Florida Keys, and (until recently) a shallow submerged ocean outfall for the City of Key West, 1000 m offshore. There are more than 350 shallow sewage injection wells. Recently, deep (>900
Bioerosion is a key process in the carbonate budget of any coral reef (Scoffin et al., 1980; Risk et al., 1995). On relatively healthy reefs, bioerosion and reef accretion rates are approximately equal (Hein and Risk, 1975; Scoffin et al., 1980). Increased eutrophication results in increased bioerosion levels (Rose and Risk, 1985; Sammarco, 1996; Holmes et al., 2000). Therefore, environmental changes leading to increased bioerosion can lead to a net loss of carbonate and subsequent decline of the reef itself (Edinger et al., 1998).

Clionid sponges are the most important framework bioeroders (Hein and Risk, 1975; MacGeachy, 1977; Stearn and Scoffin, 1977; Hudson, 1977). Boring sponges destroy reef framework directly by excavating and encrusting coral tissue (MacGeachy and Stearn, 1976), and indirectly by compromising the structural integrity of the coral skeleton (Bromley, 1978). Their activities increase local supply of fine-grained carbonate detritus (Neumann, 1966), and produce mucus in a 1-2 cm ‘dead zone’ at the coral-sponge interface (Sullivan et al., 1983). Boring sponges account for greater than 90% of total boring in most live and dead coral heads (MacGeachy and Stearn, 1976).

Following a review of reef monitoring systems being used in the Florida Keys, we were asked by Florida Marine Research Institute (FMRI) to devise a rapid bioerosion
assessment protocol that could easily be integrated into their ongoing field activities. The bioerosion assessment we devised takes approximately 60 minutes per site, depending on sponge population density. Operators can be trained in the protocol in one dive. Preliminary field observations revealed that the closely related boring sponges *Cliona delitrix* and *Cliona lampa* were abundant and widespread in the area, and these became the focus of the study.

*C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* are destructive bright orange-vermillion sponges that overgrow and kill coral. Both these sponges are boring sponges that overgrow the substrate in the latter stages of colony growth. Neumann (1966) and Rose and Risk (1985) showed the relation between colony size, number, and bioerosion amount. *C. lampa* usually mimics the skeletal structure of the underlying coral, and feels hard to the touch underwater compared to *C. delitrix*, which has large compound ostial papillae that mask the underlying coral skeleton. Clionid sponges penetrate coral by cellular etching, and remove up to 50% of the skeletal carbonate (Rose and Risk, 1985), which is expelled by oscula into surrounding water (Rutzler, 1975). The process is about 3% chemical, using carbonic anhydrase, and 97% mechanical (Rutzler, 1975).

In a study on the reefs of Grand Cayman, Rose and Risk (1985) found that density of *C. delitrix* was positively related to the numbers of water-column fecal bacteria. Other studies (Sammarco, 1996; Holmes et al., 2000) have found bioerosers to be positively correlated with nutrient levels. In this study, we combine field assessments with archived
video and stable isotope geochemistry. The results suggest land-based stresses lead to increased coral death and reef decline.
2. Methods

Study Sites

Bioerosion surveys were carried out at 43 sites along the Florida Reef Tract during the summer months of 2001. Study sites were located within 5 of the 9 Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA) water quality segments within the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS). Water quality segments are outlined in Figure 1. Further information about the ecosystem and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) programs may be found in Porter and Porter, 2002. The Coral Reef Monitoring Project (CRMP) installed permanent station markers in 1995; sites consisted of a maximum of 4 and a minimum of 2 stations, each with 3 transects 22 m in length (Porter et al., 2002). Table 1 categorizes each site that was used for this study (sites with Cliona spp. present) in its respective water quality segment.

Reefs from the Dry Tortugas, Marquesas, Backcountry, Upper, Middle, and Lower Keys were represented in this study. Site depths ranged from less than 1 m to greater than 25 m, and included hardbottom, patch, offshore deep, and offshore shallow reef types.

In addition, sponges were sampled for isotope analysis (see below) from Long Caye and Half Moon Caye at Lighthouse Reef, located approximately 75 km offshore from the mainland of Belize. There are few permanent residents in the area, and other
than tourists that visit the reef, there are no other significant sources of anthropogenic nutrients.

**Bioerosion**

The bioerosion field assessment protocol was designed to complement the ongoing study of Florida’s coral reefs by the CRMP. A 1 m wide belt transect was examined along each of the 22 m long transects. Individual colonies of *Cliona delitrix* and *Cliona lampa* were counted and their area estimated using a 5 x 5 cm transparent grid. Small (<5 g) samples of *Cliona* tissue were taken from each site (where present) for isotope analysis. Time at each site was approximately one hour. The protocol was taught to untrained collaborators within one dive. To test the methods, the same transect was repeated with multiple operators, and the agreement was greater than 95 %.

**Video analyses**

Each transect in the Florida sites has been filmed by the CRMP since 1996, with the exception of the Tortugas sites, which were filmed since 1999. Video was taken at a rate of 4 m minute⁻¹, at 40 cm above the bottom using a convergent laser light system (Jaap et al., 2001). Four reefs were selected for the historical study, each representing a different water quality segment: Black Coral Rock (Dry Tortugas); Cliff Green (Lower Keys); Content Key (Backcountry); Carysfort Deep (Upper Keys). Video from 1996 through 2001 was examined.
In the FMRI protocol (Wheaton et al., 1998), a length of chain, each link 5 cm in length, is laid down in each transect. We used the images of this chain to calibrate actual sponge size shown in the video. The area covered on the screen was then converted using chain-link measures. The number of colonies of *C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* were recorded, and area of each sponge colony estimated.

**δ¹⁵N determinations**

Methods were as described in Risk et al., (2001). Sponge samples were kept on ice out of the sun until they could be put in a freezer at the lab. Samples were kept frozen until ready to be processed at McMaster University. Sponges were decalcified in 5 % HCl over the course of a few days. Once decalcified, samples were washed and centrifuged three times in deionized water. Prepared samples were freeze-dried until analyzed. Six-mm pyrex tubes were heated to 550 °C for cleaning. Tubes were loaded with 14-15 mg of sample and sandwiched between excess amounts of CuO wire that was heat treated to 900 °C. Tubes were put on a vacuum line, and sealed using a flame. Sealed tubes were combusted for 2.5 hours at 550 °C, then run within 24 hours on a dual inlet Optima mass spectrometer at McMaster University. Analytical reproducibility, as measured by the average difference of sample replicates, was ± 0.1 ‰.

**Data Analysis**

Sponge characteristics were measured on each transect as follows: (1) horizontal area of each sponge, and (2) total number of sponges. Averages of the (1) sponge
abundance (number of sponges per transect), (2) sponge size, and (3) sponge cover (area per transect) were calculated for each site and water quality segment.

Belize $\delta^{15}$N values were compared to Florida values. Water quality data for Florida and Belize came from Southeast Environmental Research Center (SERC; Boyer, 2003) and Lapointe (2004), respectively. This study shows regional (e.g.: Lower Keys, Backcountry, etc.) and temporal (e.g.: 1996-1998, etc.) comparisons of sponge abundance, size, cover, $\delta^{15}$N of sponge tissue, and water quality.
3. Results

Sponge population characteristics and tissue $\delta^{15}$N data are summarized in Table 2. Sponge samples for $\delta^{15}$N analysis were collected at 20 of the 43 CRMP sites. Overall, *C. delitrix* was the most common species throughout the sanctuary, so it was preferentially collected. Where *C. delitrix* was absent *C. lampa* was collected instead. Compared to *C. delitrix*, $\delta^{15}$N values from *C. lampa* were systematically higher by ca. 0.6 ‰. We report here only those $\delta^{15}$N data for *C. delitrix*, as this was the most common species.

*Regional trends in sponge coverage and $\delta^{15}$N*

The four different sponge characteristics (abundance, size, cover, and $\delta^{15}$N) showed different regional trends (Figure 2). The sponge abundance was highest in the Upper Keys, Tortugas, and Marquesas, and lowest in the Backcountry, Lower, and Middle Keys (Figure 2a). Average sponge size and cover have a more clearly defined regional pattern (Figure 2b,c), which is approximately the inverse of the sponge abundance. The greatest sponge size was in the Backcountry and Lower Keys. Average sponge cover was also the greatest in Backcountry and Lower Keys. The Marquesas had intermediate sponge cover, while the Tortugas, Middle, and Upper Keys had relatively lower sponge cover. $\delta^{15}$N showed similar trends with sponge size and sponge cover. The Backcountry had the highest $\delta^{15}$N of 6.8 ‰. The Lower, Middle, and Upper Keys had similar $\delta^{15}$N (5.3, 4.8, and 5.1 ‰ respectively). Belize had the lowest $\delta^{15}$N at 2.2 ‰ (Figure 2d). Sponges were not collected for $\delta^{15}$N analysis in the Tortugas, and Marquesas because we did not have permits.
Validation of video transect data

A comparison of observational field data with archived video data showed the reliability of the video methods used in this study. Note that the width of the transect in the field was 1 m, while the video was about 0.5 m. The sponge abundance recorded in the archived video was about half that of the observed data (Figure 3a). Average sponge size (Figure 3b) and average sponge cover (Figure 3c) measured by the video technique were about double that of the observed data; however, the relationship is significantly and positively correlated. These relationships suggest that small sponge colonies are better seen by underwater observers than recorded on archived video, and that physical measurements underwater are more challenging than measurements from video.

Nonetheless, the overall trends from the archived video are consistent with and correlated with field data. This allows us to evaluate temporal trends in sponge parameters with confidence.

Temporal trends from 1996-2001 in sponge abundance, size, and cover from archived video showed an increase in bioerosion by Cliona delitrix and Cliona lampa in all regions of the FKNMS (Figure 4a-c). Although the Upper Keys experienced the largest relative increase in sponge abundance from 1996-2001, the average sponge cover and sponge size was only about one-fifteenth that of the Lower Keys (Figure 4b,c). Average sponge abundance nearly doubled between 1998 and 1999, sanctuary-wide. Over the same period, there was a sanctuary-wide decline in coral cover (Figure 5; Porter et al., 2002).
Sponge $\delta^{15}N$

Sponge tissue $\delta^{15}N$ data are summarized in Table 2. $\delta^{15}N$ values were highest in the Backcountry, followed by the Lower Keys, Upper Keys, and then the Middle Keys (Fig 2d). $\delta^{15}N$ of sponge tissue was positively and significantly correlated to total nitrogen (TN, Figure 6) and ammonium ($\text{NH}_4^+$) levels in seawater (Figure 7) for all regions of the Florida Keys. Average $\delta^{15}N$ sponge tissue values in Belize were 2.2 ‰, lower than average $\delta^{15}N$ values in Florida (average 5.2 ‰) (Figure 7).
4. Discussion

One of the most important questions facing the coral reef research community is the relative importance of sources of stress on coral reefs. We examined the scientific literature in an attempt to find studies that would allow some assessment of the factors contributing to the decline of coral reefs. The criteria were: (1) reefs had to have been sampled or assessed at the same location, (2) using similar or identical methods, (3) over a significant time interval, and (4) there had to have been some estimate of the cause of reef decline. Despite the voluminous literature available on some topics, such as coral bleaching, we were able to find only ten papers reporting on studies that met those criteria (Table 3).

Of these studies, five dealt with the effects of elevated seawater temperature and/or bleaching. Each of these noted 95-100 % recovery of corals within one year of bleaching. Despite eventual recovery, many corals did not grow during bleaching (Goreau and Macfarlane, 1990; Fitt et al., 1993) and/or were not able to complete gametogenesis in the following reproductive season (Szmant and Gassman, 1990).

The remaining papers examined the long-term effects of land-based pollution (sedimentation and sewage loading) on coral reefs. All studies found near or total coral mortality, with no recovery (Anthony et al., 1997; Hallock and Schlager 1986; Dustan and Halas 1987; Edinger et al., 1998) for as long as the stress was applied. In an urban embayment in Hawaii, redirection of sewage outflow pipes to a deep offshore location resulted in partial recovery (Grigg 1995).
In one of the first papers to note the decline, Ogden et al. (1994) used long-term photographic monitoring of the Florida Reef Tract. They reported a 40% loss of coral cover over 5 years in the Upper Keys area, which they attributed to a decline in water quality. The authors do not attribute the loss to elevated loads of land-derived nutrients, but did find moderately elevated nutrient levels in developed nearshore areas. This study is not included in Table 3 because it does not specifically attribute the loss to nutrient loading or seawater temperature.

The number of long-term studies on reefs is not large, despite more than a century of research. To draw any firm conclusions from such a limited survey as in Table 3 would be difficult - nonetheless, it would appear that, at the present time, reef damage from land-based sources of pollution has far outstripped that from any other source, including bleaching. In addition to the above, Patterson et al. (2002) discovered that white pox disease, which kills Acropora palmata at a rate of 2.5 cm² day⁻¹, is caused by a common fecal enterobacterium.

Archived video in this study showed an increase in the boring sponge abundance, size, and cover of C. delitrix and C. lampa in all regions of the FKNMS, while the CRMP has shown an overall decline in coral species and stony coral cover from the same video footage (Jaap et al., 2001; Figure 5). The CRMP found the greatest decline of coral cover in the Upper Keys, followed by the Lower Keys, from 1996-2000 (Porter et al., 2002). During this time, there were no significant bleaching events or community changes that
could be ascribed to “global change.” Average *C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* abundance, size, and cover had the greatest relative increase in the Upper Keys (2, 3, and 7 fold, respectively), while the Lower Keys had the largest sponge size and average cover - more than 50 times that of the Upper Keys.

*C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* are more commonly found in massive corals such as *Montastrea* and *Siderastrea*, and rarely in foliose or branching corals such as *Mycetophyllia* and *Acropora*. In the Caribbean, *A. palmata* is frequently attacked by a more cryptic boring sponge, *C. vestifica*, and never by *C. delitrix* or *C. lampa*. Reasons for these differences are unclear, but the presence or absence of *C. delitrix* or *C. lampa* could be determined by the reef type.

DeNiro and Epstein (1981) determined that the nitrogen isotopic composition of animals could be used to identify food sources. $\delta^{15}$N values are enriched with each step of the food chain because dietary $^{15}$N is preferentially incorporated over $^{14}$N (DeNiro and Epstein, 1981). A series of papers have documented the occurrence of elevated $^{15}$N on reefs polluted with human sewage (Yamamuro and Minagawa, 1995; Heikoop, 1997; Heikoop et al., 2000), suggesting that nitrogen isotope tissue determinations are an effective objective means of evaluating sewage stress on reefs. $\delta^{15}$N is an indicator of trophic status ($\delta^{15}$N values are enriched up the food chain), not of nutrient levels per se. Human waste carries an isotopic signature of diet; previous studies have shown that $\delta^{15}$N in coral tissue is an effective monitor of sewage stress on reefs (Risk et al., 1989, 1994b; Mendes et al., 1996; Heikoop, 1997). Sponge tissue $\delta^{15}$N values in this study strongly
correlate with water TN and NH$_4^+$; it is likely that both trends are driven by sewage loadings. TN and NH$_4^+$ levels are an indication of the amount of nutrient present, whereas the $\delta^{15}$N values indicate the source. The Lower Keys and Backcountry had the greatest *C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* size and cover, as well as elevated sponge tissue $\delta^{15}$N, TN, and NH$_4^+$ levels.

The Backcountry segment, with less than 13% of the human population of the Keys, had the highest $\delta^{15}$N, TN, and NH$_4^+$, and relatively large sponge cover and sponge size. This is likely a result of (1) local sources of NH$_4^+$ (large number of cesspools and septic systems; Lapointe and Clark, 1992) and/or (2) hydraulic isolation from shelf and Atlantic waters, with relatively long water residence times (Boyer and Jones, 2002). These sites are bathed in Florida Bay water, which receives discharge from the Everglades as well as a variety of non-point agricultural and recreational sources.

The Lower Keys had the largest total sponge cover, sponge size, and had elevated levels of $\delta^{15}$N, TN, and NH$_4^+$. Lapointe et al. (2004) also found the same trends in $\delta^{15}$N of seagrass. The Lower Keys also has the highest effective human population density of the Keys.

The Middle and Upper Keys have significantly lower coastal population densities relative to the Lower Keys, and have a much greater mixing with relatively clean Atlantic Ocean waters (Boyer and Jones, 2002). These regions had a relatively small *C. delitrix* and *C. lampa* abundance, size, and cover, as well as low tissue $\delta^{15}$N values.
Belize $\delta^{15}$N values were below all measured water quality segments in the Florida Keys (note: no $\delta^{15}$N values were taken in the Marquesas or Tortugas). Offshore Belize reefs approach pristine water levels because of minimal sources of anthropogenic nutrients coupled with mixing with open ocean waters.

The coincidence of widespread coral decline with rapid expansion in a fecal bioindicator that kills coral may not be accidental, and the relationship bears further investigation. It is greatly to be regretted that, almost 20 years after the link between *C. delitrix* and fecal loadings was established (Rose and Risk, 1985), this is the first and only follow-up study on an organism that accounts for a major proportion of the carbonate budget on Florida reefs.

Levels of bioerosion are an important part of the carbonate budget in coral reef environments (Neumann, 1966; Rutzler, 1975; MacGeachy and Stearn, 1976; Risk et al., 1995; Edinger and Risk, 1996; Holmes et al., 2000; Schonberg and Wilkinson, 2001). Examination of bioeroders is a relatively easy task that can be done by anyone with minimal experience and training. Bioerosion assessments (either some modification of the methods described herein, or the Holmes et al., 2000, rubble technique) should be an integral part of every coral reef monitoring program.
5. Conclusion

1. Sanctuary wide, coral cover declined while Clionid sponge abundance increased from 1996-2001.
2. Coral decline and relative sponge abundance increase from 1996-2001 was greatest in the Upper Keys.
3. Nitrogen isotope ratios, sponge size and sponge cover were greatest in the Lower Keys and Backcountry, where the highest values of TN and NH$_4^+$ occurred.
4. $\delta^{15}$N in offshore Belize reefs are much lower than average Florida values, suggesting large differences in the source of nutrients.
5. Coral loss in the Florida Reef Tract is a result of land-based stress, rather than ‘global change’.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Coral Reef Monitoring project (M. Callahan, W. Jaap, V. Kosmynin, M. Lybolt, J. Porter, J. Wheaton) for their support, and ideas in the field. We also thank J. Wade, B. Williams, D. Wilson, E. Webb, M. Knyf, and J. McKay for helping with lab analyses. We also thank M. McField and A. Salazar for their assistance in Belize. This work was supported by FMRI and NSERC grants to MJR. Collections and research was conducted under National Marine Sanctuary Permit FKNMS-2001-016, FKNMS-2001-016, and FKNMS(LR)-04-95-02.
References


Figure Captions

**Figure 1.** Map of the FKNMS showing study sites, water quality segments, and regional pattern in benthic NH$_4^+$ (data from SERC, see text for details).

**Figure 2.** Regional differences in average (a) sponge abundance, (b) sponge size, (c) sponge cover, and (d) sponge δ$^{15}$N. Error bars are 1 standard error, where n > 1.

**Figure 3.** Comparison of data measured by video and in the field. Both data sets are from 2001. (a) Average sponge abundance, (b) average sponge size, and (c) average sponge cover.

**Figure 4.** Timeseries trends in average (a) sponge abundance, (b) sponge size, and (c) sponge cover measured from video archive. Legend in (a) applies to all graphs. Note log y-axis in (b) and (c). Dotted lines bridge missing data.

**Figure 5.** Sanctuary-wide temporal trend in average sponge abundance, 1996 to 2001 (closed diamonds). Percent coral cover (open squares), 1996 to 2000, is plotted on the secondary y-axis (data from Porter et al., 2002).

**Figure 6.** Plot of δ$^{15}$N of sponge tissue vs. benthic TN (data from Boyer, 2003).
**Figure 7.** Plot of $\delta^{15}$N of sponge tissue vs. benthic NH$_4^+$ (data from Boyer, 2003).

Offshore Belize NH$_4^+$ datum from Lapointe (2004).
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TABLE 1

Study regions, site names, use of observational (O), video (V) and/or isotope data (I), and list of possible sources and sinks of nitrogen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water quality segment</th>
<th>Site Name *</th>
<th>Use O/V/I</th>
<th>Speculated nitrogen sources/sinks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>Content Keys (H)</td>
<td>O, V, I</td>
<td>Florida Bay, local ODS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, fluvial and groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortugas</td>
<td>Black Coral Rock (D)</td>
<td>O, V</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Loop Current, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird Key (D)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Upwelling, Loop Current, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Shoal (S)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Florida Bay, local ODS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, upwelling, Loop Current, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquesas</td>
<td>Smith Shoal (P)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Keys</td>
<td>Cliff Green (P)</td>
<td>O, V, I</td>
<td>Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Key West - Big Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Sambo Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock Key Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Key West - Big Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Head (P)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Key West - Big Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Washerman (P)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Key West - Big Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looe Deep (D)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Key West - Big Pine Key ODS, ocean outfallsite, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Keys</td>
<td>Sombrero Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Florida Bay, ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alligator Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Florida Bay, ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Florida Bay, ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Turtle Shoal (P)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Florida Bay, ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dustan Rocks (P)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Florida Bay, ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Keys</td>
<td>Carysfort Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, V, I</td>
<td>Key Largo ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Florida Current, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conch Deep (D)</td>
<td>O, I</td>
<td>Key Largo ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Florida Current, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molasses Deep (D)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Key Largo ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Florida Current, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turtle Patch (P)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Key Largo ODS, Atlantic Ocean upwelling, Florida Current, groundwater, nitrogen fixation/denitrification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Site code letters indicate site type identified by CRMP, where H= hardbottom, P= patch reef, D= offshore deep, and S= offshore shallow.

<sup>b</sup> ODS- Onsite Disposal System, includes cesspits, septic systems, and ‘package plants’.
## TABLE 2
Summary of sponge parameters and isotope values measured in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Sponge abundance</th>
<th>Average sponge size (cm$^2$)</th>
<th>Average cover (cm$^2$)</th>
<th>$\delta^{15}$N (‰)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backcountry</td>
<td>Ave: 3.9</td>
<td>Ave: 197</td>
<td>Ave: 767</td>
<td>Ave: 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 1</td>
<td>n:1</td>
<td>n:1</td>
<td>n: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Keys</td>
<td>Ave: 2.3</td>
<td>Ave: 197</td>
<td>Ave: 420</td>
<td>Ave: 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d: 0.5</td>
<td>s.d: 235</td>
<td>s.d: 428</td>
<td>s.d: 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 6</td>
<td>n: 6</td>
<td>n: 6</td>
<td>n: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Keys</td>
<td>Ave: 2.7</td>
<td>Ave: 77</td>
<td>Ave: 129</td>
<td>Ave: 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d: 2.5</td>
<td>s.d: 48</td>
<td>s.d: 48</td>
<td>s.d: 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 5</td>
<td>n: 5</td>
<td>n: 5</td>
<td>n: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Keys</td>
<td>Ave: 6.4</td>
<td>Ave: 22</td>
<td>Ave: 89</td>
<td>Ave: 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d: 3</td>
<td>s.d: 6</td>
<td>s.d: 69</td>
<td>s.d: 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 4</td>
<td>n: 4</td>
<td>n: 4</td>
<td>n: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortugas</td>
<td>Ave: 4.1</td>
<td>Ave: 35</td>
<td>Ave: 169</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s.d: 2.6</td>
<td>s.d: 16</td>
<td>s.d: 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 3</td>
<td>n: 3</td>
<td>n: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquesas</td>
<td>Ave: 5.3</td>
<td>Ave: 52</td>
<td>Ave: 275</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n: 1</td>
<td>n: 1</td>
<td>n: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ave: 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n is the number of sites where sponges were sampled.
### TABLE 3

Summary of the studies that fulfilled the requirements of a long-term study, in terms of location, result, and environmental factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goreau and Macfarlane, 1990</td>
<td>Jamaica 1987-1988; 1987 mass bleaching event (nearly all corals contained some zooxanthellae)</td>
<td>Almost complete recovery (~95%); only 7 mo. after peak bleaching - 5% showed trace of bleaching; skeletal growth ceased during bleaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szmant and Gassman, 1990</td>
<td>Caribbean 1987 bleaching event.</td>
<td>Most corals survived bleaching, but did not complete gametogenesis. Bleached corals had less C and N, and abnormal distribution of zooxanthellae.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drollet et al., 1995</td>
<td>Tahiti</td>
<td>1993-1994; bleaching episode, elevated seawater temperature and solar UV-B flux</td>
<td>Most corals recovered within six months of initial bleaching; no mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony et al., 1997</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>1991-1995; various stresses: mass bleaching, sedimentation, encrusting/ boring sponges, and macroalgae overgrowth</td>
<td>Partial/whole coral mortality due to sponges and macroalgae &gt;&gt; sedimentation &gt;&gt; mass bleaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock and Schlager, 1986</td>
<td>Geologic record</td>
<td>Holocene and older: Excess nutrients</td>
<td>Shifts in reef community from net accretion to net erosion; Drowned reefs and platforms are common; Increased bioerosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinger et al., 1998</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1980-1995; Land-based pollution, including sewage, sedimentation, nearshore eutrophication, and industrial pollution.</td>
<td>30-60% decrease in coral species diversity. No recovery until stress is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dustan and Halas, 1987</td>
<td>Florida Keys</td>
<td>1974 -1982; physical disturbance, sedimentation, and disease.</td>
<td>Decreased coral abundance and size from sedimentation and disease as a result of environmental degradation. Absent or severely depressed coral and a 6km area was dominated by species that favour raw sewage; recovery occurs only after redirecting pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigg, 1995</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1955-1977, 1982,1994; local sewage discharge (360x10^6 L/day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>