Integrating interactive stressors within marine spatial planning: A case study on the Chatham Rise

Tom Brough¹, Eva Leunissen¹, Shane Geange², Di Tracey¹, Owen Anderson¹, Carolyn J. Lundquist^{1,3}

¹National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, ² Department of Conservation, Wellington, ³School of Environment, University of Auckland

Overview

 Most spatial planning approaches consider stressors in isolation – where management targets areas of high or low stressor footprints for restoration or protection respectively.



- Spatial modelling hold significant promise to incorporate the biological response of organisms to interacting stressors – enabling spatially explicit estimations of their cumulative impacts
- Here, we show a case study on the Chatham Rise – where bottom fishing and sedimentation are used to predict species distributions

Interaction forest statistical technique used to predict distribution of taxa under three scenarios







Additive stressors

Interacting stressors

Spatial predictions generated for each scenario (Figure 1.B)

Spatial prioritisation analysis for conservation and restoration using Zonation Conservation Planning Software (Figure 1.C)



Methods & Results

 Approximately 14,000 unique (1 km) locations on the Chatham Rise had observations of the presence of important invertebrate taxa (1990-2021).

• Robust models were fit for the majority of taxa using an **Interaction Forest framework.**



- Approximately 1/3 of taxa were best predicted with no stressors, 1/3 with additive stressors and 1/3 with interacting stressors
- Unique multi-variate responses across taxa
- High variability in predicted distribution with/without stressors among taxa
- Key differences in areas shown as high priority for protection of taxa with stressor impacts, and for areas with high restoration potential.

Discussion

- Interaction Forest framework provides some unique opportunities for incorporating interacting stressors within marine spatial planning.
- Requires high-quality data ideally from systematic surveys with matched stressor

footprints

• Historical impacts (trawling pre-1990, variability in sediment deposition over time) are not accounted for, and are probably significant drivers of current distributions.

Figure 2: A) Stressor maps, B) Difference in Habitat Suitability between no stressor and stressor scenarios, C) Top 20% areas for conservation with and without stressors and priority areas for restoration potential.

Project 1.2: Spatially-explicit cumulative effects tools







March 2023 Graphic design by Nidhi Yogesh (NIWA)