This is a repository copy of *Distributions of salt-marsh foraminifera along the coast of SW California, USA : Implications for sea-level reconstructions.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/115666/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Avnaim-Katav, Simona, Gehrels, Willem Roland, Brown, Lauren et al. (2 more authors) (2017) Distributions of salt-marsh foraminifera along the coast of SW California, USA : Implications for sea-level reconstructions. *Marine Micropaleontology*. pp. 25-43. ISSN 0377-8398

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2017.02.001>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Distributions of salt-marsh foraminifera along the coast of SW California, USA:
implications for sea-level reconstructions

Simona Avnaim-Katav^{a,b,*}, W. Roland Gehrels^c, Lauren N. Brown^b, Elizabeth Fard^b,
Glen M. MacDonald^{a,b}

^a University of California, Los Angeles, Institute of the Environment and
Sustainability, La Kretz Hall, Suite 300, Box 951496, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1496,
USA.

^b University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Geography, 1255 Bunche
Hall, Box 951524, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA.

^c Environment Department, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5NG,
United Kingdom.

*Corresponding author: Telephone: +909-734-9661, Email: Simona100@ucla.edu

Reference: Avnaim-Katav, S., Gehrels, W.R., Brown, L.N., Fard, E., MacDonald, G.M., 2017. Distributions of salt-marsh foraminifera along the coast of SW California, USA: implications for sea-level reconstructions. Marine Micropaleontology 131, 25-43, doi:10.1016/j.marmicro.2017.02.001.

Abstract

Salt-marsh foraminifera are frequently used around the world as proxies in paleoenvironmental studies of sea-level change. Quantitative reconstructions of sea-level change use transfer functions which are based on the vertical zonation of salt-marsh foraminifera with respect to the tidal frame. This paper explores for the first time the environmental factors that control the foraminiferal assemblages in Southern California marshes using modern surface samples (1 cm thick) from two marshes Seal Beach and Tijuana Estuary. The dead foraminiferal assemblages demonstrate distinct zonation across the salt-marsh surfaces which is primarily related to elevation. Other variables less important than elevation such as O₂, temperature, salinity and pH additionally control the distribution pattern of these assemblages. The tidal flat and low marshes are characterized by high abundances of *Miliammina fusca* and calcareous species. The middle marsh is dominated by *Jadammina macrescens* and *Trochammina inflata*, while the high marsh zone is dominated by *Trochammina irregularis*, *Miliammina petila*, *J. macrescens* and *T. inflata*. Regression modelling was used for the development of a sea-level transfer function based on a combined training set of surface samples from the two study sites. The performance of the Weighted Average – Partial Least Squares (WA-PLS) transfer function suggests a robust relationship between the observed and estimated elevations ($r^2_{\text{Jack}} = 0.72$), and is capable of predicting former sea levels to a precision of ± 0.09 m. Our results can be used for future paleoenvironmental reconstructions along the Southern California coast, an area that has experienced changes in sea level in the past and will be affected by future sea-level rise coupled with climate and anthropogenic changes, resulting in wide impacts on the natural coastal habitats in this region.

Keywords: foraminiferal assemblages; California; salt marshes; environmental relations; redundancy analysis; transfer function; relative sea level;

1 Introduction

Salt-marsh sediment records are used to quantitatively reconstruct late Holocene relative sea-level changes (e.g., Kemp et al., 2011), with fairly high precision (up to ± 0.05 m, cf. Gehrels and Woodworth, 2013). In combination with long-term tide gauge records they have provided sea-level reconstructions of the transition from relatively low rates of change during the late Holocene in the order of tenths of mm yr^{-1} to accelerated modern rates (early 20th century) in the order of mm yr^{-1} , both in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres (Gehrels and Woodworth, 2013). Quantifying regional patterns of sea-level change using proxies from salt-marsh sediments provides information on drivers of local to regional sea-level change and ultimately on global climate change (e.g., mass–balance changes of ice sheets and glaciers) (e.g., Milne et al., 2002; Milne et al., 2009; Kopp et al., 2016). Benthic foraminifera preserved in salt-marsh sediments are frequently used for reconstructing past sea-level changes due to their vertical zonation in the modern intertidal zone (e.g., Scott and Medioli, 1980; Scott et al., 1984; Gehrels, 1994; Horton et al., 1999a; Kemp et al., 2009a; Horton and Edwards, 2005), especially in micro- to mesotidal settings (e.g., Scott et al., 2001; Barlow et al., 2013 and references therein; Kemp and Telford, 2015 and references therein). Elevation relative to the tidal frame (or frequency of tidal submergence) is the controlling environmental parameter that is of interest to sea-level studies (Gehrels, 2000). Studies exploring the ecology of modern salt-marsh foraminifera show that their spatial distribution can also be controlled by other environmental factors, such as salinity (e.g., Murray, 1971; Patterson, 1990; de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997), pH (e.g., Woodroffe et al., 2005; Barnett et al., 2016), grain-size (e.g., Matera and Lee, 1972; de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Scott et al., 1998; Barnett et al., 2016) and organic carbon concentration (e.g., de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Milker et al., 2015a). However, these environmental parameters and others (e.g., vegetation cover, geochemical properties) are significantly correlated with tidal elevation in many salt marshes (e.g., de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Horton, 1999a; Horton et al., 2003; Horton and Edwards, 2005; Milker et al., 2015a).

Many quantitative sea-level studies use regression methods to develop predictive transfer functions, capable of inferring past relative sea levels from fossil foraminifera in subsurface salt-marsh deposits (e.g., Gehrels, 1999; Horton et al., 1999b; Edwards and Horton, 2000; Gehrels, 2000; Edwards et al., 2004b; Gehrels et al., 2006; Horton and Edwards, 2006; Kemp et al., 2009b; Gehrels et al., 2012). In marshes where salt-marsh foraminifera are unimodally distributed along the environmental gradient, Weighted Averaging (WA), Locally Weighted Weighted-Averaging (LW-WA) and even to a higher degree, Weighted Averaging Partial Least-Squares (WA-PLS), are considered as the most robust models for reconstructing sea level (ter Braak and Juggins, 1993; ter Braak et al., 1993; Birks, 1995, 2010; Juggins and Birks, 2012; Kemp and Telford, 2015). Where linear species–environment responses are demonstrated, Partial Least Squares (PLS) is the most widely used technique (e.g., Stone and Brooks, 1990; Rossi et al., 2011). These methods are reviewed in detail by Birks (1995, 2003, 2010), Barlow et al. (2013) and Kemp and Telford (2015), and

have been applied to reconstruct past sea-level changes in a wide range of geographical areas, including the Atlantic coast of the USA (e.g., Gehrels, 2000; Edwards et al., 2004a,b; Gehrels et al., 2002, 2004, 2005; Horton et al., 2006; Kemp et al., 2009a, 2009b, 2011, 2013, 2015; Wright et al., 2011), the Atlantic coast of Europe (e.g., Gehrels et al., 2001; Horton and Edwards, 2005, 2006; Leorri et al., 2010; Long et al. 2014; Barlow et al., 2014; Barnett et al., 2015), eastern Canada (e.g., Patterson et al., 2004; Gehrels et al., 2005; Barnett et al., 2016), west coast of Canada (Guilbault et al., 1996), South Africa (Franceschini et al., 2005; Strachan et al., 2014), Iceland (Gehrels et al., 2006; Saher et al., 2015), Australia (Woodroffe, 2009; Gehrels et al., 2012), New Zealand (Gehrels et al., 2008; Grenfell et al., 2012) and Malaysia (Culver et al., 2015). Despite this vast literature, few studies have been conducted along the Pacific coast of the USA. Exceptions are the studies of intertidal foraminifera from Oregon, USA, to reconstruct relative sea-level changes caused by co-seismic subsidence (e.g., Hawkes et al., 2010, 2011; Engelhart et al., 2013) and to investigate the influence of taphonomic processes, small-scale variability and infaunal distribution on the accuracy of sea-level reconstructions (Milker et al., 2015a). However, neither a comprehensive modern training set, nor transfer function based on recent developments and methodological recommendations (Barlow et al., 2013; Kemp and Telford, 2015) have been developed for salt marshes in California. With that being said, previous studies, during the mid-late 1970's, from Tijuana salt-marsh, Southern California, qualitatively divided the marsh into foraminiferal zones (Scott, 1976; Scott and Medioli, 1978) which were applied in Holocene paleoenvironmental reconstructions (Scott et al., 2011).

Salt-marsh ecosystems are of high economic value and societal and ecological significance. They provide ecosystem services for tourism and commercial fisheries, as nurseries and refuge areas for a variety of organisms, for carbon sequestration, and for protecting water quality by filtering runoff and reducing the pollutant load entering estuaries. Moreover, salt marshes are a natural protection against coastal flooding, erosion and sea-level rise (e.g., Gedan et al., 2010). For the Southern California coast, with its dense population and ongoing disappearance of natural coastal habitats due to anthropogenic modification, variable tectonic regimes and climate change, the need to investigate the coastal marshes is pressing. In order to create a reference baseline for future regional paleogeographic, paleoecological and paleo sea-level study this study aims to: (1) identify and describe the distribution patterns of the living and dead foraminiferal assemblages in two coastal salt marshes: Tijuana and Seal Beach; (2) constrain by quantitative ordination methods the relationships between foraminiferal assemblages and the most important environmental drivers influencing their distribution; (3) examine whether the recent foraminiferal assemblages in these salt marshes show a distinct zonation relative to the tidal frame; (4) develop an ecological response function using the modern training set (i.e., a foraminifera based transfer function) suitable for precise relative sea-level reconstructions in an area that is susceptible to both sea-level change and tectonic land movements.

2 Study area

The salt marsh at Tijuana is part of the Tijuana River Estuary located north of the US-Mexico border (32° 33' N, 117° 07' W; Fig. 1). The salt marsh is part of the National Estuarine Research Reserve which has over 1000 ha of coastal marsh environments (Zedler et al., 1986). Just over 150 km to the northwest of Tijuana, Sea Beach consists of approximately 390 ha of salt marshes incorporated in a National Wildlife Refuge that lies within the US Naval Weapons Station at Seal Beach (33° 44' N, 118° 05' W). The Seal Beach and Tijuana sites represent salt marshes with generally similar tidal characteristics and overall climatic and oceanographic settings representative of Southern California. Tides are semidiurnal and have an observed mean range close to the upper micro-tidal range, <2 m (Table 1), as measured from 1983 to 2001 at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) tide-gauge stations in Los Angeles, ~16 km north of Seal Beach, and Imperial Beach, ~2 km north of Tijuana.

Historically, salt marshes on the Southern California coast have developed in response to the drowning of river valleys when sea levels reached their approximate current position about 5000 years before present (Zedler, 1982). Although salt marshes in California have seen a great reduction in area due to human influence, Tijuana salt marsh is considered a pristine ecosystem that preserves many of its natural qualities. Moreover the northern arm of the marsh, which was chosen for this study, is known for its simple elevation gradient and its relative physical stability (Zedler, 1977). The marsh at Seal Beach is a similar habitat that has been least affected by human disturbance thanks to its designation as a wildlife reserve. Moreover, this marsh is the only remaining undeveloped part of the Anaheim Bay estuary. Prior to development, this estuary had large fringing freshwater wetlands, salt flats, and alkali meadows, and freshwater creeks may have flowed perennially into it (Grossinger et al., 2011). Reclaimed areas of the estuary adjacent to the Seal Beach salt marsh include military, municipal and industrial infrastructure.

Natural hydrologic disturbances at Tijuana include extreme flood events which can deposit up to 8 or 9 cm of sediment in low marsh areas near channels (Cahoon et al., 1996; Wallace et al., 2005). In the past century, some reduction in streamflow has been observed due to damming upstream in the watershed. Even so, hydrologic extremes of flood and drought at Tijuana have been known to cause periods of tidal closure and hypersalinity leading to vegetation die-off (Zedler, 2010).

The most significant natural hydrologic change at the salt marsh at Seal Beach occurred about 300 years before present with the isolation of the marsh due to changes in the flow of the Santa Ana River (Leeper III, 2015). Historically sedimentation at Seal Beach appears to have kept pace with sea-level rise in the recent past, but the lack of terrestrial sediment input makes the marsh at Seal Beach all the more vulnerable to accelerated sea-level rise (Kirwan and Megonigal, 2013). This danger is compounded by the fact that Seal Beach lies directly along the San Andreas Fault and is suspected to have suffered elevation loss due to tectonic subsidence (Leeper III, 2015). Additionally, the region surrounding Seal Beach has observed a 4.13 mm/yr average lowering in surface elevation from 1994 to 2012 (Takekawa et al., 2013) due to oil extraction.

Marsh vegetation in Southern California is often classified into zones based on elevation (Peinado et al., 1994; Zedler et al., 1986; Zedler, 1977). Zonation is due to a

complex combination of biotic tolerances and interspecific competition (Engels et al., 2011). The low elevations, high salinity habitats of Southern California salt marshes are dominated by *Spartina alterniflora*. Mid-marsh regions are frequently co-dominated by a number of species including *Sarcocornia pacifica*, *Batis maritima*, and *Jaumea carnosa*. Species such as *Distichlis spicata*, *Frankenia grandifolia* and *Limonium californicum* are found in the mid-to-high marsh areas. However, the boundary between mid and high marsh vegetation is less definite, and plants from these zones also colonize the marsh-upland transition area. *Arthrocnemum subterminale* and *Monanthochloe littoralis* are species which show a preference for the highest elevations in the marsh. Marsh-upland transition can most clearly be seen by the appearance of shrub-type plants, often those of the native chaparral vegetation such as *Artemisia californica*, *Rhus lauriana*, and *Baccharis pilularis*.

The climate of Southern California is Mediterranean and experiences hot, dry summers and warm, wet winters. At Tijuana Estuary, the average annual high temperature is 21°C with an average low of 12.9°C and an average annual precipitation of 26.6 cm. At Seal Beach, average annual high temperatures are 23.4°C and lows are 13°C with an annual average of 31.1 cm of precipitation (usclimatedata.com). Drought and extreme flooding, as previously mentioned, are not uncommon and pose the most significant climatic impacts on marsh vegetation (Zedler et al., 1986; Zedler, 2010).

3 Materials and methods

3.1. Field sampling

We established twenty stations in Seal Beach salt marsh and seventeen stations in Tijuana salt marsh (Fig. 1, Table 2) along transects perpendicular to the primary direction of tidal inundation. Stations covered the sub-environments within the intertidal zone from high marsh to the tidal flat, where possible. Sampling coincided with approximately spring tide in the fall in order to standardize the timing of collection and to maintain perennial persistency in foraminiferal distribution (i.e., we avoided sampling during bloom periods) (e.g., Buzas, 1965; Jones and Ross, 1979; Horton and Edwards, 2003; Horton and Murray, 2006, 2007; Schönfeld et al., 2012). The stations at Seal Beach were sampled in mid-October 2015 and resampled (only for faunal analysis) three days after storm activity generated by Hurricane Patricia on 23 October, 2016 (www.nhc.noaa.gov). However, our results showed that the study area was not impacted by the storm and we used the replicate dead foraminiferal data at Seal Beach to enhance our interpretations. The stations at Tijuana were sampled in early December, 2015.

Station locations were determined with Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) and post processed with the Online Positioning User Service (OPUS) generated by NOAA in order to provide simplified access to high-accuracy National Spatial Reference System (NSRS) coordinates i.e., to standardize and correct for spatial changes in MSL. The elevations, with a precision of ≤ 4 cm (3cm in average), were referenced to the North American vertical datum (NAVD88) computed using GEOID12B.

At each station vegetation cover was described and pore-water salinity, temperature, O₂ concentration and pH were measured using hand-held EXTECH DO700 meter following de Rijk (1995).

Fifty seven surface marsh sediment samples with a standardized volume of 10 cm³ from the uppermost centimeter (10 cm² by 1 cm thick) were sampled for foraminiferal analysis. This sampling strategy follows the assumption that the intertidal foraminifera are primarily shallow infaunal (classification follows Buzas et al. (1993)), thus our surface samples sufficiently represent the modern intertidal environment. This hypothesis is supported by research in other salt marshes, for example in Oregon (Hawkes et al., 2010; Milker et al., 2015a), Nova Scotia (Scott and Medioli, 1980), Maine (Gehrels, 1994), Massachusetts (de Rijk, 1995), North Carolina (Culver and Horton, 2005), New Brunswick, Canada (Patterson et al., 2004) and the UK (Horton, 1997; Horton and Edwards, 2006). Nevertheless, there are a considerable number of studies that reported living infaunal salt-marsh foraminifera which might alter the composition of fossil assemblages (e.g., Hippensteel et al., 2002; Culver and Horton, 2005 and references therein) due to seasonal and local environmental conditions and bioturbation (Buzas et al., 1993; de Stigter et al., 1998; Culver and Horton, 2005; Tobin et al., 2005; Horton and Edwards, 2006). We tested the influence of infaunal foraminifera in the marshes of Southern California by analyzing foraminifera at 1 cm resolution down 10cm long mini cores from the mid-marsh (one core along each transect).

All foraminifera surface and core samples were preserved on the day of sampling in rose Bengal solution (2 g rose Bengal /l 95%- ethanol) for two weeks to distinguish living from dead specimens at the time of collection (Walton, 1952; Murray and Bowser, 2000; Schönfeld et al., 2012). Specimens were considered living at the time of collection when all chambers were stained completely bright red, except for the last chamber (e.g., Horton and Edwards, 2006; Milker et al., 2015a). Additionally the solution was buffered by calcium carbonate powder to prevent dissolution of calcareous tests. At each sampling station a second set of sediment samples (one per station) was taken and stored in sealed plastic bags for grain-size distribution and loss on ignition (LOI) analyses. All samples were stored in the refrigerator at 4°C prior to further laboratory analyses.

3.2. Laboratory techniques

Quantitative Sedimentological Analyses

Grain-size distributions of the surface samples were determined using a Malvern Mastersizer 2000 Laser Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer coupled to a Hydro 2000G large-volume sample dispersion unit at the Paleoclimatology and Paleotsunami Laboratory, California State University, Fullerton. Prior to analysis, samples were treated with 25-50 ml of 30% hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) to remove organic matter. Standard laboratory procedures for grain-size distributions are detailed in Kirby et al. (2015).

Loss-on-Ignition (LOI; a proxy for percent organic matter- %TOM) at 550 °C and 950 °C (% total carbonate - %TC) were measured according to the method of Heiri et al. (2001). For LOI measurements, samples were wet sieved to remove the material larger than 2 mm, dehydrated at 105°C for 24 hours, and burned in a muffle furnace at

550°C for 4 hours. LOI was calculated by the difference in sample dry weight at 105°C and 550°C. Samples were then burned in a furnace at 950°C for 1 hour to calculate carbonate content.

Foraminiferal analysis

A total of fifty seven surface samples and 20 core samples were analyzed for foraminifera from the two marshes. These samples were wet-sieved through 500 µm and 63 µm sieves. The >500 µm fraction was examined for larger foraminifera before being discarded. The fraction between 63 and 500 µm was subdivided into eight equal aliquots following the most reliable method for splitting a foraminiferal sample described in Horton and Edwards (2006) using a wet splitter (Scott and Hermelin, 1993). Where possible, at least 300 tests (dead and live) were counted in water which enabled easy detection of rose Bengal stained foraminifera and prevented drying of the organic residue (e.g., de Rijk, 1995; Horton and Edwards, 2006). In the short core samples, living specimens from below the surface (1-10 cm) sediment layer were considered as infaunal.

Taxonomic identifications follow Gehrels and van de Plassche (1999), Horton and Edwards (2006), Hawkes et al. (2010), Wright et al. (2011), and Milker et al. (2015a, b). The genus *Jadammina* is now considered a junior synonym of *Entzia* (Kaminski and Filipescu, 2011). However, we still employ the genus *Jadammina* in this study in order to avoid confusion since the majority of salt-marsh foraminiferal researchers use it. Juvenile specimens of *Trochammina inflata* and *Jadammina macrescens* that were difficult to distinguish from each other because of their small sizes were lumped into a single group and assigned as juvenile Trochamminids. Specimens of the genus *Ammobaculites* were combined into a single group, because these species were often broken making it difficult to identify them to the species level (Kemp et al., 2009a; Milker et al., 2015a). All counts were expressed as numerical abundance of living and dead foraminifera numbers per 10 cm³ bulk sediment and as a relative abundance (%) of species out of the total group. All foraminiferal data can be found in the supplementary material (Supplementary data 1, 2 and 3). Scanning electron microscope photographs of key species were taken at the Department of Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences, UCLA.

3.3. Statistical analysis

Dead surface foraminiferal assemblages were statistically analyzed to minimize the seasonal fluctuations commonly recorded in live populations and because they most accurately reflect the subsurface assemblages indicating that taphonomic processes are minimal (e.g., Culver and Horton, 2005, Milker et al., 2015a and references therein). Two samples with low counts (<4 specimens) were removed from the statistical analyses while the remaining 55 surface samples (average of 417 individuals per sample) with 84 as the lowest specimens number were included.

Multivariate statistical methods (unconstrained Cluster Analysis, CA, and detrended correspondence analysis, DCA) are used to identify and classify the distribution of groups and subgroups in the foraminiferal community into homogeneous faunal zones (clusters) along each transect (e.g., Frezza and Carboni, 2009; Phipps et al., 2010).

A Q-mode CA was processed by PRIMER version 6 software (Plymouth Routines In Multivariate Ecological Research, UK). The data of the common benthic species (>1% relative abundance) were double-root transformed in order to down-weight the relative contribution of highly abundant species. These transformed abundances were used to build a similarity matrix calculated between every pair of samples comprising a Bray–Curtis similarity (Bray and Curtis, 1957) as the distance metric, and used to reconstruct a dendrogram for hierarchical clustering (group average linkage). ‘Similarity profile’ (SIMPROF) permutation tests were used to identify significant groupings, such that the group being subdivided had a significant ($p < 0.05$) internal structure. A ‘similarity percentages’ (SIMPER) routine was used in order to identify species that contributed most to the similarity within each sample cluster, as well as to dissimilarities with other clusters.

A DCA was carried out in order to provide further information about the patterns of variation in the faunal data and to determine the type of response displayed by the species distribution to one or more environmental gradients, a unimodal or linear response (e.g., Leps and Smilauer, 2003). Choosing an appropriate ordination technique to quantify the direct species–environment relationships relies on determining the extent of species turnover (the beta diversity in community composition) measured in standard deviation (SD) units along an environmental gradient, as calculated by DCA (e.g., Leps and Smilauer, 2003; Barlow et al., 2013). Gradient lengths of SD <3 point toward linear faunal response along the environmental gradient, whereas those of SD >4 indicate unimodal species–environment relationships. DCA showed a linear species response and therefore RDA was used. RDA was applied to quantify the direct relationship between the distribution of benthic foraminifera to the elevation and abiotic ecological variables including pore-water and sediment properties (Table 2). This ordination technique is based on a linear species–environment relationship, where the axes are linear combinations of the environmental variables. It integrates variance as well as correlation in its search for relationships between the two sets of biotic and abiotic variables (Leyer and Wesche, 2007). In order to further test the correlation between the species distribution and elevation we used the parametric correlation coefficient Pearson’s r .

Both DCA and RDA were applied using Canoco, version 4.55 software (Leps and Smilauer, 2003; Ter Braak and Smilauer, 2002). For DCA, detrending by segments was selected and for RDA environmental parameters were standardized and Monte Carlo permutation tests (2000 permutations) were performed. In both statistical methods species data were log transformed because they don’t show normal distribution based on the Shapiro-Wilk test calculated using the PAST software package vs. 3.11 (Hammer et al., 2001) and also due to the rather uneven vertical distribution of the samples (Gehrels, 2000; Telford and Birks, 2011). We calculated inter-correlations between environmental parameters and statistical significance as well as the Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r value) with the PAST software package vs. 2.15 (Hammer et al., 2001).

DCA results were also used as an initial step for choosing an appropriate unimodal or linear-based transfer function. In order to develop transfer functions (‘ecological response functions’) for predicting marsh surface elevations, the relationship between water depth and the relative abundances of foraminiferal taxa within the combined

training data set was empirically modeled in the C2 program (version 1.7.4; Juggins, 2011). Although the difference in tidal range between the two sites is small, sample elevations were normalized using the Standardised Water Level Index (SWLI), commonly applied in salt-marsh sea-level studies (Gehrels, 1999; Horton et al., 1999; Wright et al., 2011; Barlow et al., 2013; Kemp and Telford, 2015). The SWLI value is calculated as: $(100 \times (\text{sample elevation} - \text{local mean tidal level}) / (\text{high water reference level} - \text{local mean tidal level})) + 100$. We used the mean higher high water as the high water reference level (Kemp and Telford, 2015). Although Wright et al. (2011) recommend to use the highest occurrence of foraminifera as the high water reference level in SWLI calculations, we could not establish this datum because our highest samples still contained foraminifera. All elevations are expressed relative to the same datum and a SWLI of 100 is MTL and 200 is MHHW.

Model performance was evaluated based on the cross-validated (leave-one-out/ jack-knifed) correlation between model prediction elevation and measured elevation (r^2_{jack}), the root mean squared error of prediction (RMSEP) and the tendency of the model to overestimate (underestimate) parts of the training set gradient, as mean and maximum bias (Birks, 1998; Juggins and Birks, 2012; Kemp and Telford, 2015). The observed residual scatter and observed and predicted values after model prediction in the produced scatterplots were also taken in consideration as complementing the evaluated model performance (Telford et al., 2004).

Sampling of the modern analogue along transects (e.g., evenly stratified by elevation and or within one site/marsh) may lead to spatial autocorrelation (increased resemblance of samples) and thus might negatively impact the transfer function model performance (Legendre and Fortin, 1989; Telford and Birks, 2009). The issue of spatial autocorrelation is reduced by sampling two different salt marshes and combining the results into one modern training set. Consequently, we present a robust foraminifera-based transfer function from a modern analogue potentially suitable for RSL reconstructions in Southern California.

4 Results

4.1. The environmental properties of surface sediment

Water temperature (WT) varies between 24 °C and 32 °C and between 15 °C and 20 °C in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marshes, respectively (Fig. 2; Table 2). Differences in WT between the two marshes are related to differences in sampling months (October vs. December) and differences within each marsh are related to sampling hours during the day, in each transect. The pH values of the pore-water show no observable spatial trend and range commonly from 6.1 to 7.8 in Seal Beach excluding one sample with the lowest pH (4.3) and from 6.4 to 7.3 in Tijuana. Low O₂ concentration is measured in the most elevated stations of Seal Beach and thereafter a decreasing trend is observed ranging from 8 to 0.3 mg/l. O₂ concentration were rather low, <1.6 3 mg/l, at all stations in Tijuana excluding two stations with values of 6.6 and 3.3 mg/l. Salinity values in Seal Beach show a decreasing trend from the high marsh samples (~40 ‰) to the low marsh samples (~34 ‰) whereas in Tijuana the values varies between 27 ‰ and 38 ‰ in all stations apart of one high marsh sample with 20 ‰. The organic matter content is fluctuating in both transects and ranges from 67 to 1% and from 12 to 75% in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marshes, respectively. The organic matter content in both transects was the highest in the mid marsh

sediments (apart from two samples in Seal Beach in which sparse vegetation occurs) and it decreases somewhat towards the low marsh edge due to the decrease in vegetation cover. The carbonate content varied between 1% and 22% and between 1% and 11% in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marshes, respectively, with the higher values occurring in the mid marsh samples in both transects (apart from two samples in Seal Beach which had also low organic matter content). There was no clear trend in the grain-size distribution along the intertidal zone of both transects. Tijuana salt marsh is dominated generally by silty sediment (62-77%), except in two sandy high marsh stations (TJE1, TJE2; Fig. 2; Table 2). Seal Beach stations are characterized by silty to sandy sediments with low concentrations of clay (<14%). Increasing sand concentrations in the lower salt-marsh stations of Seal Beach (SB8-SB17) are probably related to a tidal velocity gradient.

4.2. Distribution of live (rose Bengal stained) foraminifera in the surface samples

The distribution of the live dominant taxa identified along transects from Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marshes are summarized in Figs. 3 and 4, respectively. Nine different agglutinated taxa were found in the live (rose Bengal stained) populations from both sites which were dominated by *Jadammina macrescens*, *Trochammina inflata*, *Miliammina fusca*, and *Ammobaculites* spp. Other species such as *Trochammina irregularis*, *Miliammina petila* and *Scherochorella moniliformis* were observed in rather low numbers (Plate 1). Calcareous species were found mainly in the tidal flat and low marsh sediments. High abundances of juvenile calcareous miliolids were encountered in several high marsh samples. These were probably transported by tides via nearby tidal creeks (Plate 2) as suggested by the high sand content in the same samples.

The live species exhibit observable zonation relative to elevation. At both sites, the relative abundance of *M. fusca* is larger at lowest elevations. The tidal flat sediments at Seal Beach (St. 16) are dominated by this species with general abundances between 92 and 496 specimens/10 cm³ sediment volume and *S. moniliformis* with 108 and 216/10 cm³ (Fig. 3). In the low marsh sediments at Seal Beach (St. SB8-SB17) and at Tijuana (St. TJE10-TJE 15) these two species occur in decreasing numbers (Figs. 3 and 4). In the middle marsh these species are replaced by high concentrations of *J. macrescens* and *T. inflata* (St. TJE7-TJE 9 and TJE 16), while at Seal Beach (St. SB3-SB7) *Ammobaculites* spp. also occur. The highest stations (St. SB1 and SB18-SB20 and St. TJE1-TJE 3 and TJE17) are characterized by higher numbers of *J. macrescens* and *T. inflata* and occurrence of *T. irregularis* and *M. petila* (Figs. 3 and 4, Supplementary data 1 and 2).

4.3. Distribution patterns of dead foraminiferal assemblages in the surface samples

The dead foraminiferal assemblages are dominated by the same taxa as the live (rose Bengal stained) populations at the same stations with occasional higher concentrations in both marshes (Figs. 3 and 4).

The dead foraminiferal zonation defined by the Q mode cluster analyses mimics the vascular plant zonation in Seal Beach saltmarsh whereas in Tijuana it differs slightly from the zonation of vascular plants. Three main sample groups (clusters 1, 2 and 3) were distinguished in each salt marsh (Figs. 5 and 6).

At Seal Beach, cluster 1 contains samples from the low marsh (St. SB17 and SB8-SB15 and their replicates) with elevations between 1.37-1.67 m NAVD88 designated as cluster 1b and samples from tidal flat (St. SB16, 2SB16) with only one elevation of 0.98 m NAVD88 labeled as cluster 1a. Both sub-clusters are characterized by *J. macrescens* (7-68%), *T. inflata* (18-57%), calcareous species (1-25%) and *M. fusca* (1-29%). The latter species is more abundant in cluster 3a where it is also accompanied by *S. moniliformis* (5-11%). Cluster 2 consists entirely of mid marsh stations (St. SB2-SB7 and their replicates) with elevations between 1.48 and 1.58 m NAVD88 (Fig. 5, Table 2, Supplementary data 1). This cluster is divided into two sub-clusters 2a and 2b. Sub cluster 2a is characterized by *J. macrescens* (21-75%), *Ammobaculites* spp. (12-62%) and *T. inflata* (<20%). Sub cluster 2b is dominated by *J. macrescens* (57-89%) and accompanied by *T. inflata* (<29%) and calcareous species (<5%). Cluster 3 includes stations from the high marsh (St. SB1, SB18-SB20 and their replicates) with elevations between 1.56 and 1.79 m NAVD88. The most significant species contributing to this cluster are *J. macrescens* (>46%), *T. inflata* (<38%) and *T. irregularis* (<7%).

At Tijuana, cluster 1 consists in part of the low marsh stations (St. TJE12-TJE15) with the lowest elevations between 1.39 and 1.48 m NAVD88 (Fig. 6, Table 2, Supplementary data 2). This cluster is dominated by *J. macrescens* (21-52%), *Trochammina inflata* (18-48%), calcareous species (11-38%), *M. fusca* (4-9%) and by *S. moniliformis* (1-3%). Cluster 2 contains samples from the mid to low marsh (St. TJE4 – TJE11 and TJE16) with elevations between 1.42-1.59 m NAVD88. Samples in this cluster are dominated by *J. macrescens* (35-72%), *T. inflata* (20-51%) and calcareous species (1-13%). Cluster 3 encompasses the high marsh samples (St. TJE1-3 and TJE17) with elevations between 1.57- 1.93 m NAVD88. The dominant species in this cluster are similar to those occurring in cluster 3 at Seal Beach including *J. macrescens* (>40%), *T. inflata* (12-44%), *T. irregularis* (4-12%) and *M. petila* (<7%) (Fig. 6).

4.4. Surface and infaunal foraminiferal distribution in the short cores

The infaunal foraminiferal distributions in the short cores are shown in Fig. 7. The down core distribution of dead foraminifera is given in Supplementary data 1 and 2. Similar foraminiferal species are currently living (rose Bengal stained) at the surface (0-1 cm depth) of the transition from mid to low marsh (St. SB5) of Seal Beach and of the mid marsh (St. TJE8) of Tijuana with general abundances of 872/10 cm³ and 340/10 cm³, respectively. The living assemblage at the surface of Seal Beach is dominated by *J. macrescens* (624/10 cm³), calcareous species (192/10 cm³) and *T. inflata* (56/10 cm³). The living assemblage at the surface of Tijuana is dominated by *T. inflata* (188/10 cm³), *J. macrescens* (108/10 cm³), and calcareous species (24/10 cm³). Living infaunal specimens of the same surface living species are observed between 1 cm and maximum down to 6 cm, showing general decreasing numbers with core depth. In the shallowest depths (1-2 cm), the total highest numbers of infaunal specimens representing 16% and 10% out of the total assemblages, in Seal Beach and Tijuana, respectively, are observed. The most abundant infaunal species is *T. inflata* (672/10 cm³ or 80/10 cm³ at 1-2 cm in Seal Beach and Tijuana, respectively) which also found deeper (down to 6 cm) compared to other infaunal species.

4.5. The relationship between foraminiferal composition and environmental variables

The short lengths of the first DCA axis in turnover (less than 2 SD) units for each transect and for the combined surface assemblage of both marshes (Table 3a-c) indicate that the foraminifera demonstrate a linear response to one or more environmental gradients and thus a linear ordination method (i.e., RDA) is expected to perform well. The applied Monte Carlo tests suggest a significant influence ($p < 0.05$; Table 4a) of several environmental parameters on the species distribution in the modern data set of Seal Beach. O₂ explains 24.1% of the variance in the data set, elevation, salinity, carbonate content and temperature, each justifying values between 16.3% and 19.9% of the variance in the data set. These significant environmental variables in Seal Beach are correlated to the first two axes, calculated with the RDA, which explain 51% of the cumulative variance of the species data and 94% of the species-environment relationship (Table 4a, Fig. 8A). However, in Tijuana, elevation and TOM were found to be the significant environmental parameters, explaining 43.2% and 8.3% of the variance in the data set, respectively (Table 4b, Fig. 8B). Axes one and two explain 56% of the total variance in the foraminiferal data (Table 4b).

The combined RDA results for both salt marshes show that elevation is the most significant environmental parameter explaining 17.1% of the variance in the data set. Other parameters explaining the variance in the data set include O₂ (12.2%), temperature (7.6%), salinity (10.9%), pH (2.1%) with the remainder (50%) consisting of inter-correlations between variables (Table 4c). The first two axes calculated with the RDA explain 38% of the cumulative variance of the species data and 93% of the species-environment relationship (Table 4c, Fig. 9).

In general, the results of the RDA (Figs. 8 and 9) support the Q-mode CA for both sites (Figs. 5 and 6). The distance between the samples with relatively good separation of the three assemblages within each transect is distinguished in the three dendrograms (1, 2, 3; Figs. 8 and 9) and shows the dissimilarities between the sample clusters and the similarities within each sample cluster. In the RDA ordination diagrams, cluster 3 samples representing high marsh sediments in both salt marshes are plotting around the elevation arrow while cluster 1 samples, representing mid to low marsh and low to tidal flat sediments, with lower elevations plotting mostly in the opposite direction.

Several samples of cluster 2 plot close to the carbonate content, temperature and O₂ arrows, all pointing in the same direction (Figs. 8A and 9). The arrow of salinity is in the same direction as the arrow of elevation in Seal Beach indicating an inter-correlation between the two and reflecting a similar general trend from higher values in the high marsh to lower values towards the low marsh (Figs. 8 and 2).

The relationships between elevation, the most significant environmental parameter (Table 4c) and abundance of the six strongly correlative foraminiferal species are shown in Fig. 9. *Jadammina macrescens* and *T. irregularis* are positively correlated with elevation, although rather weakly ($r = 0.2$). *Miliammina petila* occurs in low relative abundances at high marsh sites (i.e., in Tijuana) does not seem to have any correlation with elevation ($r = -0.03$). Conversely, *M. fusca*, calcareous spp. and *S.*

moniliformis occurring in the low marsh to tidal flat stations, are negatively correlated with elevation (Figs. 5, 6, 8 and 9) (r values range from -0.3 to -0.5). *Trochammina inflata* occurs in high relative abundances at low marsh as well as at high marsh sites, notably in Seal Beach, and does not seem to have any correlation with elevation ($r = -0.1$) (Fig. 8A). *Ammobaculites* spp. that have higher abundances in the mid marsh sediments, cluster 2 of Seal Beach, are positively correlated with O_2 (Figs. 8A and 9).

4.6. Development of a foraminifera-based transfer function

DCA of the Southern California training set, combining Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marshes with the SWLI as the environmental variable, produced a gradient length of 1.98 (Table 3c), allowing us to apply linear regression models, i.e., PLS (Birks, 1995). Nonetheless, WA-PLS also performs well for a linear species distribution along such an environmental gradient and while providing 'the minimal adequate model' (Birks, 1998 and reference therein), occasionally it outperforms PLS (Ter Braak et al., 1993). For this reason we tested also the WA-PLS model predictions.

Prior to the development of the foraminifera-based transfer function we performed a screening exercise. Three samples that contain high abundances of *Ammobaculites* species (>26%) and belonging to cluster 2a (Fig. 5) were excluded from the original 55 salt-marsh samples. The reasoning behind this decision is that these species are usually found broken in surface marsh sediments (Kemp et al., 2009a; Milker et al., 2015a) and to a greater extent they are hardly preserved within the subsurface fossilized record and thus, are not considered as useful proxy species for sea-level studies.

In order to improve the predictive ability of the transfer function we removed samples that have a difference between the predicted and observed values larger than 25% of the total observed elevation range, between 120.7 and 222.8 m NAVD88 (following Edwards et al., 2004). Consequently, PLS was developed from a screened training set of 43 samples and 8 species whereas a WAPLS was developed from 44 samples and 8 species. The final component in each transfer function was chosen according to the highest r^2 and the lowest RMSEP and maximum bias values if the reduction in prediction error exceeds 5% for this component compared to the next lowest component (Ter Braak and Juggins, 1993). This decision path was merely applied to the first three components in order not to add statistical complexity (Wright et al., 2011; Barlow et al., 2013).

The performance of both regression methods is presented in Table 5. The statistical output of the PLS foraminiferal transfer function shows that the second component of our model performed better than the first component providing the highest correlation between the observed and predicted values with $r^2_{\text{Jack}} = 0.49$, and the lowest root-mean squared-error of prediction (RMSEP_{Jack}) of 14.7 SWLI. Whereas the WAPLS-based transfer-function shows that the third component performed significantly better than the other components and also compared to the PLS model, with the lowest RMSEP_{Jack} of 11.9 SWLI, higher $r^2_{\text{Jack}} = 0.72$ and lower maximum bias values (22.7). The transfer function shows a stronger performance between observed and predicted SWLIs as also reflected in the scatter plots for the WAPLS (Fig. 10). A trend was found in the residuals of the WAPLS component 2, but this trend was weaker with the use of component 3. Nevertheless the residual scatter is suggesting that some

elevation predictions are underestimated especially from the landward upper edge of the gradient (high marsh).

5 Discussion

5.1. Environmental controls on modern foraminiferal distribution

Among the environmental variables controlling the spatial foraminiferal distribution across salt marshes (e.g., salinity, organic carbon concentration, grain-size, pH) (e.g., Patterson, 1990; de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Scott et al., 1998; Woodroffe et al., 2005; Milker et al., 2015a; Barnett et al., 2016), elevation which is associated with tidal inundation (or subaerial exposure) is frequently identified as the primary control, at least indirectly, responsible for their zonation (Gehrels, 2000; Horton et al., 2003; Edwards et al., 2004; Horton and Edwards, 2005; Barlow et al., 2013; Milker et al., 2015a). Consequently, these organisms have been extensively used as proxies for sea-level reconstruction (e.g., Scott and Medioli, 1980; Patterson et al., 2004; Barlow et al., 2013).

The results of the Q-mode CA and the RDA from Southern California further support the hypothesis that foraminiferal assemblages are strongly related to elevation and hence tidal submergence. At Tijuana elevation explains 43% of the total variance in the foraminiferal assemblages whereas at Seal Beach, 16% of the variance of the species data is explained by elevation (Fig. 8, Table 4a-b). Despite the difference in the elevational control between marshes, the combined RDA results of both data sets still show that elevation is the primary factor influencing the foraminiferal zonation, explaining 17.1% of the variance in the data set (Fig. 9, Table 4c) similar to studies in the Magdalen Islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada (Barnett et al., 2016), Oregon, USA (Hawkes et al., 2010) and the UK (Horton and Edwards, 2006). Elevation is followed by four additional environmental variables explaining lower variance in the data set including O₂ (12.2%), temperature (7.6), salinity (10.9), pH (2.1) and with the remainder (50%) consisting of inter-correlations between variables (Table 4c). Inter-correlations between environmental variables and foraminifera are known from other intertidal studies since varied factors also may be governed by the frequency and duration of tidal exposure as controlled by elevation (Horton et al., 2003; Horton and Edwards, 2005). For example in Seal Beach a significant ($p < 0.05$, $r = 0.36$) correlation between elevation and salinity was observed (Fig. 8b). Pore-water salinity is an additional key factor (after elevation) known to control marsh foraminiferal distributions (Murray, 2006), for example in tidal marshes with extremely low gradients having complex topography such as of the Great Marshes of eastern Massachusetts (e.g., de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997). Salinity of the sediment pore-water generally varies considerably due to the combined influence of the tidal cycle and infiltration of seawater, desiccation, precipitation and seepage of fresh ground water. The Southern California marshes experience frequent droughts under dry climate conditions. Pore-water salinity decreases from the high marsh (~40 ‰) to the low marsh (~34 ‰) at Seal Beach marsh (Fig. 2). This trend is also measured by the RDA results where salinity explains 16.8% of the variance in the species data and it has a positive correlation with elevation (Fig. 8b, Table 4b). On the other hand, salinity values at Tijuana were more variable and thus had no significant influence on the distribution pattern of the foraminifera. It seems that this difference between both

marshes is associated with their topographic characteristics with Tijuana transect having a simple gradient with no topographic complications whereas Seal Beach has more complex and irregular topography. Other studies also imply that when the topography is irregular, there is no very clear vertical foraminiferal zonation with respect to the tidal frame (de Rijk, 1995; de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Müller-Navarra et al., 2016). Nonetheless, since salinity varies considerably through the tidal cycle and our measurements were done only at the time of the sample collection during summer when evaporation is playing an important role, not much significance is attached to our measurements of this environmental parameter.

At Tijuana marsh, elevation is followed by TOM explaining 8.3% of the variance in the data set (Fig. 8b, Table 4b). Mainly mid to low samples dominated by *J. macrescens* and *T. inflata* were positively related to the TOM (Figs. 6, 8b). These species are known to prefer higher amounts of organic matter (Armynot du Châtelet et al., 2009). When the data are combined, the clear control of TOM on the distribution of foraminifers in Tijuana becomes masked.

Further environmental parameters probably affect the distributions patterns of foraminifera in Seal Beach, for example O₂ and temperature (Fig. 8). Substrate oxygenation is an important factor determining the degree of infaunal foraminiferal dispersion into the substrate (Walker and Goldstein, 1999). O₂ and temperature also influence organic matter degradation and thus the preservation of agglutinant species organic cement (Berkeley et al., 2007 and references therein). However, the potential of preservation of agglutinant species is also inherent selectively by different species (Berkeley et al., 2007 and references therein). At Seal Beach, O₂ and temperature are positively related to mid marsh sediment that are the only samples characterized by higher abundances of *Ammobaculites* spp. (Fig. 8A). It may be that their preservation specifically at the mid marsh is associated with more stable environmental conditions compared to the salt marsh edges. Similar fragility was related to the coarseness of the grains making up the tests of *M. fusca* explained their poor preservation (de Rijk and Troelstra, 1999) compared to other more packed grains of relatively robust species such as *T. inflata* (Berkeley et al., 2007 and references therein). It is worth mentioning that this study was not designed to determine the temporal variability of intertidal foraminifera in the surface sediments from a time series survey (e.g., by monthly sampling). Consequently, we cannot attribute more significance to these factors which fluctuate daily, through the tidal cycle and seasonally.

5.1.1. Vertical zonation of dead foraminifera

The comparison between the dead foraminiferal assemblages across the salt-marsh surfaces of Seal Beach and Tijuana show that their distributions are very similar to each other and are also comparable to foraminiferal distributions in other parts of the world. This indicates that despite the recent hydrological changes, the foraminiferal distributions are robust to these changes and their prominent elevational zonation (with site-specific differences) is not affected.

The dead foraminiferal assemblages of the tidal flat and low marsh of the studied sites are characterized by the occurrence of *M. fusca* and calcareous species. The agglutinant *M. fusca* is known as an indicative species of lower elevations, for example along the North America's Pacific coast (e.g., Nelson et al., 2008; Hawkes et

al., 2010; Engelhart et al., 2013, Milker et al., 2015a) and the North America's Atlantic coast (e.g., Edwards et al., 2004). In the middle marsh the dominant dead species include *J. macrescens*, *T. inflata* and *Ammobaculites* spp. *Trochammina inflata* and more prominently *J. macrescens* are also dominating higher elevations of the high marshes at both sites where they are accompanied by *T. irregularis* and *M. petila*. *Jadammina macrescens* and *T. inflata* have frequently been reported from middle marsh (Guilbault et al., 1996; Jennings and Nelson, 1992; Nelson et al., 2008; Hawkes et al., 2010; Engelhart et al., 2013, Milker et al., 2015a ,b) and the highest marsh environments (e.g., Patterson, 1990; de Rijk and Troelstra, 1997; Horton et al., 1999; Wang and Chappell, 2001; Hippensteel et al., 2002; Horton et al., 2003; Edwards et al., 2004a; Franceschini et al., 2005; Woodroffe et al., 2005). *Trochammina irregularis* (often grouped with *T. salsa*) has commonly been detected as a dominant species in the high and highest marsh in North American Pacific marshes (Hawkes et al., 2010; Engelhart et al., 2013; Milker et al., 2015a, b) and in New Zealand (e.g., Hayward et al., 2004; Southall et al., 2006) and Tasmania (Callard et al., 2011). Similarly *M. petila* has been also observed in the middle and high marshes from Oregon (Engelhart et al., 2013). The agglutinant *Balticammina pseudomacrescens* is an important sea-level indicator (Gehrels and van de Plassche, 1999) dominating higher elevation of mid to highest marsh zones in North American Pacific marshes, for example in Oregon salt marshes (Hawkes et al., 2010, 2011; Engelhart et al., 2013; Milker et al., 2015a, b) but is absent in the studied salt marshes in California.

5.2. The influence of taphonomic processes

Processes as sub-surface foraminiferal production (infauna) and taphonomic changes vary temporally and spatially, from one intertidal system to another, and may influence the fossil assemblages (e.g., Martin, 1999; Berkeley et al., 2007). Accordingly there is a clear need to explore these processes in each depositional environment, as a base for employing an adequate surface sampling strategy aiming at accurate paleoenvironmental interpretations based on the microfossil record. At Seal Beach and Tijuana, test production mirrors rather proportionally the standing crop numbers, a principle discussed in Berkeley et al. (2007) (Figs. 3 and 4). Samples with high numbers of standing crops yielded high total numbers (per 10 cm³ sediment volume) of dead foraminifera though exceeding the living ones, often by over an order of magnitude. This observation applies to most species excluding *S. moniliformis* and calcareous species in both marshes which showed opposite trends with higher numbers of live specimens compare to the dead numbers. This is probably due to taphonomic processes and low preservation potential (Figs. 3 and 4). Dead agglutinant specimens of *S. moniliformis* were found only in lower elevations. These are very fragile and tend to break easily due to the loss of organic cement by oxidation (Berkeley et al., 2007). On the low marsh and tidal flat lower numbers of dead calcareous species were observed compared to the live foraminifera (Figs. 3 and 4, Supplementary data 1 and 2). This difference along with apparent dissolution (Plate 2, Fig. 6b) is probably associated with reduced mean pH values of 6.5 and 6.9 in Seal Beach and in Tijuana, respectively, causing carbonate dissolution and lower preservation of the calcareous tests. Early diagenetic dissolution and loss of calcareous tests related to a pH <~7, which results in a carbonate undersaturation is a known process from intertidal environments along the North-West American coastal

marshes (e.g., Hawkes et al., 2010; Milker et al., 2015a), salt marshes in the Mediterranean region (Cundy et al., 2000; Shaw et al 2016) as well as from other temperate and tropical coasts (Wang and Chappell, 2001; Edwards and Horton, 2000; Horton and Murray, 2006; Berkeley et al., 2009). Moreover, a general spatial trend of better preservation at higher elevations was observed at Tijuana (Fig. 4), possibly associated with diagenetic controls on the preservation potential of calcareous and agglutinated tests.

5.3. Surficial vs. subsurface foraminifera

Most paleoenvironmental studies of intertidal marshes use the foraminiferal assemblages in surface sediment (upper 1 to 2 cm) as a modern counterpart assuming that they are characterized primarily by epifaunal production (e.g., Scott and Medioli, 1980; Gehrels, 1994; de Rijk, 1995; Horton, 1999; Patterson et al., 2004; Woodroffe et al., 2005; Horton and Edwards 2006; Kemp et al., 2009a) or shallow infaunal (Buzas et al., 1993). However, several studies have shown that intertidal foraminifera can live infaunally as deep as several decimeters in some marsh settings (e.g., Goldstein et al., 1995; Ozarko et al., 1997; Goldstein and Watkins, 1998; Saffert and Thomas, 1998; Goldstein and Watkins, 1999; Patterson et al., 1999; Hippensteel et al., 2002; Culver and Horton, 2005; Duchemin et al., 2005; Tobin et al., 2005; Berkeley et al., 2007; Leorri and Martin, 2009; Milker et al., 2015a). In such cases sampling the uppermost surface sediment (0-1 cm) would produce poor modern analogues (Duchemin et al., 2005). For example Ozarko et al. (1997) and Patterson et al. (1999) relied on a deeper surface sampling (to 10 cm), covering the entire distribution of the living infauna. Relying on such thick intervals may be misleading as they might represent a longer time span, in some cases a decade or longer, in some salt marsh settings (Milker et al., 2015a).

At Seal Beach and Tijuana the highest numbers of living specimens at the transition to middle marsh (St. SB5) and middle marsh (St. TJE8) are found in the surface samples (Fig. 7). The numbers of infaunal specimens, restricted to the first six cm of the cores, are low compared to the total foraminiferal assemblage and show a decreasing trend from 16% and 10% between 1 and 2 cm at Seal Beach and Tijuana, respectively, to nil (Fig. 7). These results are in accordance with other salt-marsh studies reporting living species predominantly in the top few centimeters of salt marsh in North Carolina (Culver and Horton, 2005), New Brunswick, Canada (Patterson et al., 2004) and the UK (Horton, 1997; Horton and Edwards, 2006).

Furthermore, the same infaunal species are presently living in the surface samples indicating that none of them are exclusively infaunal. Additionally the dominant infaunal species *T. inflata*, *J. macrescens* and calcareous miliolids are also dominating the dead surface and fossil assemblages in both marshes. Consequently, our results show that the influence of infaunal species on the dead assemblage is minor since most reproduction is concentrated near the sediment surface and that the same post-depositional processes influence fossil assemblages as the dead surface assemblages. These observations enable us to use the dead assemblages in the upper surface sediments as an adequate modern analogue for accurate quantitative paleoenvironmental interpretations.

The dead fossil assemblages in the mini cores analyzed also reveal interesting results. At Tijuana, similar species that dominate the surface dead assemblages occur along the entire 10 cm core with similar ratios and abundances. However at Seal Beach the down core shows a fossilized dead assemblage different from the surface dead assemblage. *Miliammina fusca* dominates the entire foraminiferal assemblage in the lower part of the core (Supplementary data 1 and 2) and numbers gradually decrease towards the top. This faunal change is indicating a change from a low marsh setting to a mid-marsh setting (Figs. 3-6).

5.4. Robustness of the transfer functions for relative sea-level estimates

This study demonstrates that elevation related to tidal inundation is a primary control on the foraminiferal distributions across the two salt marshes in Southern California and our data are thus suitable for developing a transfer function for reconstructing past sea-level changes (described in chapter 5.1). The WAPLS transfer function (component 3) is the favored model with the best statistical performance compared to the PLS model (described in chapter 4.6) (Table 5, Fig. 10, Supplementary data 4). The performance of the transfer function is also evaluated by the positive correlation between transfer function model prediction error ($RMSEP_{Jack}$) and tidal and elevation ranges at the studied sites (e.g., Callard et al., 2011; Barlow et al., 2013; Mills et al., 2013). Earlier studies show that salt-marsh foraminifera-based transfer function models produce RMSEPs values between ~3–23% of the tidal range in a micro-tidal setting characterized by a <2 m tidal range (summaries in Callard et al. (2011) and Barlow et al. (2013)). The elevation range of the modern analogue is additionally influencing the error terms of RSL reconstruction, with a common RMSEPs between 5 and 15% of the elevation range of samples produced in most studies. In the current study the RMSEP value (11.9 SWLI or 0.09 m NAVD88) is 5.7% of the tidal range (1.6 m; Table 1) and 10% of the elevation range of the samples (0.95 m; Table 2). These values are within the common ranges presented by Barlow et al. (2013).

6 Conclusions

This study, for the first time, quantifies the environmental drivers controlling the distribution of foraminiferal assemblages in two coastal salt marshes along the Southern California coast, Seal Beach and Tijuana. The Q-mode CA and the RDA results show that elevation is the primary factor influencing the foraminiferal zonation. Seal Beach has more topographical complexity than Tijuana salt marsh, and thus more environmental parameters (e.g., O_2 , salinity), apart from elevation, affect the foraminiferal distribution. The dead assemblages in the upper surface sediments are an adequate modern analogue for quantitative paleoenvironmental interpretations due to i) concentrated presence in the upper cm of sediment enabling statistical analyses, ii) presence of the same dominant foraminifera in the live and dead assemblages in both marshes indicating similar influence of post-depositional processes, iii) exceedance of the abundances of the surface dead foraminifera compared to the live abundances, reflecting preservation of several generations of foraminifera.

The dead surface assemblages in both marshes show a distinct zonation with respect to elevation, similar to earlier studies, however with some notable site-specific variability. The tidal flat and low marsh are characterized by higher concentrations of *M. fusca* and calcareous species, the middle marsh is dominated by *J. macrescens*, *T. inflata* and *Ammobaculites* spp (primarily at Seal Beach) and the high marsh zone is dominated by *J. macrescens*, *T. inflata* accompanied by *T. irregularis* and *M. petila*.

The development of WA-PLS foraminiferal transfer functions based on the training set combining data from two salt marshes increases the likelihood that fossil assemblages are adequately represented in the modern training set. The regional training set also reduces problems of spatial autocorrelation. The performance of the transfer functions is supported statistically by a robust relationship between the observed and the predicted elevations ($r^2_{\text{Jack}} = 0.72$), the lower maximum bias values in the training set and by a precision of the reconstructions of 0.09 m NAVD88 (RMSEP_{Jack}) which is 5.7% of the tidal range and 10% of the elevation range of the samples. Our results agree with other foraminiferal studies from micro-tidal saltmarsh environments and can be used for future paleoenvironmental reconstructions in the study area.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the US Department of Interior establishing grant #Y561461:03 for the Southwest Climate Science. Dr. Avnaim-Katav also expresses her gratitude to the Leon H. Charney School of Marine Sciences (University of Haifa, Israel) for the support via the Helmsley Charitable Trust. Thanks are due to Matthew E. Kirby (Cal-State Fullerton) for the granulometric analysis and to Andrew Fricker and Scott Lydon for their help with the field work. We gratefully acknowledge the Seal Beach Wildlife Reserve and the Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve for site access. Matt Zebrowski of the Cartography Laboratory of the Department of Geography and Ming-Chang Liu of the Department of Earth, Planetary and Space Sciences, at UCLA (University of California Los Angeles), are thanked for the graphics and the SEM, respectively. Editor Ric Jordan and the two anonymous reviewers are deeply appreciated for their constructive comments and suggestions resulting in a significantly improved manuscript.

References

Barlow, N. L., Shennan, I., Long, A. J., Gehrels, W. R., Saher, M. H., Woodroffe, S. A., & Hillier, C. (2013). Salt marshes as late Holocene tide gauges. *Global and Planetary Change*, 106, 90–110.

Barlow, N. L., Long, A. J., Saher, M. H., Gehrels, W. R., Garnett, M. H., & Scaife, R. G. (2014). Salt-marsh reconstructions of relative sea-level change in the North Atlantic during the last 2000 years. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 99, 1–16.

Barnett, R.L., Gehrels, W.R., Charman, D.J., Saher, M.H., & Marshall, W.A. (2015). Late Holocene sea-level change in Arctic Norway. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 107, 214–230.

- 943 Barnett, R. L., Garneau, M., & Bernatchez, P. (2016). Salt-marsh sea-level indicators and
944 transfer function development for the Magdalen Islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence,
945 Canada. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 122, 13–26.
- 946 Berkeley, A., Perry, C. T., Smithers, S. G., Horton, B. P., & Taylor, K. G. (2007). A review of
947 the ecological and taphonomic controls on foraminiferal assemblage development in intertidal
948 environments. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 83(3), 205–230.
- 949 Berkeley, A., Perry, C. T., & Smithers, S. G. (2009). Taphonomic signatures and patterns of
950 test degradation on tropical, intertidal benthic foraminifera. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 73(3),
951 148–163.
- 952 Birks, H. J. B. (1995). Quantitative palaeoenvironmental reconstructions. *Statistical modelling
953 of quaternary science data. Technical guide*, 5, 161–254.
- 954 Birks, H. J. B. (1998). DG Frey and ES Deevey Review 1: Numerical tools in
955 palaeolimnology—Progress, potentialities, and problems. *Journal of Paleolimnology*, 20(4),
956 307–332.
- 957 Birks, H.J.B. (2003). Quantitative paleoenvironmental reconstructions from Holocene
958 biological data. In: Mackay, A.W., Battarbee, R.W., Birks, H.J.B., Oldfield, F. (Eds.), *Global
959 Change in the Holocene*. Arnold, London, pp. 342–357.
- 960 Birks, H.J.B. (2010). Numerical methods for the analysis of diatom assemblage data, In:
961 Smol, J.P., Stoermer, E.F. (Eds.), *The Diatoms: Applications for the Environmental and Earth
962 Sciences*, Second ed. University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 23–54.
- 963 Bray, J. R., & Curtis, J. T. (1957). An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern
964 Wisconsin. *Ecological monographs*, 27(4), 325–349.
- 965 Buzas, M. A. (1965). The distribution and abundance of foraminifera in Long Island Sound:
966 Smithsonian Institution Miscellaneous Collection, v. 149, 94 p.
- 967 Buzas, M. A., Culver, S. J., & Jorissen, F. J. (1993). A statistical evaluation of the
968 microhabitats of living (stained) infaunal benthic foraminifera. *Marine
969 Micropaleontology*, 20(3-4), 311–320.
- 970 Cahoon, D. R., Lynch, J. C., & Powell, A. N. (1996). Marsh vertical accretion in a southern
971 California estuary, USA. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 43(1), 19–32.
- 972 Callard, S. L., Gehrels, W. R., Morrison, B. V., & Grenfell, H. R. (2011). Suitability of salt-
973 marsh foraminifera as proxy indicators of sea level in Tasmania. *Marine
974 Micropaleontology*, 79(3), 121–131.
- 975 Culver, S. J., & Horton, B. P. (2005). Infaunal marsh foraminifera from the outer banks,
976 North Carolina, USA. *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 35(2), 148–170.
- 977 Culver, S.J., Leorri, E., Mallinson, D.J., Corbett, D.R., & Shazili, N.A.M. (2015). Recent
978 coastal evolution and sea-level rise; Setiu Wetland, Peninsular Malaysia. *Palaeogeography,
979 Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 417, 406–421.

980 Cundy, A.B., Kortekaas, S., Dewez, T., Stewart, I.S., Collins, P.E.F., Croudace, I.W.,
981 Maroukian, H., Papanastassiou, D., Gaki-Papanastassiou, P., Pavlopoulos, K., & Dawson, A.
982 (2000). Coastal wetlands as recorders of earthquake subsidence in the Aegean: a case study of
983 the 1894 Gulf of Atalanti earthquakes, central Greece. *Marine Geology*, 170 3–26.

984 De Rijk, S. (1995). Salinity control on the distribution of salt marsh foraminifera (Great
985 Marshes, Massachusetts). *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 25(2), 156–166.

986 De Rijk, S., & Troelstra, S. R. (1997). Salt marsh foraminifera from the Great Marshes,
987 Massachusetts: environmental controls. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
988 *Palaeoecology*, 130(1), 81–112.

989 De Rijk, S., & Troelstra, S. (1999). The application of a foraminiferal actuo-facies model to
990 salt-marsh cores. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 59–66.

991 De Stigter, H. C., Jorissen, F. J., & Van der Zwaan, G. J. (1998). Bathymetric distribution and
992 microhabitat partitioning of live (Rose Bengal stained) benthic foraminifera along a shelf to
993 bathyal transect in the southern Adriatic Sea. *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 28(1),
994 40–65.

995 Du Châtelet, É. A., Bout-Roumazelles, V., Riboulleau, A., & Trentesaux, A. (2009).
996 Sediment (grain size and clay mineralogy) and organic matter quality control on living
997 benthic foraminifera. *Revue de micropaléontologie*, 52(1), 75–84.

998 Duchemin, G., Jorissen, F. J., Redois, F., & Debenay, J. P. (2005). Foraminiferal
999 microhabitats in a high marsh: consequences for reconstructing past sea
1000 levels. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 226 (1), 167–185.

1001 Edwards, R. J., & Horton, B. P. (2000). Reconstructing relative sea-level change using UK
1002 salt-marsh foraminifera. *Marine Geology*, 169(1), 41–56.

1003 Edwards, R. J., Wright, A. J., & Van de Plassche, O. (2004a). Surface distributions of salt-
1004 marsh foraminifera from Connecticut, USA: modern analogues for high-resolution sea level
1005 studies. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 51(1), 1–21.

1006 Edwards, R. J., Van De Plassche, O., Gehrels, W. R., & Wright, A. J. (2004b). Assessing sea-
1007 level data from Connecticut, USA, using a foraminiferal transfer function for tide
1008 level. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 51(3), 239–255.

1009 Engelhart, S. E., Horton, B. P., & Kemp, A. C. (2011). Holocene sea-level changes along the
1010 United States' Atlantic coast. *Oceanography*, 24(2), 70–79,

1011 Engelhart, S. E., Horton, B. P., Vane, C. H., Nelson, A. R., Witter, R. C., Brody, S. R., &
1012 Hawkes, A. D. (2013). Modern foraminifera, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, and bulk geochemistry of central
1013 Oregon tidal marshes and their application in paleoseismology. *Palaeogeography,*
1014 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 377, 13–27.

1015 Engels, J. G., Rink, F., & Jensen, K. (2011). Stress tolerance and biotic interactions determine
1016 plant zonation patterns in estuarine marshes during seedling emergence and early
1017 establishment. *Journal of Ecology*, 99(1), 277–287.

- 1018 Franceschini, G., Mc Millan, I. K., & Compton, J. S. (2005). Foraminifera of Langebaan
1019 Lagoon salt marsh and their application to the interpretation of late Pleistocene depositional
1020 environments at Monwabisi, False Bay coast, South Africa. *South African Journal of*
1021 *Geology*, 108(2), 285–296.
- 1022 Frezza, V., & Carboni, M. G. (2009). Distribution of recent foraminiferal assemblages near
1023 the Ombrone River mouth (Northern Tyrrhenian Sea, Italy). *Revue de*
1024 *micropaléontologie*, 52(1), 43–66.
- 1025 Gedan, K. B., Kirwan, M. L., Wolanski, E., Barbier, E. B., & Silliman, B. R. (2010). The
1026 present and future role of coastal wetland vegetation in protecting shorelines: Answering
1027 recent challenges to the paradigm. *Climatic Change* 106, 7–29.
- 1028 Gehrels, W. R. (1994). Determining relative sea-level change from salt-marsh foraminifera
1029 and plant zones on the coast of Maine, USA. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 10, 990–1009.
- 1030 Gehrels, W. R. (1999). Middle and late Holocene sea-level changes in eastern Maine
1031 reconstructed from foraminiferal saltmarsh stratigraphy and AMS 14 C dates on basal
1032 peat. *Quaternary Research*, 52(3), 350–359.
- 1033 Gehrels, W. R., & van de Plassche, O. (1999). The use of *Jadammina macrescens* (Brady)
1034 and *Balticammina pseudomacrescens* Brönnimann, Lutze and Whittaker (Protozoa:
1035 Foraminiferida) as sea-level indicators. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
1036 *Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 89–101.
- 1037 Gehrels, W. R. (2000). Using foraminiferal transfer functions to produce high-resolution sea-
1038 level records from salt-marsh deposits, Maine, USA. *The Holocene*, 10(3), 367–376.
- 1039 Gehrels, W. R., Roe, H. M., & Charman, D. J. (2001). Foraminifera, testate amoebae and
1040 diatoms as sea-level indicators in UK saltmarshes: a quantitative multiproxy
1041 approach. *Journal of Quaternary Science*, 16(3), 201–220.
- 1042 Gehrels, W.R., Belknap, D.F., Black, S., & Newnham, R.M. (2002). Rapid sea-level rise in
1043 the Gulf of Maine, USA, since AD 1800. *The Holocene*, 12, 383–389.
- 1044 Gehrels, W.R., Milne, G.A., Kirby, J.R., Patterson, R.T., & Belknap, D.F. (2004). Late
1045 Holocene sea-level changes and isostatic crustal movements in Atlantic Canada. *Quaternary*
1046 *International*, 120, 79–89.
- 1047 Gehrels, W. R., Kirby, J. R., Prokoph, A., Newnham, R. M., Achterberg, E. P., Evans, H.,
1048 Black, S., & Scott, D. B. (2005). Onset of recent rapid sea-level rise in the western Atlantic
1049 Ocean. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 24(18), 2083–2100.
- 1050 Gehrels, W. R., Marshall, W. A., Gehrels, M. J., Larsen, G., Kirby, J. R., Eiríksson, J.,
1051 Heinemeier, J., & Shimmield, T. (2006). Rapid sea-level rise in the North Atlantic Ocean
1052 since the first half of the nineteenth century. *The Holocene*, 16(7), 949–965.
- 1053 Gehrels, W. R., Hayward, B. W., Newnham, R. M., & Southall, K. E. (2008). A 20th century
1054 acceleration of sea-level rise in New Zealand. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(2) 1–5,
1055 L02717.

- 1056 Gehrels, W. R., Callard, S. L., Moss, P. T., Marshall, W. A., Blaauw, M., Hunter, J., Milton,
1057 J.A., & Garnett, M. H. (2012). Nineteenth and twentieth century sea-level changes in
1058 Tasmania and New Zealand. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 315, 94–102.
- 1059 Gehrels, W. R., & Woodworth, P. L. (2013). When did modern rates of sea-level rise
1060 start? *Global and Planetary Change*, 100, 263–277.
- 1061 Goldstein, S. T., Watkins, G. T., & Kuhn, R. M. (1995). Microhabitats of salt marsh
1062 foraminifera: St. Catherines Island, Georgia, USA. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 26(1), 17–29.
- 1063 Goldstein, S. T., & Watkins, G. T. (1998). Elevation and the distribution of salt-marsh
1064 Foraminifera, St. Catherines Island, Georgia; a taphonomic approach. *Palaios*, 13(6), 570–
1065 580.
- 1066 Goldstein, S. T., & Watkins, G. T. (1999). Taphonomy of salt marsh foraminifera: an example
1067 from coastal Georgia. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 103–
1068 114.
- 1069 Grenfell, H.R., Hayward, B.W., Nomura, R., & Sabaa, A.T. (2012). A foraminiferal proxy
1070 record of 20th century sea-level rise in the Manukau Harbour, New Zealand. *Marine and*
1071 *Freshwater Research*, 63, 370–384.
- 1072 Grossinger, R. Stein, E.D. Cayce, K. Askevold, R. Dark, S., & Whipple, A. (2011). Historical
1073 Wetlands of the Southern California Coast: An Atlas of US Coast Survey T-sheets, 1851–
1074 1889. Technical Report 589. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa
1075 Mesa, CA and San Francisco Estuary Institute, Oakland, CA.
- 1076 Guilbault, J. P., Clague, J. J., & Lapointe, M. (1996). Foraminiferal evidence for the amount
1077 of coseismic subsidence during a late Holocene earthquake on Vancouver Island, west coast
1078 of Canada. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 15(8), 913–937.
- 1079 Hammer, O., Harper, D.A.T., & Ryan, P.D. (2001). PAST: Palaeontological statistics package
1080 for education and data analysis. *Palaeontol. Electron.* 4, 1–9 (online).
- 1081 Hawkes, A. D., Horton, B. P., Nelson, A. R., & Hill, D. F. (2010). The application of
1082 intertidal foraminifera to reconstruct coastal subsidence during the giant Cascadia earthquake
1083 of AD 1700 in Oregon, USA. *Quaternary International*, 221(1), 116–140.
- 1084 Hawkes, A. D., Horton, B. P., Nelson, A. R., Vane, C. H., & Sawai, Y. (2011). Coastal
1085 subsidence in Oregon, USA, during the giant Cascadia earthquake of AD 1700. *Quaternary*
1086 *Science Reviews*, 30, 364–376.
- 1087 Hayward, B. W., Grenfell, H. R., Nicholson, K., Parker, R., Wilmhurst, J., Horrocks, M.,
1088 Swales, A., & Sabaa, A. T. (2004). Foraminiferal record of human impact on intertidal
1089 estuarine environments in New Zealand's largest city. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 53(1), 37–
1090 66.
- 1091 Hippensteel, S. P., Martin, R. E., Nikitina, D., & Pizzuto, J. E. (2002). Interannual variation of
1092 marsh foraminiferal assemblages (Bombay Hook National Wildlife Refuge, Smyrna, DE): Do
1093 foraminiferal assemblages have a memory? *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 32(2),
1094 97–109.

- 1095 Horton, B. P. (1997). *Quantification of the indicative meaning of a range of Holocene sea-*
1096 *level index points from the western North Sea* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Durham).
- 1097 Horton, B. P. (1999). The distribution of contemporary intertidal foraminifera at Cowpen
1098 Marsh, Tees Estuary, UK: implications for studies of Holocene sea-level
1099 changes. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 127–149.
- 1100 Horton, B. P., Edwards, R. J., & Lloyd, J. M. (1999). A foraminiferal-based transfer function:
1101 implications for sea-level studies. *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 29(2), 117–129.
- 1102 Horton, B. P., & Edwards, R. J. (2003). Seasonal distributions of foraminifera and their
1103 implications for sea-level studies: SEPM (Society for Sedimentary Geology) Special
1104 Publication no. 75, p. 21–30.
- 1105 Horton, B. P., Larcombe, P., Woodroffe, S. A., Whittaker, J. E., Wright, M. R., & Wynn, C.
1106 (2003). Contemporary foraminiferal distributions of a mangrove environment, Great Barrier
1107 Reef coastline, Australia: implications for sea-level reconstructions. *Marine Geology*, 198(3),
1108 225–243.
- 1109 Horton, B. P., & Edwards, R. J. (2005). The application of local and regional transfer
1110 functions to the reconstruction of Holocene sea levels, north Norfolk, England. *The*
1111 *Holocene*, 15(2), 216–228.
- 1112 Horton, B. P., & Edwards, R. J. (2006). Quantifying Holocene sea level change using
1113 intertidal foraminifera: lessons from the British Isles. *Cushman Foundation for Foraminiferal*
1114 *Research Special Publication* 40.
- 1115 Horton, B. P., & Murray, J. W. (2006). Patterns in cumulative increase in live and dead
1116 species from foraminiferal time series of Cowpen Marsh, Tees Estuary, UK: Implications for
1117 sea-level studies. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 58(4), 287–315.
- 1118 Horton, B. P., & Murray, J. W. (2007). The roles of elevation and salinity as primary controls
1119 on living foraminiferal distributions: Cowpen Marsh, Tees Estuary, UK. *Marine*
1120 *Micropaleontology*, 63(3), 169–186.
- 1121 Horton, B. P., Corbett, R., Culver, S. J., Edwards, R. J., & Hillier, C. (2006). Modern
1122 saltmarsh diatom distributions of the Outer Banks, North Carolina, and the development of a
1123 transfer function for high resolution reconstructions of sea level. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
1124 *Science*, 69(3), 381–394.
- 1125 Jennings, A. E., & Nelson, A. R. (1992). Foraminiferal assemblage zones in Oregon tidal
1126 marshes; relation to marsh floral zones and sea level. *The Journal of Foraminiferal*
1127 *Research*, 22(1), 13–29.
- 1128 Jones, G. D., & Ross, C. A. (1979). Seasonal distribution of foraminifera in Samish Bay,
1129 Washington. *Journal of Paleontology*, 53, 245–257.
- 1130 Juggins, S. (2011). C2 Data Analysis Version 1.7. 2. *Newcastle upon Tyne: University of*
1131 *Newcastle*.

- 1132 Juggins, S., & Birks, H. J. B. (2012). Quantitative environmental reconstructions from
1133 biological data. In *Tracking environmental change using lake sediments* (pp. 431–494).
1134 Springer Netherlands.
- 1135 Kaminski, M.A., & Filipescu, S., (eds), (2011). Proceedings of the Eighth International
1136 Workshop on Agglutinated Foraminifera. *Grzybowski Foundation Special Publication*, 16,
1137 29–35.
- 1138 Kemp, A. C., Horton, B. P., & Culver, S. J. (2009a). Distribution of modern salt-marsh
1139 foraminifera in the Albemarle–Pamlico estuarine system of North Carolina, USA:
1140 implications for sea-level research. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 72(3), 222–238.
- 1141 Kemp, A. C., Horton, B. P., Corbett, D. R., Culver, S. J., Edwards, R. J., & van de Plassche,
1142 O. (2009b). The relative utility of foraminifera and diatoms for reconstructing late Holocene
1143 sea-level change in North Carolina, USA. *Quaternary Research*, 71(1), 9–21.
- 1144 Kemp, A. C., Horton, B. P., Donnelly, J. P., Mann, M. E., Vermeer, M., & Rahmstorf, S.
1145 (2011). Climate related sea-level variations over the past two millennia. *Proceedings of the*
1146 *National Academy of Sciences*, 108(27), 11017–11022.
- 1147 Kemp, A.C., Horton, B.P., Vane, C.H., Bernhardt, C.E., Corbett, D.R., Engelhart, S.E.,
1148 Anisfeld, S.C., Parnell, A.C., & Cahill, N. (2013). Sea-level change during the last 2500 years
1149 in New Jersey, USA. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 81, 90–104.
- 1150 Kemp, A. C., & Telford, R. J. (2015). Transfer functions. *Handbook of Sea-Level Research:*
1151 *John Wiley and Sons, Chichester*, 470–499.
- 1152 Kirby, M.E., Knell, E.J., Anderson, W.T., Lachniet, M.S., Palermo, J., Eeg, H., Lucero, R.,
1153 Murrieta, R., Arevalo, A., Silveira, E., & Hiner, C.A. (2015). Evidence for insolation and
1154 Pacific forcing of late glacial through Holocene climate in the Central Mojave Desert (Silver
1155 Lake, CA). *Quaternary Research*, 84, 174–186.
- 1156 Kirwan, M. L., & Megonigal, J. P. (2013). Tidal wetland stability in the face of human
1157 impacts and sea-level rise. *Nature*, 504(7478), 53–60.
- 1158 Kopp, R. E., Simons, F. J., Mitrovica, J. X., Maloof, A. C., & Oppenheimer, M. (2013). A
1159 probabilistic assessment of sea level variations within the last interglacial stage. *Geophysical*
1160 *Journal International*, 193(2), 711–716.
- 1161 Leeper, R. J. (2015). *Abrupt subsidence in the Seal Beach Wetlands, southern*
1162 *California* (Doctoral dissertation, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON).
- 1163 Legendre, P., & Fortin, M. J. (1989). Spatial pattern and ecological analysis. *Vegetatio*, 80(2),
1164 107–138.
- 1165 Leorri, E., & Martin, R. E. (2009). The input of foraminiferal infaunal populations to sub-
1166 fossil assemblages along an elevational gradient in a salt marsh: application to sea-level
1167 studies in the mid-Atlantic coast of North America. *Hydrobiologia*, 625(1), 69–81.
- 1168 Leorri, E., Gehrels, W. R., Horton, B. P., Fatela, F., & Cearreta, A. (2010). Distribution of
1169 foraminifera in salt marshes along the Atlantic coast of SW Europe: Tools to reconstruct past
1170 sea-level variations. *Quaternary International*, 221(1), 104–115.

- 1171 Lepš, J., & Šmilauer, P. (2003). *Multivariate analysis of ecological data using CANOCO*.
1172 Cambridge university press.
- 1173 Leyer, I., & Wesche, K. (2007). *Multivariate Statistik in der Ökologie: Eine Einführung*.
1174 Springer-Verlag.
- 1175 Long, A. J., Barlow, N. L. M., Gehrels, W. R., Saher, M. H., Woodworth, P. L., Scaife, R. G.,
1176 Brain, M.J., & Cahill, N. (2014). Contrasting records of sea-level change in the eastern and
1177 western North Atlantic during the last 300 years. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 388,
1178 110–122.
- 1179 Martin, R.E., 1999. Taphonomy and temporal resolution of foraminiferal assemblages. In:
1180 Sen Gupta, B.K. (Ed.), *Modern Foraminifera*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp.
1181 281–298.
- 1182 Matera, N. J., & Lee, J. J. (1972). Environmental factors affecting the standing crop of
1183 foraminifera in sublittoral and psammolittoral communities of a Long Island salt
1184 marsh. *Marine Biology*, 14(2), 89–103.
- 1185 Milker, Y., Horton, B. P., Nelson, A. R., Engelhart, S. E., & Witter, R. C. (2015a). Variability
1186 of intertidal foraminiferal assemblages in a salt marsh, Oregon, USA. *Marine*
1187 *Micropaleontology*, 118, 1–16.
- 1188 Milker, Y., Horton, B. P., Vane, C. H., Engelhart, S. E., Nelson, A. R., Witter, R. C., Khan,
1189 N. S., & Bridgeland, W. T. (2015b). Annual and seasonal distribution of intertidal
1190 foraminifera and stable carbon isotope geochemistry, Bandon Marsh, Oregon, USA. *The*
1191 *Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 45(2), 146–155.
- 1192
- 1193 Milne, G. A., Gehrels, W. R., Hughes, C. W., & Tamsiea, M. E. (2009). Identifying the
1194 causes of sea-level change. *Nature Geoscience*, 2(7), 471–478.
- 1195 Mills, H., Kirby, J., Holgate, S., & Plater, A. (2013). The Distribution Of Contemporary
1196 Saltmarsh Foraminifera In A Macrotidal Estuary: An Assessment Of Their Viability For Sea-
1197 Level Studies. *Journal of Ecosystems and Ecography*, 3(3), 1–16 doi:10.4172/2157-
1198 7625.1000131
- 1199 Müller-Navarra, K., Milker, Y., & Schmiedl, G. (2016). Natural and anthropogenic influence
1200 on the distribution of salt marsh foraminifera in the Bay of Tümlau. *Journal of Foraminiferal*
1201 *Research*, 46(1), 61–74.
- 1202 Murray, J.W. (1971). Living foraminiferids of tidal marshes: a review. *Journal of*
1203 *Foraminiferal Research* 1, 156–161.
- 1204 Murray, J. W., & Alve, E. (1999). Natural dissolution of modern shallow water benthic
1205 foraminifera: taphonomic effects on the palaeoecological record. *Palaeogeography*,
1206 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 146(1), 195–209.
- 1207 Murray, J. W., & Bowser, S. S. (2000). Mortality, protoplasm decay rate, and reliability of
1208 staining techniques to recognize ‘living’ foraminifera: a review. *The Journal of Foraminiferal*
1209 *Research*, 30(1), 66–70.

- 1210 Murray, J. W. (2006). *Ecology and applications of benthic foraminifera*. Cambridge
1211 University Press.
- 1212 Nelson, A. R., Sawai, Y., Jennings, A. E., Bradley, L. A., Gerson, L., Sherrod, B. L., Sabeau,
1213 J., & Horton, B. P. (2008). Great-earthquake paleogeodesy and tsunamis of the past 2000
1214 years at Alsea Bay, central Oregon coast, USA. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 27(7), 747–768.
- 1215 Ozarko, D.L., Patterson, R.T., & Williams, H.F.L. (1997). Marsh foraminifera from Nanaimo,
1216 British Columbia: infaunal habitat and taphonomic implications. *Journal of Foraminiferal*
1217 *Research*, 27, 51–68.
- 1218 Patterson, R. T. (1990). Intertidal benthic foraminiferal biofacies on the Fraser River Delta,
1219 British Columbia: modern distribution and paleoecological importance. *Micropaleontology*,
1220 36, 183–199..
- 1221 Patterson, R. T., Guilbault, J. P., & Clague, J. J. (1999). Taphonomy of tidal marsh
1222 foraminifera: implications of surface sample thickness for high-resolution sea-level
1223 studies. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 199–211.
- 1224 Patterson, R. T., Gehrels, W. R., Belknap, D. F., & Dalby, A. P. (2004). The distribution of
1225 salt marsh foraminifera at Little Dipper Harbour New Brunswick, Canada: implications for
1226 development of widely applicable transfer functions in sea-level research. *Quaternary*
1227 *International*, 120(1), 185–194.
- 1228 Peinado, M., Alcaraz, F., Delgadillo, J., De La Cruz, M., Alvarez, J., & Aguirre, J. L. (1994).
1229 The coastal salt marshes of California and Baja California. *Vegetatio*, 110(1), 55–66.
- 1230 Phipps, M. D., Kaminski, M. A., & Aksu, A. E. (2010). Calcareous benthic foraminiferal
1231 biofacies along a depth transect on the southwestern Marmara shelf
1232 (Turkey). *Micropaleontology*, 56, 377–392.
- 1233 Rossi, V., Horton, B. P., Corbett, D. R., Leorri, E., Perez-Belmonte, L., & Douglas, B. C.
1234 (2011). The application of foraminifera to reconstruct the rate of 20th century sea level rise,
1235 Morbihan Golfe, Brittany, France. *Quaternary Research*, 75(1), 24–35.
- 1236 Saffert, H., & Thomas, E. (1998). Living foraminifera and total populations in salt marsh peat
1237 cores: Kelsey Marsh (Clinton, CT) and the Great Marshes (Barnstable, MA). *Marine*
1238 *Micropaleontology*, 33(3), 175–202.
- 1239 Saher, M.H., Gehrels, W.R., Barlow, N.L.M., Long, A.J., Haigh, I.D., & Blaauw, M. (2015).
1240 A 600 year multiproxy record of sea-level change and the influence of the North Atlantic
1241 Oscillation. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 108, 23–36.
- 1242 Schönfeld, J., Alve, E., Geslin, E., Jorissen, F., Korsun, S., & Spezzaferri, S. (2012). The
1243 FOBIMO (FORaminiferal BIO-MONitoring) initiative—Towards a standardised protocol for
1244 soft-bottom benthic foraminiferal monitoring studies. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 94, 1–13.
- 1245 Scott, D. B. (1976). Brackish-water foraminifera from southern California and description of
1246 *Polysaccammina ipohalina* n. gen., n. sp. *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 6(4), 312–
1247 321.

- 1248 Scott, D. S., & Medioli, F. S. (1978). Vertical zonations of marsh foraminifera as accurate
1249 indicators of former sea-levels. *Nature* 272, 528–531.
- 1250 Scott, D. B., & Medioli, F. S. (1980). Quantitative studies of marsh foraminiferal distributions
1251 in Nova Scotia; implications for sea level studies. *Special Publications-Cushman Foundation*
1252 *for Foraminiferal Research*.
- 1253 Scott, D. B., Medioli, F. S., & Duffett, T. E. (1984). Holocene rise of relative sea level at
1254 Sable Island, Nova Scotia, Canada. *Geology*, 12(3), 173–176.
- 1255 Scott, D. B., & Hermelin, J. O. R. (1993). A device for precision splitting of
1256 micropaleontological samples in liquid suspension. *Journal of Paleontology*, 67(01), 151–
1257 154.
- 1258 Scott, G., Thompson, L., Hitchin, R., & Scourse, J. (1998). Observations on selected salt-
1259 marsh and shallow-marine species of agglutinated foraminifera: grain size and mineralogical
1260 selectivity. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 28, 261–267.
- 1261 Scott, D. B., Medioli, F. S., & Schafer, C. T. (2001). *Monitoring in coastal environments*
1262 *using foraminifera and thecamoebian indicators*. Cambridge University Press.
- 1263 Scott, D. B., Mudie, P.J., & Bradshaw, J.S. (2011). Coastal evolution of Southern
1264 California as interpreted from benthic foraminifera, ostracodes, and pollen. *Journal of*
1265 *Foraminiferal Research*, 41, 285–307.
- 1266 Shaw, T.A., Kirby, J.R., Holgate, S., Tutman, P., & Plater, A.J. (2016). Contemporary salt-
1267 marsh foraminifera distribution from the Adriatic Coast of Croatia and its potential for Sea-
1268 Levels studies. *Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 46 (3) 314–332.
- 1270 Southall, K. E., Gehrels, W. R., & Hayward, B. W. (2006). Foraminifera in a New Zealand
1271 salt marsh and their suitability as sea-level indicators. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 60(2), 167–
1272 179.
- 1273 Stone, M., & Brooks, R. J. (1990). Continuum regression: cross-validated sequentially
1274 constructed prediction embracing ordinary least squares, partial least squares and principal
1275 components regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52, 237–269.
- 1276 Strachan, K.L., Finch, J.M., Hill, T., & Barnett, R.L. (2014). A late Holocene sea-level curve
1277 for the east coast of South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, 110 (1/2), art. # 2013—
1278 0198, 9 pp.
- 1279 Takekawa, J. Y., Thorne, K. M., Buffington, K. J., Freeman, C. M., & Block, G. (2013).
1280 Evaluation of subterranean subsidence at Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. U.S.
1281 *Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center, Vallejo, CA*.
- 1282 Telford, R. J., Heegaard, E., & Birks, H. J. B. (2004). All age–depth models are wrong: but
1283 how badly? *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 23(1), 1–5.
- 1284 Telford, R. J., & Birks, H. J. B. (2009). Evaluation of transfer functions in spatially structured
1285 environments. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 28(13), 1309–1316.

- 1286 Telford, R.J., & Birks, H.J.B. (2011). A novel method for assessing the statistical significance
1287 of quantitative reconstructions inferred from biotic assemblages. *Quaternary Science*
1288 *Reviews*, 30, 1272–1278.
- 1289 Ter Braak, C. J., & Juggins, S. (1993). Weighted averaging partial least squares regression
1290 (WA-PLS): an improved method for reconstructing environmental variables from species
1291 assemblages. *Hydrobiologia*, 269(1), 485–502.
- 1292 Ter Braak, C. J., & Smilauer, P. (2002). CANOCO reference manual and CanoDraw for
1293 Windows user's guide: software for canonical community ordination (version 4.5).
- 1294 ter Braak, C.J.F., Juggins, S., Birks, H.J.B., & van de Voet, H. (1993). Weighted averaging
1295 partial least squared regression (WA-PLS): definition and comparison with other methods for
1296 species-environment calibration. In: Patil, G.P., Rac, C.R. (Eds.), *Multivariate*
1297 *Environmental Statistics*. Elsevier Science Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 525–560.
- 1298 Tobin, R., Scott, D.B., Collins, E.S., & Medioli, F.S. (2005). Infaunal benthic foraminifera in
1299 some North American marshes and their influence on fossil assemblages. *Journal of*
1300 *Foraminiferal Research*, 35, 130–147.
- 1301 Wallace, K., Callaway, J. C., & Zedler, J. (2005). Evolution of tidal creek networks in a high
1302 sedimentation environment: a 5-year experiment at Tijuana Estuary, California. *Estuaries and*
1303 *Coasts*, 28(6), 795–811. Retrieved from
1304 <http://www.springerlink.com/index/7H2P240120801675.pdf>
- 1305 Walker, S. E., & Goldstein, S. T. (1999). Taphonomic tiering: experimental field taphonomy
1306 of molluscs and foraminifera above and below the sediment–water
1307 interface. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 227–244.
- 1308 Walton, W. R. (1952). *Techniques for recognition of living foraminifera*. *Cushman*
1309 *Foundation for Foraminiferal Research*, 3, 56–60.
- 1310 Wang, P., & Chappell, J. (2001). Foraminifera as Holocene environmental indicators in the
1311 South Alligator River, northern Australia. *Quaternary International*, 83, 47–62.
- 1312 Woodroffe, S.A. (2009). Testing models of mid to late Holocene sea-level change, North
1313 Queensland, Australia. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 28, 2474–2488.
- 1314 Woodroffe, S. A., & Horton, B. P. (2005). Holocene sea-level changes in the Indo-
1315 Pacific. *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences*, 25(1), 29–43.
- 1316 Wright, A. J., Edwards, R. J., & van de Plassche, O. (2011). Reassessing transfer-function
1317 performance in sea-level reconstruction based on benthic salt-marsh foraminifera from the
1318 Atlantic coast of NE North America. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 81(1), 43–62.
- 1319 Zedler, J. B. (1977). Salt marsh community structure in the Tijuana Estuary, California.
1320 *Estuarine and Coastal Marine Science*, 5(1), 39–53. doi:10.1016/0302-3524(77)90072-X
- 1321 Zedler, J. B. (1982). The ecology of southern California coastal salt marshes: a community
1322 profile. Washington, D.C. FWS/OBS–81/54.

- Zedler, J. B. (2010). How frequent storms affect wetland vegetation: A preview of climate-change impacts. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 8(10), 540–547. doi:10.1890/090109
- Zedler, J. B., Covin, J., Nordby, C., Williams, P., & Boland, J. (1986). Catastrophic events reveal the dynamic nature of salt-marsh vegetation in Southern California. *Estuaries*, 9(1), 75–80. doi:10.1007/BF02689746
- Zedler, J. B., Nordby, C. S., & Kus, B. E. (1986). The Ecology of Tijuana Estuary, California. USGS, Estuarine Profile.

Table captions

Table 1. The nearest tide gauge station for each site with observations of Mean Higher High Water (MHHW), Mean Tide Level (MTL) and Mean Sea-Level (MSL). Tidal water level heights (m), above North American vertical datum (NAVD88), are measured over the period from 1983 to 2001 at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Table 2. Sample locations, elevation, pore-water and sediment properties of the surface marsh samples collected at Seal Beach (denoted with the initials SB) and Tijuana (denoted with the initials TJE) during spring tide on mid-October, and early December 2015, respectively. TOM (total organic matter) and carbonate content were determined by Loss-on-Ignition at 550 and 950 °C, respectively. Detailed granulometric data detailed in Supplementary data No. 1 and 2. (nd = no data; asterisk denote stations in which a mini core was collected in addition to the surface sample).

Table 3. Statistical results of Detrended Correspondence Analysis (DCA) for Seal Beach (a), Tijuana (b) and the combined surface assemblage of both marshes (c).

Table 4. Statistical results of Redundancy Analysis (RDA) for Seal Beach (a), Tijuana (b) and the combined surface assemblage of both marshes (c).

Table 5. Results of the transfer functions performance criteria for foraminifera training set using two regression models: Partial Least Squares and Weighted Averaging-Partial Least Squares (see text for details). Given are the cross-validated (jack-knifed) correlation (r^2) between observed and estimated elevation in the modern data, the mean and maximum bias, the Root Mean Squared Error of Prediction (RMSEP) and the change of the RMSEP (in %) from one component to the next.

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Location of the study area on the North American Pacific coast, southern California (A), and sites mentioned in the text including Seal Beach salt-marsh (B) and Tijuana salt-marsh (C) with transects highlighted showing the surface station

1367 locations (asterisk denote stations in which a mini core was collected in addition to
1368 the surface sample). See also Tables 1 and 2.

1369 Fig. 2. Environmental variables from sampled transects in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt
1370 marshes including: temperature, pH, O₂, salinity, organic matter, carbonate content,
1371 sand, silt and clay content and vertical profile relative to the North American vertical
1372 datum (NAVD88). Sample elevation profiles with the tidal datum for MHHW (mean
1373 highest high water). See also Tables 1 and 2.

1374 Fig. 3. Absolute abundances of the most abundant live (rose Bengal stained) (A) and
1375 dead foraminifera B) and their counts in the Seal Beach salt-marsh surface
1376 samples collected during mid-and late October, 2015. Sample elevation profiles are
1377 shown.

1378 Fig. 4. Absolute abundances of the most abundant live (rose Bengal stained) (A) and
1379 dead foraminifera (B) and their counts in the Tijuana salt- marsh surface samples
1380 collected during December, 2015. Sample elevation profiles are shown

1381 Fig. 5. Dendrogram of Q-mode cluster analysis of the dead foraminifera from Seal
1382 Beach salt-marsh. The most significant species contributing to each cluster, based on
1383 the ‘similarity percentages’ (SIMPER) routine, are shown on top of each cluster (*J.m.*
1384 – *J. macrescens*; *A.spp.* – *Ammobaculites* spp.; *T.in.* – *T. inflata*; Cal. – Calcareous
1385 species; *T.ir.* – *T. irregularis*; *M.f.* – *M. fusca*; *S.m* – *S. moniliformis*. The percentages
1386 of the most common dead species are given below the dendrogram.

1387 Fig. 6. Dendrogram of Q-mode cluster analysis of the dead foraminifera from Tijuana
1388 salt-marsh. Taxa that make significant contributions to the similarity within each
1389 cluster, based on SIMPER routine, are shown on top of each cluster (abbreviations are
1390 given in Fig. 5) and the percentages of the most common dead species are given
1391 below the dendrogram.

1392 Fig. 7. Total and individual live (rose Bengal stained) foraminiferal numbers (per
1393 10cm³ sediment volume), and total percentages of live (rose Bengal stained)
1394 specimens relative to the total populations in each mini core (10cm deep) taken from
1395 the middle marshes of Seal Beach and Tijuana, St. 5 and St. 8, respectively.

1396 Fig. 8. Redundancy Analysis (RDA) ordination triplots with forward selected
1397 significant environmental variables (Table 4) showing retrospective projection of the
1398 surface samples—species—environmental variables for Seal Beach (A) and Tijuana
1399 (B). Clusters sample distinguished in the Q-mode CA (Figs. 5 and 6) were
1400 incorporated into the RDA results.

1401 Fig. 9. Redundancy Analysis (RDA) ordination triplot with forward selected
1402 significant environmental variables (Table 4) showing retrospective projection of the
1403 surface samples—species—environmental variables for the combined data sets of
1404 Seal Beach and Tijuana. Clusters sample distinguished in the Q-mode CA (Figs. 5 and
1405 6) were incorporated into the RDA results.

1406

1407 Fig. 10. Scatterplots showing the relationship between observed standardized water
1408 level index (SWLI) against model predicted SWLI and residuals versus observed

SWLI using WA-PLS (component 3) transfer function in the modern data set derived from the southern California salt marshes.

Plate captions

Plate 1. Agglutinant foraminifera from surface sediments collected in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marches, along the coast of southern California.

The scale bars of Figs. 2c, 3b equal 20 μm , of Figs. 2a-b equal 50 μm , of Figs. 1a-c, 4a-b, 5b, 6a-c, 7c, 8, 9c, 10b-e equal 100 μm , of Figs. 3a, 5a, 7a-b, 9a-b, 10a equal 200 μm .

(1a-b) *Miliammina fusca* (Brady, 1870), side view. (1c) *M. fusca*, aperture view. (2a-b) *Miliammina petila* Saunders, 1958, side view. (2c) *M. petila*, aperture view. (3a) *Scherochorella moniliformis* (Siddall, 1886), side view. (3b) *S. moniliformis*, aperture view. (4a) *Trochammina irregularis* Cushman & Brönnimann, 1948, side view. (4b) *T. irregularis*, side and aperture view. (5a) *Ammobaculites dilatatus* Cushman & Brönnimann, 1948, side view. (5b) *A. dilatatus*, aperture view. (6a-b) *Ammobaculites* sp., side view. (6c) *Ammobaculites* sp., aperture view. (7a-b) *Ammobaculites* spp., side view. (7c) *Ammobaculites* spp., aperture view. (8) *Ammobaculites* spp., side view. (9a) *Trochammina inflata* (Montagu, 1808), spiral view. (9b) *T. inflata*, umbilical view. (9c) *T. inflata*, aperture view. (10a-b) *Jadammina macrescens* (Brady, 1870), spiral view. (10c) *J. macrescens*, umbilical view. (10d) *J. macrescens*, umbilical view showing collapsed chambers occurred soon after the specimen was dried. (10e) *J. macrescens*, aperture view with secondary apertures.

Plate 2. Calcareous intertidal taxa from surface sediments collected in Seal Beach and Tijuana salt marches, along the coast of southern California.

The scale bars of Figs. 1, 3 and 5c equal 50 μm , of Figs. 2, 4a-b, 5a-b and 6a-b equal 100 μm .

(1) *Cornuspira* sp., side view. (2) *Quinqueloculina* sp. side view. (3) miliolid, side view. (4a) *Trichohyalus aguayoi* (Bermúdez), spiral view. (4b) *T. aguayoi*, umbilical view. (5a) *Ammonia* sp. spiral view. (5b) *Ammonia* sp. umbilical view. (5c) *Ammonia* sp. aperture view. (6a) *Elphidium* sp side view. (6b) *Elphidium* sp. aperture view.

Supplementary data captions

Supplementary data 1. Seal Beach salt-marsh: general data and census foraminiferal data.

Supplementary data 2. Tijuana salt-marsh: general data and census foraminiferal data.

1455 Supplementary data 3. Taxonomic reference list of species presented in text and in
1456 Supplementary data 1 and 2.

1457

1458 Supplementary data 4. Scatterplots showing the relationship between observed
1459 standardized water level index (SWLI) against model predicted SWLI and residuals
1460 versus observed SWLI using PLS (component 2) transfer function in the modern data
1461 set derived from the southern California salt marshes.
1462

Figure 1

1466

1467 Figure 2

Seal Beach salt marsh

Figure 3

Tijuana salt marsh

A. Live foraminifera

B. Dead foraminifera

1470

1471 Figure 4

1472

1473 Figure 5

1474

1475 Figure 6

Figure 7

1478

1479 Figure 8

Figure 9

Figure 10

1484

1485 Plate 1

1486

1487 Plate 2

1488

Site	Nearest tidal station (ID)	MHHW	MTL	MSL	MLLW	Mean diurnal range
Seal Beach	Los Angeles (9410660)	1.61	0.81	0.8	-0.06	1.67
Tijuana River Estuary	Imperial Beach (9410120)	1.56	0.77	0.77	-0.07	1.64

Table 1

Sample name	Coordinates		Elevation (m NAVD88)	Pore-water properties				Sediment properties (%)				
	Latitude (N)	Longitude (E)		pH	Temp. (°C)	O ₂ (mg/l)	Salinity (‰)	TOM	Carbonate	Sand	Silt	Clay
SB19	33 44 25.3116	-118 5 17.7163	1.63±0.03	6.5	25.4	1.7	nd	3.4	0.7	65.4	32.1	2.5
SB20	33 44 25.3334	-118 5 17.8292	1.79±0.04	nd	nd	nd	nd	8.1	1.5	29.1	62.0	8.8
SB1	33 44 26.4765	-118 5 16.7351	1.57±0.04	6.7	25.6	1.2	40.8	40.2	6.9	20.7	70.7	8.5
SB2	33 44 26.3093	-118 5 15.6391	1.58±0.04	7.0	30.0	5.8	36.7	55.1	21.6	41.7	50.1	8.1
SB3	33 44 26.0878	-118 5 14.5482	1.58±0.04	7.8	32.5	8.0	38.4	58.1	16.7	48.3	44.1	7.5
SB18	33 44 26.0348	-118 5 13.3831	1.56±0.03	7.6	27.9	4.6	39.5	1.2	0.6	88.0	12.0	0.0
SB4	33 44 25.8576	-118 5 12.6228	1.51±0.03	6.6	28.5	1.2	34.2	2.6	0.9	77.6	21.7	0.6
SB5*	33 44 25.5088	-118 5 11.7917	1.48±0.03	4.3	26.9	4.5	34.4	63.5	13.7	10.9	76.9	12.1
SB6	33 44 25.1860	-118 5 11.0653	1.50±0.03	6.5	29.7	4.2	36.0	53.4	11.0	7.5	78.6	13.8
SB7	33 44 25.4806	-118 5 10.2254	1.50±0.03	5.7	24.3	4.6	34.1	66.6	17.0	8.3	77.5	14.1
SB8	33 44 25.2602	-118 5 9.6482	1.45±0.03	6.1	26.2	2.0	33.5	17.7	3.7	25.2	64.3	10.4
SB9	33 44 25.4797	-118 5 8.6051	1.48±0.03	6.6	25.6	2.2	34.0	14.4	3.3	19.4	71.6	8.9
SB10	33 44 25.7897	-118 5 8.5703	1.45±0.03	7.8	27.6	2.9	33.7	32.6	3.8	26.4	65.0	8.5
SB11	33 44 24.8903	-118 5 7.2019	1.46±0.03	6.3	29.2	2.8	34.0	9.5	1.4	24.0	71.8	4.1
SB12	33 44 25.4888	-118 5 6.5347	1.54±0.04	6.2	24.3	0.8	34.3	52.7	16.2	11.4	79.7	8.8
SB13	33 44 25.3204	-118 5 6.1613	1.37±0.04	6.3	24.7	3.0	34.2	9.6	1.8	42.1	52.0	5.7
SB14	33 44 24.8828	-118 5 5.7642	1.51±0.03	6.4	25.4	0.3	34.0	11.3	1.6	36.4	58.0	5.5
SB17	33 44 24.8615	-118 5 5.6192	1.56±0.03	6.8	25.4	1.4	34.0	4.4	1.2	45.2	50.2	4.5
SB15	33 44 24.7418	-118 5 5.4418	1.67±0.03	6.1	25.4	1.9	33.8	4.4	0.8	54.0	42.2	3.8
SB16	33 44 24.6803	-118 5 5.2340	0.98±0.04	6.9	27.0	2.4	34.1	2.7	0.8	67.2	31.1	1.6
TJE1	32 34 27.0512	-117 7 39.3707	1.93±0.03	7.2	15.6	1.6	21.4	17.0	1.5	63.2	30.9	5.9
TJE2	32 34 27.0115	-117 7 39.5918	1.80±0.01	7.3	15.3	0.2	27.3	15.8	1.7	55.3	35.7	9.0
TJE3	32 34 26.9140	-117 7 39.8134	1.71±0.03	7.2	17.5	0.2	31.3	50.8	7.2	15.0	61.6	23.2
TJE17	32 34 27.1192	-117 7 40.4346	1.58±0.03	6.8	16.4	0.4	37.2	47.4	5.0	11.3	65.6	22.9
TJE4	32 34 26.8188	-117 7 40.1039	1.48±0.03	6.4	16.3	1.2	34.7	35.8	5.1	6.0	67.9	25.9
TJE5	32 34 26.7614	-117 7 40.4217	1.59±0.03	7.3	17.1	6.6	32.2	41.4	7.1	8.0	69.3	22.6
TJE6	32 34 26.6542	-117 7 40.7628	1.53±0.03	7.0	18.2	0.2	32.8	74.5	11.1	1.9	73.3	24.6
TJE7	32 34 26.5336	-117 7 41.0782	1.42±0.03	6.8	17.8	0.2	33.2	56.3	9.9	nd	nd	nd
TJE16	32 34 26.3524	-117 7 41.7866	1.58±0.03	6.7	16.5	0.5	36.8	20.7	3.1	5.7	75.6	18.6
TJE8*	32 34 26.1397	-117 7 42.1450	1.46±0.03	6.6	17.5	0.5	29.4	50.5	7.9	4.9	69.8	25.1
TJE9	32 34 25.6358	-117 7 42.9642	1.46±0.03	6.6	17.1	0.4	37.5	38.3	5.2	2.0	72.4	25.4
TJE10	32 34 25.1096	-117 7 43.8299	1.57±0.03	6.9	19.3	3.3	34.6	23.9	4.6	5.9	70.8	23.1
TJE11	32 34 24.8189	-117 7 44.6329	1.54±0.03	6.9	20.0	1.1	28.7	24.6	4.7	5.0	74.3	20.6
TJE12	32 34 24.3459	-117 7 44.7942	1.45±0.03	7.2	18.6	0.5	35.4	18.0	3.6	6.1	74.8	19.0
TJE13	32 34 23.9469	-117 7 45.1092	1.42±0.03	7.0	18.7	0.4	30.9	18.7	4.6	5.6	75.9	18.3
TJE14	32 34 23.5376	-117 7 44.9764	1.48±0.03	7.2	16.8	1.2	32.2	12.0	3.0	17.7	74.1	8.1
TJE15	32 34 23.2793	-117 7 44.8901	1.39±0.03	7.2	19.0	0.4	30.0	21.5	3.5	6.7	76.6	16.6

Table 2

a. Seal Beach	Axis 1	Axis 2	Axis 3	Axis 4
Eigenvalues	0.318	0.165	0.024	0.012
Lengths of gradient	2.017	1.519	1.19	1.214
Cumulative percentage variance of species data	40.6	61.7	64.7	66.3
b. Tijuana				
Eigenvalues	0.252	0.012	0.008	0.002
Lengths of gradient	1.468	0.447	0.407	0.438
Cumulative percentage variance of species data	62.1	65.1	67.2	67.7
c. Combined sites				
Eigenvalues	0.318	0.214	0.022	0.009
Lengths of gradient	1.981	1.847	0.907	1.004
Cumulative percentage variance of species data	40.9	68.3	71.1	72.3

1493

1494 Table 3

a. Seal Beach	Axis 1	Axis 2	Axis 3	Axis 4	F-value	P value	Captured variance
Eigenvalues	0.344	0.164	0.019	0.008			
Species-environment correlation	0.826	0.813	0.517	0.427			
Cumulative percentage variance							
Of species data	34.4	50.8	52.7	53.5			
Of species-environment relatio	63.8	94.2	97.7	99.1			
Correlations							
O ₂ (mg/L)					11.41	0.0005	24.1
Elevation					8.92	0.0005	16.3
Salinity (‰)					3.66	0.0105	16.7
Carbonate (wt.%)					2.79	0.0255	17.7
Temperature (°C)					3.02	0.0215	19.9
b. Tijuana							
Eigenvalues	0.501	0.06	0.235	0.102			
Species-environment correlation	0.886	0.578	0	0			
Cumulative percentage variance							
Of species data	50.1	56.1	79.6	89.8			
Of species-environment relatio	89.4	100	0	0			
Correlations							
Elevation					11.39	0.0005	43.2
TOM (wt.%)					4.11	0.007	8.6
c. Combined sites							
Eigenvalues	0.238	0.141	0.023	0.006			
Species-environment correlation	0.805	0.66	0.535	0.319			
Cumulative percentage variance							
Of species data	23.8	37.9	40.2	40.7			
Of species-environment relatio	58.2	92.7	98.3	99.7			
Correlations							
Elevation					10.95	0.0005	17.1
O ₂ (mg/L)					8.41	0.0005	12.2
Salinity (‰)					3.66	0.0075	7.6
Temperature (°C)					2.88	0.027	10.9
pH					3.15	0.0175	2.1

Table 4

1495
1496

PLS	R^2_{Jack}	Ave.Bias _{Jack}	Max.Bias _{Jack}	RMSEP _{Jack}	%Change
Component 1	0.242	-0.030	32.224	18.033	
Component 2	0.492	-0.696	21.553	14.737	18.281
Component 3	0.507	-0.628	20.451	14.527	1.420
Component 4	0.543	-0.481	26.127	14.218	2.132
Component 5	0.578	-0.253	28.639	13.557	4.643
WAPLS					
Component 1	0.338	0.148	27.778	18.576	
Component 2	0.511	-0.180	20.976	16.002	13.860
Component 3	0.724	0.621	22.757	11.964	25.232
Component 4	0.680	-0.016	26.186	12.995	-8.620
Component 5	0.683	-0.289	27.531	12.964	0.240

1497

1498 Table 5

1499

SB5-0-1	0	1	0.125		Sample Name
SB5-1-2	1	1	0.125		
SB5-2-3	2	1	0.125		Aliquot/8
SB5-3-4	3	1	0.125		Aliquot sample size
SB5-4-5	4	1	0.125		Census live
SB5-5-6	5	1	0.125		<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>
SB5-6-7	6	1	0.125		Calcareous miliolids
SB5-7-8	7	1	0.125		<i>Trochammina inflata</i>
SB5-8-9	8	1	0.125		juvenile Trochamminids
SB5-9-10	9	1	0.125		Total live
					Census dead
					<i>Ammobaculites dilatatus</i>
					<i>Ammobaculites</i> sp.
					<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>
					<i>Miliammina fusca</i>
					Calcareous miliolids
					<i>Scherochorella moniliformis</i> (forma R
					Textulariid sp.
					<i>Trochammina inflata</i>
					<i>Trochammina</i> sp.
					juvenile Trochamminids
					Total dead
					Total live+dead
					Processed data
					Live BF/10 cm ³
					<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>
					Calcareous miliolids
					<i>Trochammina inflata</i>
					total live populations 10cm ³
					%live relative to the total populations
					Dead BF/10 cm ³
					<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>
					<i>Miliammina fusca</i>
					Calcareous miliolids
					<i>Trochammina inflata</i>

1500

1501 Supplementary Data 1

1502

92	Total live	
136	Census dead	
169	<i>Ammobaculites</i> spp.	
112	<i>Ammonia</i> sp.	
98	<i>Bolivina</i> sp.	
165	<i>Cornuspira involvens</i>	
59	<i>Elphidium</i> spp.	
164	<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>	
93	<i>Miliammina fusca</i>	
100	<i>Miliammina petila</i>	
92	Calcareous miliolids	
167	<i>Scherochorella moniliformis</i> (forma R	
221	<i>Reophax</i> spp.	
32	Textulariid sp.	
161	<i>Trichohyalus aguayoi</i>	
159	<i>Trochammina inflata</i>	
85	<i>Trochammina irregularis</i>	
	juvenile Trochamminids	
	Unidentified agglutinated miliolid	
	Total dead	
	Processed data	
	Live BF/10 cm ³	
	<i>Ammobaculites</i> spp.	
	<i>Ammonia</i> sp.	
	<i>Bolivina</i> sp.	
	<i>Cornuspira involvens</i>	
	<i>Elphidium</i> spp.	
	<i>Jadammina macrescens</i>	
	<i>Miliammina fusca</i>	
	<i>Miliammina petila</i>	
	Calcareous miliolids	
	<i>Scherochorella moniliformis</i> (forma R	
	<i>Reophax</i> spp.	
	Textulariid sp.	
	<i>Trichohyalus aguayoi</i>	
	<i>Trochammina inflata</i>	
	<i>Trochammina irregularis</i>	
	juvenile Trochamminids	
	Unidentified very coarse agglutinated	
	Live general Calcareous /10 cm3	
	Live absolute abundances /10 cm3	
	Dead BF/10 cm ³	

1505

1506 Supplementary Data 2 continued

Taxonomic reference list of species presented in text and in Supplementary data 1 and 2

- Ammobaculites* spp. Wright et al., 2011, p. 59, Fig. A2/4
- Ammonia* spp. Murray, 1979, p. 57, Figs. 18a–l; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 73, P3, Figs. 10a–c, Figs. 11a–c, Fig. 12a–c.
- Cornuspira* spp. Loeblich & Tappan, 1988, p. 322, Pl. 51, Figs. 7–8
- Trichohyalus aguayoi* (Bermúdez, 1935). Bermudez, 1935, p. 204, pl. 15, Figs. 10–14.
- Elphidium* spp. Murray, 1979, p. 53, Figs. 16a–d; Hayward et al., 1999, p. 219, P17, Figs. 1–28; Murray, 2006, p. 65, Fig. 4.2, 11; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 75, P4, figs. 15–20.
- Jadammina macrescens* (Brady, 1870). Murray, 1979, p. 27, Figs. 6k–m; Gehrels and van de Plassche, 1999, p.98, P1, Figs. 1–5; Hayward et al., 1999, p. 217, P1, Figs. 27–29; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 67, P1, Figs. 4a–d; Hawkes et al., 2010, p. 133, P1, Figs. 7a–d; Wright et al., 2011, p. 58, Fig. A1/5.
- Miliammina fusca* (Brady, 1870). Murray, 1979, p. 24, Figs. 5d–f; Hayward et al., 1999, p. 217, P1, Figs. 25, 6; Edwards et al., 2004; p. 16, P1, Fig. 7; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 67, P1, Figs. 5a, b. Wright et al., 2011, p. 59, Fig. A2/2.
- Miliammina petila* Saunders, 1958. Saunders, 1958, p. 87, pl. 1, figs. 10, 11; Milker et al., 2015, p. 5, Pl. 1, Figs. 3–4.
- Quinqueloculina* spp. Murray, 1979, p. 35, Figs. 9a–i; Hayward et al., 1999, p. 223; P4, Figs. 26–28; p. 225, P5, Figs. 9, 10; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 71, P2, Figs. 9a, b.
- Scherochorella moniliformis* Siddall, 1886. Murray, 1979, p. 24, Fig. 5b; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 67, P1, Figs. 6a–c; Wright et al., 2011, p. 58, Fig. A1/6.
- Trochammina inflata* (Montagu, 1808). Hayward et al., 1999, p. 219, P2, Figs. 6–8; Edwards et al., 2004; p. 16, P1, Figs. 14, 15; Horton and Edwards, 2006; p. 71, P2, Figs. 8a–d; Wright et al., 2011, p. 58, Fig. A1/9; Kemp et al., 2012; p. 29, P1, Figs. 7–8. AppendixA, AppendixB
- Trochamminita irregularis* Cushman & Brönnimann, 1948. Loeblich & Tappan, 1988, p. 67, Pl. 51, Figs. 1–5; Hawkes et al. 2010, p. 18, Pl. 1, Figs. 3a–b; Milker et al., 2015, p. 5, Pl. 1, Fig. 11.

Reference

1559
1560
1561 Bermudez, P.J. (1935). Foraminiferos de la costa norte de Cuba. *Memorias de la*
1562 *Sociedad*
1563 *Cubana de Historia Natural*, 9, 129–224.
1564
1565 Edwards, R. J., Wright, A. J., & van de Plassche, O. (2004). Surface distribution of
1566 salt-marsh foraminifera from Connecticut, USA: Modern analogues for high-
1567 resolution sea level studies. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 51, 1–21.
1568
1569 Gehrels, W. R., & van de Plassche, O. (1999). The use of *Jadammina macrescens*
1570 (Brady) and *Balticammina pseudomacrescens* Brönnimann, Lutze and Whittaker
1571 (Protozoa: Foraminiferida) as sea-level indicators. *Palaeogeography,*
1572 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 149(1), 89–101.
1573
1574 Hawkes, A. D., Horton, B. P., Nelson, A. R., & Hill, D. F. (2010). The application of
1575 intertidal foraminifera to reconstruct coastal subsidence during the giant Cascadia
1576 earthquake of AD 1700 in Oregon, USA. *Quaternary International*, 221(1), 116–140.
1577
1578 Hayward, B. W., Grenfell, H. R., Reid, C. M., & Hayward, K. A. (1999). Recent New
1579 Zealand Shallow-Water Benthic Foraminifera: Taxonomy, Ecologic Distribution,
1580 Biogeography, and use in
1581 Paleoenvironmental Assessments: Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences
1582 Monograph 21, Lower Hutt, New Zealand, 264 p.
1583
1584
1585 Horton, B. P., & Edwards, R. J. (2006). Quantifying Holocene sea level change using
1586 intertidal foraminifera: lessons from the British Isles. *Cushman Foundation for*
1587 *Foraminiferal Research Special Publication* 40.
1588
1589
1590 Kemp, A. C., Horton, B. P., Vann, D. R., Engelhart, S. E., Grand Pre, C. A., Vane, C.
1591 H., Nikitina, D., & Anisfeld, S. C. (2012). Quantitative vertical zonation of salt-marsh
1592 foraminifera
1593 for reconstructing former sea level; an example from New Jersey, USA. *Quaternary*
1594 *Science Reviews*, 54, 26–39.
1595
1596 Loeblich, A. R., & Tappan, H. (1988). Foraminiferal genera and their classification:
1597 Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, 1694p.
1598
1599 Milker, Y., Horton, B. P., Nelson, A. R., Engelhart, S. E., & Witter, R. C. (2015).
1600 Variability of intertidal foraminiferal assemblages in a salt marsh, Oregon,
1601 USA. *Marine Micropaleontology*, 118, 1–16.
1602
1603 Murray, J. W. (1979). British nearshore foraminiferids, in Kermack, D. M., and
1604 Barners, R. S. K., (eds), Synopsis of the British Fauna (New Series) No 16: Academic
1605 Press, London, 62 p.
1606
1607 Murray, J. W. (2006). Ecology and Applications of Benthic Foraminifera: Cambridge
1608 University Press, Cambridge, 426 p.

1609

1610 Saunders, J.B. (1958). Recent foraminifera of mangrove swamps and river estuaries
1611 and their fossil counterparts in Trinidad. *Micropaleontology*, 4, 79–92.

1612

1613 Wright, A. J., Edwards, R. J., & van de Plassche, O. (2011). Reassessing transfer-
1614 function performance in sea-level reconstruction based on benthic salt-marsh
1615 foraminifera from the Atlantic coast of NE North America. *Marine*
1616 *Micropaleontology*, 81(1), 43–62.

1617

1618

PLS component 2

1619

1620

Supplementary data 4