



materials on the northern shelf, we also collected highresolution seismic-reflection profiles using a surfacestreamer as receiver. Lines were spaced 150 m apart on the inner Santa Cruz shelf and 400 m apart on the mid- to outer-shelf. Differential global positioning system (GPS) providing boat-position accuracy better than 10 m. On the northern shelf from the sheltered area around Santa Cruz northwest to Point Año Nuevo, the innermost survey lines were run into water depths as shallow as 5 m. However in most other areas, shallowest lines were at about the 10-m isobath, leaving a significant data gap to

On the shelf south of Monterey Canyon, two surveys were conducted with hull-mounted multibeam swath-bathymetry/backscatter systems. The first survey used a Simrad EM1000 system on the *R/V Pacific Hunter* of California State University, Humbolt. The second survey used a Simrad EM300 system on the R/V Ocean Brunswick and C&C Technologies in cooperation with the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute). These backscatter from the seafloor. Line spacing varied to accommodate the variation in seafloor coverage afforded by the systems that image swaths averaging about 5 times water depth. Nearshore coverage extended shoreward to the 20-m isobath along the coast between Monterey and Moss Landing and to approximately the 50-m isobath

The side-scan sonar mosaics on the shelf north of Monterey Canyon have a pixel resolution of 0.4 m for the inner shelf and 0.8 m for the outer shelf. Although this pixel resolution allows us to resolve relatively small features on the seafloor, the accuracy of pixel location is considerably poorer than this due to inaccuracies in navigating the fish towed behind the ship for the northern surveys. The southern-shelf data, which were collected with hull-mounted systems, were processed at pixel bathymetry. The estimated navigational accuracy in pixel location is 50 m for the northern shelf data and 10 m for the southern shelf data. See Eittreim and others (in press) for a fuller discussion of the navigational accuracy and

Based on the acoustic imagery, boundaries were drawn between areas interpreted as different bottom bottom, whereas outcropping rocks and coarse sand have high reflectivity (fig. D). Sands show uniform reflectivity whereas rock outcrops display geometric patterns that are associated with layering, jointing, faulting and folding (figs. A, B). Granitic rocks show non-layered knobby patterns associated with weathering and jointing style (fig. E). Coarse sands usually occur in shallow troughs (fig. F) and display 1-m wavelength ripples where highresolution data (better than 1-m per pixel) are available. Interpretation was done at the scale of 2.4 m per pixel. At an image resolution of 72 dpi, common to most video screens, this represents a scale of 1:6,800. We emphasize that the distributions of bottom types are based largely on the acoustic imagery and not on direct samples. However, numerous sample identifications, mostly from rocks dredged from the upper continental slope and canyon walls (McCulloch and others, 1985; Stakes and others, 1999), seafloor sediment samples and collected by ROV (remotely operated vehicles; H.G. Greene and D. Stakes, MBARI, personal communication) support the interpretations. Most importantly, outcrops directly onshore were often used to identify the innershelf outcrops (Clark, 1981; Brabb, 1989; Dibblee, 1999; Clark and others, 1997). Our interpretations are largely in concert with those of McCulloch and Greene (1989), who presented a regional interpretation of the geology of the

- Clark, J.C., 1981, Stratigraphy, paleontology, and geology of the central Santa Cruz Mountains, California Coast Ranges: U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper Clark, J.C., Dupré, W.R. and Rosenberg, L.I., 1997, Geologic map of the Monterey and Seaside 7.5-minute quadrangles, Monterey County, California: a digital database: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 97-30, text 25 p., map scale 1:24,000. Dibblee, T.W. Jr., 1999, Geologic map of the Monterey Peninsula and vicinity: Dibblee Geological Foundation, Santa Barbara, CA, Map no. DF-71, map scale: 1:62,500. Edwards, B.D., in press, Variations in sediment texture on the storm-dominated Monterey Eittreim, S.L., Anima, R.J., and Stevenson, A.J., in press, Seafloor geology of the ESRI, 1998, ARC Version 7.2.1: Redlands, California, Environmental Systems Research Galliher, E.W., 1932, Sediments of Monterey Bay, California: California Division of McCulloch, D.S., Utter, P.A., and Menack, J.S., 1985, Maps showing locations of selected pre-Quaternary rock samples from 34 degrees 30 minutes North latitude to 42 degrees North latitude, California continental margin: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map, MF-1719, 38 pp., (4 sheets), scale: 1:250,000. McCulloch, D.S., and Greene, H.G., 1989, Geologic map of the central California continental margin, in Greene, H.G., and Kennedy, M.P., editors, California Continental Margin Geologic Map Series, central California continental margin,
- Data Center for Marine Geology & Geophysics, Data Announcement 98-MGG-03, CD-ROM Set, Version 4.0 (http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/bathymetry/hydro.html). Stakes, D.S., Rigsby, C.A., and Baucom, P.C., 1999, Igneous and sedimentary rocks from the Monterey Canyon, California and implications for regional tectonics: American

Wessel, P., and Smith, W. H. F., 1998, New, improved version of Generic Mapping Tools released: EOS Transactions of the American Geophysical Union, v. 79 (47), p. 579