University of Dundee

Harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) abundance within the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary, Scotland

Hanson, Nora; Thompson, Dave; Duck, Callan; Baxter, John; Lonergan, Mike

Published in:

Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems

DOI:

[10.1002/aqc.2609](https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2609)

Publication date:

2017

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hanson, N., Thompson, D., Duck, C., Baxter, J., & Lonergan, M. (2017). Harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) abundance within the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary, Scotland: recent trends and extrapolation to extinction. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 27(1), 268-281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2609>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) abundance within the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary, Scotland: recent trends and extrapolation to extinction

Journal:	<i>Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems</i>
Manuscript ID:	AQC-15-0016.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Hanson, Nora; University of St Andrews, NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute Thompson, Dave; University of St Andrews, NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute Duck, Callan; University of St Andrews, NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute Lonergan, Mike; University of St Andrews, NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute; University of Dundee, School of Medicine
Broad habitat type (mandatory) select 1-2:	coastal < Broad habitat type, littoral < Broad habitat type
General theme or application (mandatory) select 1-2:	monitoring < General theme or application, Special Area of Conservation < General theme or application, conservation evaluation < General theme or application
Broad taxonomic group or category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1-2:	mammals < Broad taxonomic group or category
Impact category (mandatory, if relevant to paper) select 1-2:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 1
5
6 2 *Harbour seal (Phoca vitulina) abundance within the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary,*
7
8 3 *Scotland: recent trends and extrapolation to extinction*
9 4

10 5 Running head: Rapid harbour seal decline and extrapolation to extinction
11 6

12
13
14 7 Nora Hanson¹, Dave Thompson^{1*}, Callan Duck¹, John Baxter & Mike Lonergan^{1,3}
15 8

16
17 9 ¹NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St
18
19 10 Andrews, UK
20 11

21
22 12 ²Scottish Natural Heritage, UK
23 13

24
25 14 ³School of Medicine, University of Dundee, UK
26 15

27 16 *Correspondence to: D. Thompson, Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St
28
29 17 Andrews, Fife KY16 8LB, UK. Email : dt2@st-andrews.ac.uk
30 18
31 19

32
33
34
35 20 **ABSTRACT**

- 36
37 21 1. Aerial surveys have detected alarming declines in the counts of harbour seals in
38 22 several regions across Scotland.
39 23 2. Demographic data and simple models were used to examine the recent decline in the
40 24 numbers of harbour seals counted in one population within a Special Area of
41 25 Conservation (SAC) on the east coast of Scotland. The models suggest that the
42 26 continuation of current trends would result in the species effectively disappearing from
43 27 this area within the next 20 years.
44 28 3. While the cause of the decline is unknown, it must be reducing adult survival because
45 29 the high rate of decline cannot be wholly accounted for by changes in other
46 30 demographic parameters.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4. Recovery of the population to the abundance recorded at the time the SAC was designated (2005) is likely to take at least 40 years, even if the cause of the decline is immediately identified and removed.

5. The models suggest that partial removal of the cause can have only limited benefits to population recovery, and there are unlikely to be any long-term benefits from introducing or reintroducing additional individuals while the underlying problem persists. Therefore, if the population of harbour seals in this area is to recover it is essential that the sources of the increased mortality are identified and measures are put in place to manage these.

KEYWORDS: coastal, littoral, monitoring, Special Area of Conservation, conservation evaluation, mammals

INTRODUCTION

The UK is home to around 30% of Europe's harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*), with the majority of these hauling out at island and coastal sites in the north and west of Scotland (SCOS, 2013). Harbour seals in Scotland have been monitored on an approximately five-yearly cycle since the late 1980s. Two populations, in part of the Moray Firth and around the Firth of Tay, have been surveyed more frequently. The surveys have detected alarming declines in the number of harbour seals observed at haulout sites in several regions. This trend is most apparent in populations in Orkney and on the north and east coasts of Scotland, where numbers have declined by between 65% and 90%, respectively, since the 1990s (Duck and Morris, 2014). Importantly, the decline in number of seals counted is not simply a consequence of changes in seal behaviour altering the proportion of time seals spend hauled out during the moult. A recent telemetry study comparing harbour seals in the declining Orkney population and a stable population on the west coast of Scotland demonstrated that the proportion of animals hauled out during the survey window was high in both areas, and similar to previously published proportions for this species (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013). The declines in harbour seal counts are thus likely to represent real reductions in the numbers of animals present in the region.

Harbour seals are protected under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010, which prohibits the killing of any seal except under a licence granted by the Scottish Government explicitly for the protection of fisheries or fish farms. There is also the capacity under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 to designate seal conservation areas where it is considered necessary to further encourage the proper conservation of seals. Furthermore, a number of harbour seal Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) have been designated under the EU Habitats Directive (for a map of SACs in Scotland, see: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/03/16182005/54>). The Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary (FTEE; Figure 1) was designated an SAC in 2005 in part due to its importance as a breeding and haulout site for harbour seals. Between 1990 and 2002 the average aerial survey count in the FTEE was 640 harbour seals but annual aerial surveys since 2002 indicate a continuing and significant decline in this population: in 2013 only 50 animals were counted within the FTEE (Duck and Morris, 2014).

To address this situation, the ultimate and proximate causes of the decline must be identified. This, in turn, requires a sound understanding of the population structure and its dynamics. For a number of reasons, estimating the structure of pinniped populations is not straightforward (Lonergan, 2014; see discussions in Matthiopoulos *et al.*, 2014). When the population of interest is critically small and in decline minimising disturbance to the population is particularly important, but in addition to aerial surveys, targeted – and repeated – land-based surveillance studies are necessary to estimate key demographic parameters such as adult survival rates, age structure, sex ratio and fecundity (Bowen *et al.*, 2003; Mackey *et al.*, 2008). Some age classes can be identified when observing harbour seals at a distance – for example, very small animals obviously are young and sub-yearlings can be identified by characteristically pale unpatterned pelage (Thompson and Rothery, 1987). Large mature adults may also be distinguishable from other age/sex classes. However, some one-year old animals are similar in length to small adults (Härkönen and Heide-Jørgensen, 1990) and the species is less sexually dimorphic than many other pinnipeds (Burns, 2008). This lack of obvious dimorphism means that visual identification of the sex of adult harbour seals from a distance is seldom possible, so assumptions about sex ratio of survey counts must be adopted. The sex of animals could be determined non-invasively from the DNA analysis of scats left

at haulouts, but obtaining a representative sample from the population is difficult and moving from this to estimating the structure of the population is seldom practical. Furthermore, harbour seals can haul out in sex-related groups so haulout groups may not provide an unbiased estimate of sex ratio. Mass mortality events and strandings data can provide information on the sex ratio, age structure and fecundity of affected populations – but with the caveat that these data are likely to be biased towards particular groups of animals (e.g. Härkönen and Heide-Jørgensen, 1990; but see also Härkönen *et al.*, 2007). Relatively unbiased samples may be obtained where animals are part of a subsistence hunt or culled for management purposes but there are no such samples available for harbour seals in the UK. In the absence of direct estimates of these demographic parameters, indirect estimates and information from other similar populations must be adopted.

Here, available demographic information on the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary and neighbouring harbour seal populations is pooled from across multiple sources to characterize and contextualize decadal trends in abundance within the region, to explore the potential proximate causes of the decline and to extrapolate to future population sizes under various scenarios. Insights gained from this exercise are discussed in relation to the future management and conservation of this population specifically, and of harbour seals in the UK more generally. The results confirm a rapid decline in the number of harbour seals hauled out in the FTEE and demonstrate that, if the problem persists at its present rate, the population will become extinct from this area within 20 years.

DATA & ANALYSIS

All analyses were implemented within the R statistical framework (R Development Core Team, 2013) and are based on the number of seals counted at haulouts. These numbers can be converted into rough population estimates by multiplying the counts of harbour seals by a factor of 1.4 (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013) and those of grey seals by a factor of 3 (Lonergan *et al.*, 2011) to allow for those seals not hauled out at the time of the survey.

Harbour seal population in Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary

Aerial surveys during the moulting period are used to monitor the abundance of harbour seals in the UK. Surveys are conducted from either a fixed-wing aircraft using conventional photography or from a helicopter using thermal imaging during the first three weeks of August, in the period two hours before and after low tide (Thompson *et al.*, 2010b). These counts represent an index of the minimum population abundance. Previous research suggests that the proportion of animals hauled out and available to be counted is similar between sites, so persistent interannual changes in the counts are unlikely to be due to changes in seal haulout behaviour (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013).

Counts were made in the FTEE region in most years from 1990 to 2000 and annually from 2002 – 2013 (Table 1). Four previous counts in 1971, 1975 and 1984 were also included in the analysis, although they used a different survey method. These were boat-based survey counts made during the June/July breeding/pupping season and are likely underestimates of the total population size. Thompson and Harwood (1990) counted twice as many seals in Orkney using aerial surveys conducted during the moult period than using boat-based surveys during the breeding/pupping season.

To investigate trends in the harbour seal counts, a generalized additive model (GAM) (Wood, 2006), with quasipoisson errors and a log link function, was fitted to the data by maximum likelihood. As the later part of the trajectory appeared to resemble an exponential decay, a similar generalized linear model (GLM) was also fitted, with different exponential rates of population growth up to 2000 and from 2001 onwards. This initial transition point was chosen visually, and its suitability was checked by fitting models with a range of transition dates. Model suitability was assessed by examining residual dispersion and quasi-Akaike Information Criterion values (QAIC Akaike, 1976; Burnham and Anderson, 2002).

Additional sources of information existed for this population and were included in the assessment of the population trajectory. In 2010, 2011, and 2012 land-based counts of harbour seal pups were conducted in the FTEE during the June/July breeding/pupping season. These numbers, combined with the counts of adults during the August moult,

159 provide an estimate of the proportion of pups in the population. Additionally, since
160 2008, harbour seal carcasses with distinctive 'spiral' or 'corkscrew' injuries have been
161 found at various locations around the UK, including a total of 36 carcasses within or
162 close to the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary (Table 2). The pathology of these injuries has
163 been described elsewhere (Bexton *et al.*, 2012), and the potential causes were discussed
164 in Onoufrinou *et al.* (2014) and Thompson *et al.* (2015). Recent observations of adult
165 male grey seals predating on harbour seals and grey seal pups have demonstrated that
166 the characteristic 'spiral' lesions can be inflicted by another seal (Thompson *et al.*,
167 2015; van Neer *et al.*, 2015). The number of such harbour seal carcasses reported in the
168 FTEE is likely to underestimate the total number of animals that are killed in this way
169 because the data describe only animals that wash ashore and are reported. Carcasses of
170 animals that are killed far from the shore are unlikely to wash ashore and will be
171 underrepresented in this dataset. As with all marine mammal strandings data, it is
172 extremely difficult to estimate the scale of under-reporting, but it is likely to be large for
173 pinnipeds. Additionally, the relative buoyancy of animals of different sexes or ages is
174 likely to affect the chance of their carcasses being recovered, and variation in this may
175 make the sample unrepresentative. In the absence of more appropriate data, the sex ratio
176 of these mortalities over the years 2008 to 2013 was investigated by fitting binomial
177 GLMs.

178 *Neighbouring populations*

180 There are a few, small, harbour seal groups neighbouring the FTEE population: in the
181 Firth of Forth (~ 50 km to the south) and the Montrose basin (~50 km to the north) that
182 could be potential sources of immigrants or destinations for emigrants (Figure 1). Until
183 recently, far fewer animals were counted in those areas than in the FTEE. However, that
184 difference is less clear now that the FTEE counts have decreased. Four counts are
185 available from the Firth of Forth (Duck and Morris, 2014), but it is difficult to estimate
186 trends from so few data points. Here, it was assumed that the uncertainty in these counts
187 was similar to those from the FTEE. The counts were modelled using a GAM with
188 quasipoisson error distribution and with the same overdispersion as was estimated from
189 the FTEE data (scale = 13.3). GLMs were also fitted to the data collected after 2000,
190 when the FTEE counts began to show a decline.

1
2
3
4 191
5
6 192
7
8 193
9
10 194
11 195
12 196
13 197
14 198
15 199
16 200
17
18
19
20
21 201
22 202
23 203
24 204
25 205
26 206
27 207
28 208
29 209
30 210
31 211
32 212
33 213
34 214
35 215
36 216
37 217
38 218
39 219
40 220
41 221
42 222
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Grey seal population in Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary

Harbour seals share the FTEE with larger and more abundant grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*). The only available information about the number of grey seals in this region comes from August harbour seal moult surveys, when grey seals are also counted. Seventeen counts of grey seals were made between 1990 and 2013 (Table 1), and one count was made during a boat-based survey in 1984. To investigate trends in the count data over this time period, a GAM was fitted with quasipoisson error distribution and a log link function.

RESULTS

Harbour seal abundance in the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary showed positive growth prior to 2001 after which there was a clear transition to a rapid decline. Emigration of seals to nearby haulouts, or local redistribution, could not be ruled out, but seems unlikely based on available counts of neighbouring populations and distances to those populations. Potential proximate causes for the decline are explored in more detail, including changes to haulout behaviour, fecundity, survival and emigration.

Harbour seal population in Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary

The choice of the year 2000 as the transition point in the population trajectory was supported by the fact that models fitted with transitions in 1998, 1999, 2001 and 2002 had greater residual overdispersion. Equivalent models fitted with Poisson errors also had higher AIC values than the model with a break point at year 2000. The results of the GAM and the GLM with a change in trajectory after 2000 were similar (Figure 2), especially for recent years. While the truth is probably somewhere between these extremes, a model where two exponential trajectories were fitted along with a shrinkage spline allowed the two representations to compete and produced results indistinguishable from the original GLM. A similar model containing two smooth functions and two exponential trajectories, all meeting between 2000 and 2001, produced identical results. These combined models therefore support a relatively sudden transition between two periods with different, but stable, rates of exponential population change.

223 The population growth rate between 1970 and 2000 was estimated at 4.6% *p.a.* (95%
224 Confidence Interval 3.5 - 5.7). This lies within the range of values that have been
225 observed in other harbour seal populations (Thompson *et al.*, 2005; Lonergan *et al.*,
226 2007), but is still far from the 12% intrinsic rate of increase for harbour seals (Härkönen
227 *et al.*, 2002). The different methodology used for the early surveys may limit their
228 comparability with the later ones, and the reliance that can be put on the estimate of
229 population growth prior to 2000. However, even if count data from the three years of
230 boat-based surveys were doubled (following Thompson and Harwood, 1990), estimated
231 population growth was still positive (1.8% *p.a.*; 95% CI 0.9 - 2.8). This source of
232 uncertainty does not affect the estimated annual rate of decline since 2000, which was
233 19.9% (95% CI: 16.8 – 23.0). This is significantly faster than the estimated annual rate
234 of decline in the harbour seal population around the Orkney Islands and northern
235 Scotland (13% *p.a.*; 95% CI 10.8 - 14.8), another area where there are serious concerns
236 for this species (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013). Detailed examination of the modelled
237 trajectories showed that some recent counts (2009, 2011, 2013) and GAM predictions
238 lie below the trajectory estimated by the GLM (Figure 2), suggesting that the decline of
239 the FTEE population is unlikely to be slowing.

241 A total of 12 harbour seal pups were observed during onshore visual searches of the
242 FTEE in 2010, 6 in 2011, and just one in 2012 (R. Milne, SMRU, *pers. comm.*). In those
243 years 124, 77 and 88 adult harbour seals were observed during the moult aerial surveys,
244 meaning roughly 1 pup was observed for every 10 animals counted in 2010 and the ratio
245 was 1:13 in 2011, and 1:88 in 2012. These ratios are lower than those estimated for
246 other populations. For example, in The Wash (~450 km south of the FTEE on the east
247 coast of England) the ratio of peak pup numbers observed via aerial surveys during the
248 breeding season to mean total moult counts of adult animals was much higher (1:1.6 to
249 1:3.5; SCOS, 2012). The low proportion of pups in the area in recent years implies
250 either a lower fecundity among adult females or that a smaller proportion of the
251 population are adult females.

252
253 The sex ratio of the unusual mortality events caused by spiral lesions (based on
254 recovered stranded carcasses) was modelled with binomial GLMs. If it is assumed that

there were no detection biases on the basis of sex, GLMs suggested that 29% (95% CI: 16 – 47) of the animals killed in this way were male. An intercept-only model performed worse than one including a year covariate ($\Delta AIC = 5$) providing some evidence to suggest the proportion had changed over the period. Unfortunately, it is not possible to test whether the carcasses match the sex ratio of the surviving population, or other populations under more normal conditions.

Neighbouring populations

GAMs fitted to the four available counts from the Firth of Forth (116 in 1997; 280 in 2005; 148 in 2007; and 145 in 2013) showed no evidence of changes in abundance over the period. A GLM fitted to the data from after 2000 ($n = 3$), when the FTEE counts were declining, suggested the population in the Firth of Forth may have been in decline but the annual rate of change was in the range -0.21 to +0.05 (95% CI). The range in the FTEE during the same period was -0.23 to -0.16. The uncertainty associated with small samples in the Firth of Forth means that approximately 45 more surveys would be required to match the precision of the current estimate of the trend in the FTEE. Without this added precision, no firm conclusions can be made about trends in abundance in the Firth of Forth area.

Over the last ten years, 36 harbour seals have been fitted with telemetry tags in and around the FTEE. Inspection of their GPS tracks showed two of them hauled out at or beyond Montrose to the north, and another two hauled out within the Firth of Forth to the south. Other individuals swam beyond these places without coming ashore there (Sparling *et al.*, 2012). It therefore seems unlikely that the abundance trajectories in these areas will be wholly independent.

Grey seal population in Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary

Fitting a GAM to the counts of grey seals in the FTEE in August showed that there has probably been a slow decline ($\sim 1\%$ *p.a.*) in their numbers over the period since 1990 (Figure 3). While this change is not statistically significant (95% CI: -4.3 – +0.9), it clearly shows that, at least in August, there has not been a substantial increase in grey seal numbers in the FTEE. Grey seal pup production has been increasing at around 9%

1
2
3
4 287 *p.a.* in the British North Sea breeding colonies (SCOS, 2013); though pup production at
5 288 the Isle of May (a SAC for grey seals), a breeding colony about 35km from the FTEE
6 289 harbour seal population, has been fairly stable (Duck and Morris, 2011). Grey seal and
7 290 harbour seal at-sea and haulout usage overlaps in the FTEE (Jones *et al.*, 2013) but the
8 291 observed stability in the number of grey seals in the area implies that any competitive
9 292 pressure they apply to the harbour seals is unlikely to have increased, unless there is a
10 293 total carrying capacity for pinnipeds in the area that has steadily reduced over this
11 294 period. Reductions in pinniped carrying capacity could be caused by a reduced prey
12 295 resources, or reductions in access to suitable haulout locations. The latter is not the case
13 296 as there are ample suitable haulout locations for both species in the FTEE; the former is
14 297 less easily determined. North Sea regime shifts (Beaugrand, 2004; Beaugrand *et al.*,
15 298 2014) and trends in pelagic fish communities (e.g. Shephard *et al.*, 2014) are well
16 299 documented but the impact of these changes on marine mammal diet and condition is
17 300 not well understood.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Potential proximate causes

303 There is one behavioural change, and four changes in the population's demographics,
304 with the potential to produce the observed decline in harbour seal numbers in the FTEE.
305 It is unlikely that a single factor is responsible for the dramatic decline in this
306 population, but for the sake of clarity, each is discussed in isolation below.

307
308 The counts of hauled out animals could decrease if haulout behaviour changed and the
309 proportion of time animals spent out of the water during the survey window declined.
310 Harbour seals tagged in the FTEE in 2001-2003 did not show significant interannual
311 variation in haulout probability, but because seals lose their tags during the moult, no
312 animals were tracked during August, when the counts used in the present study were
313 made (Sharples *et al.*, 2009). However, a recent study in Orkney, where the harbour seal
314 population is also declining rapidly, used flipper-attached satellite tags to track animals
315 throughout their moulting period. The animals showed similar haulout behaviour to that
316 previously reported elsewhere and to a control sample of individuals from a stable
317 population on the west coast of Scotland (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, to
318 account for the magnitude of the reductions found in the FTEE population since 2000, a

93% reduction in the proportion of time spent hauled out around daytime low tides during the moult (and hence proportion of animals available to be counted) would be required. The number of harbour seals hauled out peaks during their moult (Watts, 1996; Thompson *et al.*, 2005), so whilst interannual shifts in haulout behaviour are possible, it is considered unlikely that they were the main cause of the observed changes.

The decline could be caused by a reduction in pup and/or adult survival. If all pups die, populations decline at a rate determined by the mortality rates among adults. There are few adult survival estimates for harbour seals in the region. In the Kattegat-Skagerrak, the annual survival rate of male harbour seals has been estimated at 0.91, while female survival was slightly higher (Härkönen and Heide-Jørgensen, 1990). A higher rate 0.97 (95% CI 0.92 – 0.99) was estimated in the Cromarty Firth, in northeastern Scotland, from photo identification mark-recapture of live animals (Mackey *et al.*, 2008); and in a nearby population, recent estimates were 0.95 (95% CI 0.91-0.97) for females and 0.92 (95% CI 0.83-0.96) for males (Cordes and Thompson, 2014). The FTEE population is therefore declining too rapidly for even a total failure in recruitment to provide a complete explanation, though it could be a contributory factor. If adult female survival is assumed to have been 0.92 before the decline, then a total failure of recruitment would need to have been accompanied by a reduction in adult survival of at least 10% to produce the observed changes.

The decline could simply be explained by a reduction in overall survival. Lower adult survival would increase the proportion of juveniles in the population, and result in a drop in the ratio of pup numbers to total abundance and an accelerating rate of decline in abundance. A gradual decrease in the proportion of females in the population would have similar effects. The female-bias in the recovered spiral-cut carcasses is difficult to interpret due to incomplete information on the cause of the mortalities and potential detection biases (e.g. due to differences in carcass buoyancy between sexes). However, the low pup to adult ratio found in the population in recent years is consistent with changes in the population structure and a shift towards fewer females than males. The counts and GAM trajectory falling below the predicted values from the GLM in recent

351 years (Figure 2) hint at an accelerating rate of decline, but as such provide very limited
352 evidence to support such a conclusion.

353

354 The same argument that applies to pup/adult survival also means that reduced fecundity
355 alone cannot entirely explain the decline. While reduced fecundity could contribute to
356 the observed low pup to adult ratio, if fecundity were zero (which it cannot be given the
357 observations of pups in 2010, 2011, and 2012) the adult mortality would have to equal
358 the observed rate of decline, i.e. 19% *p.a.* An increase in the age at first reproduction
359 would be equivalent to a reduction in fecundity, but again, there are no data available to
360 test this hypothesis.

361

362 Emigration and immigration are the last demographic parameters that must be
363 examined. Emigration is only distinct from mortality if the animals arrive somewhere
364 else. The Moray Firth contains the only harbour seal population in reasonable proximity
365 that is sufficiently large that an immigration of tens of animals per year could possibly
366 pass unnoticed (Duck and Morris, 2014). Emigration from the FTEE to smaller
367 populations south of the Moray Firth or to the Firth of Forth would likely have been
368 detected as substantial percentage increases in survey counts. A cessation of
369 immigration to the FTEE population from neighbouring populations could possibly
370 have contributed to the observed decline, but there is no evidence that the FTEE
371 population received large numbers of immigrants in the years before the decline
372 occurred. The Moray Firth population is again the most likely source of animals for
373 such redistribution but it is > 250 km away from the FTEE and telemetry data suggests
374 that harbour seal redistribution at this scale is likely to be minimal (Thompson *et al.*,
375 1994; Cunningham *et al.*, 2009; Sharples *et al.*, 2009). While net immigration to the
376 FTEE population in years prior to 2000 is possible, it is considered that reduced
377 immigration is unlikely to explain the observed rapid population decline since 2000.

378

379 *Future scenarios*

380 Attempts to predict the future trajectory of the FTEE population depend on assumptions
381 about the underlying cause of the decline and any potential mitigation. This section
382 attempts to project the future of the FTEE population under various possible scenarios.

383
384 *'Business as usual'*
385 If no management actions are taken to identify and rectify the cause of decline in this
386 population, and if it continues at the rate established since 2000 (19% *p.a.*), effective
387 population extinction is likely. Even ignoring stochastic effects, this can be expected to
388 occur before 2040 (Figure 4). In practice, random variations in the sex ratio of births
389 and timings of deaths are likely to make this occur much sooner.

390
391 A simple stochastic model of the female component of the FTEE harbour seal
392 population assuming 92% annual survival of non-pups (Mackey *et al.*, 2008), 40%
393 survival of pups (Harding *et al.*, 2005), 90% of females older than 3 years old pup each
394 year (Härkönen and Heide-Jørgensen, 1990) and a 50:50 sex ratio, produces a
395 population growth rate of 5% *p.a.* Introducing an additional 25% mortality, affecting
396 adults and non-pup juveniles, changes this to an 19% *p.a.* decline. Treating each birth
397 and each individual's annual mortality risk as an independent draw from binomial
398 distributions, and starting with a population of 35 non-pup females, suggests extinction
399 is likely to occur after 20 years (95% CI, from 1000 replicates: 12 – 34 yrs). Figure 5
400 shows the trajectories of 100 replicate simulated populations. The starting population
401 size of 35 animals was chosen on the assumption that more than half of the 50 animals
402 counted in 2013 were female, but that some of those were pups. This starting estimate
403 may be slightly low to account for the proportion of animals missed from the moult
404 count because they were in the water, but the model also neglects the counteracting
405 possibility that extinction occurs as a result of all males dying or that individual deaths
406 are not independent.

407
408 *Source of decline eliminated*

409 The GLM model fitted to survey counts after 2000 suggested that the 2013 survey was
410 one where a low proportion of animals were hauled out, and that 70 animals could have
411 been expected to be seen, rather than the 50 animals that were actually observed. Using
412 a scaling factor of 1.4 to account for those animals not hauled out during the survey
413 window (Lonergan *et al.*, 2013) the total population abundance was estimated to be 100
414 animals. With this – perhaps over optimistic – number, and assuming the sex-ratio and

age structure are stable and comparable to those for other harbour seal populations, and ignoring stochastic effects such as elimination of males, the time for abundance to return to 600 can be estimated. Table 3 contains some estimated recovery times based on different population growth rates. The additional years needed for population recovery per year of delay in eliminating the present cause of decline are also presented.

The population growth rates explored in Table 3 were chosen on the basis of existing empirical information on harbour seal population dynamics within the North Sea region. Twelve percent is the present growth rate for the Wadden Sea harbour seal population (TSEG, 2013) and is often considered to be around the maximum sustainable growth rate for pinniped populations (Härkönen *et al.*, 2002). This represents the most 'optimistic' scenario whereby the cause of the present situation is immediately resolved and the population reaches and maintains a maximum growth rate for at least 16 years. Perhaps more realistic are the projections from growth rates between 3% and 6%. The population in The Wash was growing at 3% *p.a.* prior to the 1988 phocine distemper epidemic. It then increased and was approximately 6% *p.a.* between the 1988 and 2002 epidemics (Thompson *et al.*, 2005; Lonergan *et al.*, 2007). If the abundance estimates that were made for the Tay in the 1970s are believed to be consistent with the more recent ones, then this population was growing at around 4.5% *p.a.* up to the beginning of the recent decline. In these scenarios, the FTEE population could be expected to recover to its previous abundance in 30 – 60 years. Even in this 'ideal' scenario, there is no 'quick fix'. In reality, the different survey method used in early counts was likely to have caused underestimation of abundances and therefore overestimation of the rate of population growth. Assuming that the underestimation was about half (Thompson and Harwood, 1990), this has the effect of decreasing the population's rate of growth prior to 2000 to about 2%.

Source of decline partially eliminated

The accepted "normal" maximum growth rate for pinniped population is 12% *p.a.* (Härkönen *et al.*, 2002), but the FTEE population is declining by around 19% *p.a.* The impact of the problem is thus 31% (i.e. 12% - -19% = 31%); a halving of the impact of the problem to 15.5% could be expected to result in a population rate of decline of 3.5%

447 *p.a.* (i.e. $-19\% + 15.5\% = -3.5\%$). Whatever is affecting this population would therefore
448 need to be reduced by more than half of the total impact for the population to stabilize at
449 its current level, and by more than that to permit it to begin to recover. A growth rate of
450 6% under optimal conditions similar to that observed in The Wash (Thompson *et al.*,
451 2005; Lonergan *et al.*, 2007), would imply that population recovery would require at
452 least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the problem to be resolved. If the maximum achievable growth rate were 3%
453 *p.a.* – which may be more representative of Scottish harbour seal populations – then
454 recovery would depend on finding an almost complete solution to the problem.

456 *Female shortage in recovering population*

457 Direct measurement of the true sex ratio in the FTEE population is neither feasible, nor
458 advisable given its present state and the need to minimize disturbance. A project is
459 underway to estimate the sex ratio of this population non-invasively via DNA testing of
460 scats; however, recovery of suitable samples has proven difficult in this region.
461 Additionally, the method requires many assumptions about patterns of haulout
462 behaviour and defecation and is unlikely to produce an estimate of sex ratio that is truly
463 representative of the population. However, if there is a shortage of females in the
464 recovering population, this would both increase the risk of local extinction because of
465 stochastic variation (i.e. all the females dying) and slow the initial stages of the
466 recovery. Populations starting with more highly skewed sex ratios would initially grow
467 more slowly and it would take longer for their growth rates to recover to more normal
468 values.

470 *Extinction & recolonization*

471 Though capable of long distance movement, harbour seals generally exhibit high site
472 fidelity, generally using haulouts less than ~25 km apart (Thompson *et al.*, 1998;
473 Cunningham *et al.*, 2009; Sharples *et al.*, 2012; Cordes and Thompson, 2015), and there
474 is evidence that genetic diversity increases with distance (Stanley *et al.*, 1996;
475 Goodman, 1998). Philopatry could thus limit their ability to recover from local
476 extinctions. There is no indication that males and females of this species travel together
477 (Thompson *et al.*, 1998), therefore the establishment of a population would seem to
478 require multiple colonizing events.

479
480 There are two examples of UK harbour seal populations that became extinct and have
481 recovered to some extent, in the Tees and the Ythan Estuaries. The population in the
482 Ythan was removed by shooting in 1979 and 1980. It is not known when the first
483 animals returned, but by the mid 1990s harbour seals were seen regularly in the estuary.
484 The harbour seal population in the Tees disappeared at an unknown date in the mid 19th
485 century when large parts of the estuary were developed (Woods, 2012). Harbour seals
486 recolonized the Tees Estuary in the 1970s or early 1980s and the population has grown
487 slowly to reach around 20 to 50 seals (Woods, 2012). The first successful pupping was
488 recorded in 1994. The more rapid recolonization of the Ythan Estuary may be related to
489 the proximity of small harbour seal haulout groups on the coast 45km to the north
490 (Figure 1). In contrast, the nearest groups to the Tees are in the Firth of Forth, 200km to
491 the north, or in the River Humber, 170km to the south (Figure 1).

492
493 In the event of harbour seal extinction in the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary, the most
494 likely source of colonizing animals would be the small populations in the Firth of Forth,
495 50 to 60 km away, or the animals that haul out north of Montrose, about 40km from the
496 FTEE haulouts. However, it is not clear that these groups of animals actually are
497 sufficiently separated to follow different population trajectories. Telemetry tags
498 attached to harbour seals in the FTEE have recorded some of these individuals hauling
499 out in the Firth of Forth and around Montrose (SMRU, *unpublished data*). Beyond these
500 areas, and the few animals now on the Ythan Estuary, the next nearest potential sources
501 of immigrants to the FTEE would be the Moray Firth or the Tees and Humber Estuaries
502 (Figure 1). These areas are > 200km away, so reestablishment of the FTEE population
503 would be unlikely to occur rapidly.

504

505 DISCUSSION

506 The data available to assess the extent of, and potential mechanisms for, the decline in
507 harbour seal numbers in the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary are diffuse and often sparse.
508 Nevertheless, analysis of these limited data provides insights into the potential
509 proximate causes for the rapid decline. Furthermore, they provide an avenue to explore
510 possible scenarios for the future of this population and the likely impact of specific

management policies. Such an approach may also be useful in other studies of populations where demographic data are limited or non-existent.

Using such data, the present study demonstrates that if the trends identified here continue at the present rate, harbour seals are likely to effectively disappear from the FTEE within the next 20 years. Exploration of the demographic parameters that could produce such changes indicate that the, presently unidentified, cause of the decline must be reducing adult survival (potentially in addition to reducing fecundity and/or pup survival). Simple projections and simulations demonstrate that, if the cause is immediately identified and removed, recovery of the population to the abundance when the SAC was designated is likely to take at least 40 years and that partial removal of the problem would have limited benefits. Thus there are unlikely to be any long-term benefits from introducing or reintroducing additional individuals while the problem persists.

Globally, harbour seals are classified as a species of ‘least concern’ on the IUCN Red List; however, the rapid population declines such as the one described here and in Orkney and Shetland (Thompson *et al.*, 2001; Lonergan *et al.*, 2007, 2013) represent significant regional losses of a large and iconic predator. In the FTEE population, a reduction in overall survival must be invoked to account for the rate of decline – but the potential causes of an increase in mortality are various and often inter-linked.

Substantial declines in food availability or accessibility could increase competition for limited resources between conspecifics, and with grey seals. Harbour seals tagged in the area foraged primarily in an area ~ 25-100 km from the haulout site (Sharples *et al.*, 2009, 2012), but there are few simultaneous telemetry data to assess whether grey seals actively exclude harbour seals from some areas. Given that there is a high degree of dietary overlap between the species and that both use the FTEE to haul out, there is considerable potential for overlap in foraging areas. If inter-specific competition is indeed hastening the demise of the FTEE harbour seal population, the question of any relevant management action remains. However, a reduction in harbour seal condition as a result of increased competition for resources would most likely be manifest in the

population as reduced fecundity and/or pup survival. In addition to natural mortality from predators, this has been proposed as an explanation for the decline of the harbour seal population on Sable Island, Canada (Bowen *et al.*, 2003). Reduced fecundity and/or pup survival could be a factor in the decline of the FTEE population but neither of these can wholly account for the rapid rate of decline observed. A substantial reduction in adult survival must also be invoked.

A notable recent phenomenon has been the discovery of multiple carcasses with 'corkscrew' or 'spiral' injuries on the east coast of Scotland and England (Thompson *et al.*, 2010a; Bexton *et al.*, 2012). The majority of these have been adult female harbour seals, or juvenile male grey seals. The pathology of these characteristic injuries is consistent with the animals being pulled through a ducted propeller (Bexton *et al.*, 2012), but there now exists unequivocal evidence that such injuries can be, and in some cases are being, inflicted by adult male grey seals (Thompson *et al.*, 2015; van Neer *et al.*, 2015). Investigations into the prevalence of this behaviour and its impact on harbour seal populations are ongoing. While the numbers of 'corkscrew' harbour seals recorded in the FTEE since 2008 are fairly low ($n = 36$), these are likely to underestimate total numbers because not all carcasses will be washed ashore, detected, or reported. Furthermore, the 6 corkscrew mortalities reported in 2013 represent >10% of the total number of animals counted at the FTEE that year. Clearly, mortality at this rate is not sustainable for this population.

Each year of delay in addressing the cause of the decline seems likely to both increase the risk of local extinction and further delay any recovery to historical abundances by several years. Future management actions should be focused on unequivocally identifying and ameliorating this, and other, potential sources of additional harbour seal mortality if the population is to be conserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Aerial surveys were funded by SNH and NERC. We thank colleagues at SMRU for their help conducting surveys. Preparation of this work benefited from discussions with C. Morris and A. Hall at the SMRU.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

575

576 REFERENCES

577 Akaike H. 1976. An information criterion (AIC). *Journal of Mathematical Science* **14**: 5–

578 9.

579 Beaugrand G. 2004. The North Sea regime shift: evidence, causes, mechanisms and

580 consequences. *Progress in Oceanography* **60**: 245–262.

581 Beaugrand G, Harlay X, Edwards M. 2014. Detecting plankton shifts in the North Sea:

582 a new abrupt ecosystem shift between 1996 and 2003. *Marine Ecology Progress*

583 *Series* **502**: 85–104.

584 Bexton S, Thompson D, Brownlow A, Barley J, Milne R, Bidewell C. 2012. Unusual

585 mortality of pinnipeds in the United Kingdom associated with helical

586 (corkscrew) injuries of anthropogenic origin. *Aquatic Mammals* **38**: 229–240.

587 Bowen WD, Ellis SL, Iverson SJ, Boness DJ. 2003. Maternal and newborn life-history

588 traits during periods of contrasting population trends: implications for explaining

589 the decline of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*), on Sable Island. *Journal of*

590 *Zoology* **261**: 155–163.

591 Burnham KP, Anderson DR. 2002. *Model selection and multimodel inference: a*

592 *practical information-theoretic approach*. Springer.

593 Burns JJ. 2008. Harbor Seal and Spotted Seal (*Phoca vitulina* and *P. largha*) (WF

594 Perrin, B Würsig, and JGM Thewissen, Eds). *Encyclopedia of Marine*

595 *Mammals*.

596 Cordes LS, Thompson PM. 2014. Mark-recapture modeling accounting for state

597 uncertainty provides concurrent estimates of survival and fecundity in a

598 protected harbor seal population. *Marine Mammal Science* **30**: 691–705.

- 599 Cordes LS, Thompson PM. 2015. Mark-resight estimates of seasonal variation in harbor
600 seal abundance and site fidelity. *Population Ecology*: 1–6.
- 601 Cunningham L, Baxter JM, Boyd IL, Duck CD, Lonergan M, Moss SE, McConnell B.
602 2009. Harbour seal movements and haul-out patterns: implications for
603 monitoring and management. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater
604 Ecosystems* **19**: 398–407.
- 605 Duck CD, Morris CD. 2011. Grey seal pup production in Britain in 2010. Sea Mammal
606 Research Unit, St Andrews, Scotland.
- 607 Duck CD, Morris CD. 2014. Surveys of harbour (common) and grey seals on the east,
608 north and north-west coast of Scotland and in Orkney, including the Moray Firth
609 and the Firth of Tay, in August 2013. No. 759. Scottish Nature Heritage.
- 610 Goodman SJ. 1998. Patterns of extensive genetic differentiation and variation among
611 European harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina vitulina*) revealed using microsatellite
612 DNA polymorphisms. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **15**: 104–118.
- 613 Harding KC, Fujiwara M, Axberg Y, Härkönen T. 2005. Mass-dependent energetics
614 and survival in harbour seal pups. *Functional Ecology* **19**: 129–135.
- 615 Härkönen T, Heide-Jørgensen M-P. 1990. Comparative life histories of east Atlantic
616 and other harbour seal populations. *Ophelia* **32**: 211–235.
- 617 Härkönen T, Harding KC, Heide-Jørgensen M-P. 2002. Rates of increase in age-
618 structured populations: a lesson from the European harbour seals. *Canadian
619 Journal of Zoology* **80**: 1498–1510.
- 620 Härkönen T, Harding K, Rasmussen TD, Teilmann J, Dietz R. 2007. Age- and sex-
621 specific mortality patterns in an emerging wildlife epidemic: the phocine
622 distemper in european harbour seals. *PLoS ONE*: e887.

623 Jones E, McConnell BJ, Sparling CE, Matthiopoulos J. 2013. Grey and harbour seal
624 usage maps. No. Version 2150. Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St
625 Andrews.

626 Lonergan M. 2014. Modelling beyond data is uninformative: a comment on ‘State-space
627 modelling reveals proximate causes of harbour seal population declines’ by
628 Matthiopoulos et al. *Oecologia* **175**: 1063–1067.

629 Lonergan M, Duck CD, Thompson D, Mackey BL, Cunningham L, Boyd IL. 2007.
630 Using sparse survey data to investigate the declining abundance of British
631 harbour seals: Harbour seal declines. *Journal of Zoology* **271**: 261–269.

632 Lonergan M, Thompson D, Thomas L, Duck C. 2011. An approximate Bayesian
633 method applied to estimating the trajectories of four British grey eal
634 (*Halichoerus grypus*) Populations from Pup Counts. *Journal of Marine Biology*
635 **2011**: 1–7.

636 Lonergan M, Duck C, Moss S, Morris C, Thompson D. 2013. Rescaling of aerial survey
637 data with information from small numbers of telemetry tags to estimate the size
638 of a declining harbour seal population. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and*
639 *Freshwater Ecosystems* **23**: 135–144.

640 Mackey BL, Durban JW, Middlemas SJ, Thompson PM. 2008. A Bayesian estimate of
641 harbour seal survival using sparse photo-identification data. *Journal of Zoology*
642 **274**: 18–27.

643 Matthiopoulos J, Cordes L, Mackey B, Thompson D, Duck C, Smout S, Caillat M,
644 Thompson P. 2014. State-space modelling reveals proximate causes of harbour
645 seal population declines. *Oecologia* **174**: 151–162.

- 646 Van Neer A, Jensen LF, Siebert U. 2015. Grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) predation on
647 harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) on the island of Helgoland, Germany. *Journal of*
648 *Sea Research* **97**: 1–4.
- 649 Onoufriou J, Thompson D. 2014. Testing the hypothetical link between shipping and
650 unexplained seal deaths: final report. No. USD2. Sea Mammal Research Unit,
651 University of St Andrews.
- 652 R Development Core Team. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical
653 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria.
- 654 SCOS. 2012. Scientific advice on matters related to the management of seal
655 populations: 2012. Sea Mammal Research Unit.
- 656 SCOS. 2013. Scientific advice on matters related to the management of seal
657 populations: 2013. Sea Mammal Research Unit.
- 658 Sharples RJ, Mackenzie ML, Hammond PS. 2009. Estimating seasonal abundance of a
659 central place forager using counts and telemetry data. *Marine Ecology Progress*
660 *Series* **378**: 289–298.
- 661 Sharples RJ, Moss SE, Patterson TA, Hammond PS. 2012. Spatial variation in foraging
662 behaviour of a marine top predator (*Phoca vitulina*) determined by a large-scale
663 satellite tagging program. *PLoS One* **7**: e37216.
- 664 Shephard S, Rindorf A, Dickey-Collas M, Hintzen NT, Farnsworth K, Reid DG. 2014.
665 Assessing the state of pelagic fish communities within an ecosystem approach
666 and the European Marine Strategy Framework Directive. *ICES Journal of*
667 *Marine Science: Journal du Conseil* **71**: 1572–1585.

668 Sparling C, Russell D, Lane E, Grellier K, Lonergan M, McConnell B, Matthiopoulos J,
669 Thompson D. 2012. Baseline seal information for the FTOWDG area. SMRUL-
670 FDG-2012-0 to FTOWDG.

671 Stanley HF, Casey S, Carnahan JM, Goodman S, Harwood J, Wayne RK. 1996.
672 Worldwide patterns of mitochondrial DNA differentiation in the harbor seal
673 (*Phoca vitulina*). *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **13**: 368–382.

674 Thompson D, Lonergan M, Duck C. 2005. Population dynamics of harbour seals *Phoca*
675 *vitulina* in England: monitoring growth and catastrophic declines. *Journal of*
676 *Applied Ecology* **42**: 638–648.

677 Thompson D, Bexton S, Brownlow A, Wood D, Patterson T, Pye K, Lonergan M,
678 Milne R. 2010a. Report on recent seal mortalities in UK waters caused by
679 extensive lacerations October 2010. NERC Sea Mammal Research Unit,
680 Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews.

681 Thompson D, Duck CD, Lonergan ME. 2010b. The status of harbour seals (*Phoca*
682 *vitulina*) in the United Kingdom. *NAMMCO Scientific Publications* **8**: 117–128.

683 Thompson D, Onoufriou J, Brownlow A, Bishop A. 2015. Preliminary report on
684 predation by adult grey seals on grey seal pups as a possible explanation for
685 corkscrew injury patterns seen in the unexplained seal deaths. No. USD 1&6
686 supplement. Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St Andrews.

687 Thompson P, Rothery P. 1987. Age and sex differences in the timing of moult in the
688 common seal, *Phoca vitulina*. *Journal of Zoology* **212**.

689 Thompson PM, Harwood J. 1990. Methods for estimating the population-size of
690 common seals, (*Phoca vitulina*). *Journal of Applied Ecology* **27**: 924–938.

- 1
2
3
4 691 Thompson PM, Kovacs KM, McConnell BJ. 1994. Natal dispersal of harbour seals
5
6 692 (*Phoca vitulina*) from breeding sites in Orkney, Scotland. *Journal of the*
7
8 693 *Zoology, London* **234**: 668–673.
9
10 694 Thompson PM, Mackay A, Tollit DJ, Enderby S, Hammond PS. 1998. The influence of
11
12 695 body size and sex on the characteristics of harbour seal foraging trips. *Canadian*
13
14 696 *Journal of Zoology* **76**: 1044–1053.
15
16
17 697 Thompson PM, Van Parijs S, Kovacs KM. 2001. Local declines in the abundance of
18
19 698 harbour seals: implications for the designation and monitoring of protected
20
21 699 areas. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **38**: 117–125.
22
23
24 700 TSEG. 2013. Aerial Surveys of Harbour Seals in the Wadden Sea in 2012: Substantial
25
26 701 increase in moult counts. Common Wadden Sea Secretariat, Wilhelmshaven.
27
28 702 Watts P. 1996. The diel hauling-out cycle of harbour seals in an open marine
29
30 703 environment: correlates and constraints. *Journal of Zoology* **240**: 175–200.
31
32
33 704 Wood SN. 2006. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Chapman &
34
35 705 Hall/CRC: Boca Raton.
36
37 706 Woods R. 2012. The State of the Natural Environment of the Tees Estuary (SONET): A
38
39 707 review of the seal chapter. Industry Nature Conservation Association.
40
41 708
42
43 709
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

710 **TABLES**

711 **Table 1:** Counts of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*)
712 hauled out during the annual moult in August in the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary
713 Special Area of Conservation since regular surveys began. Prior to 1990, counts were
714 made from boat-based surveys conducted during the breeding season (June/July). From
715 1990, counts were made from a fixed wing aircraft using standard photography, from a
716 helicopter using thermal imaging, or using both of these methods ('both').

Year	Harbour seals	Grey seals	Survey method
1971	296		boat
1971	170		boat
1975	208		boat
1984	310	259	boat
1990	467	912	fixed wing
1991	670	1549	fixed wing
1992	773	1226	fixed wing
1994	575	1468	fixed wing
1997	633	1891	thermal imaging
2000	700	2253	fixed wing
2002	668	1593	fixed wing
2003	461	1663	fixed wing
2004	459		fixed wing
2005	335	843	both
2006	342	1379	fixed wing
2007	275	1559	both
2008	222	508	fixed wing
2009	111	450	fixed wing
2010	124	1555	fixed wing
2011	77	1322	fixed wing
2012	88	1202	fixed wing
2013	50	482	thermal imaging

717

Table 2: Occurrence and sex of harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) mortalities from corkscrew injuries recorded on the east coast of Scotland south of Aberdeen.

	Male	Female	Unidentified
2008*		2	
2009*	1	3	
2010		8	1
2011	1	5	3
2012	4	2	
2013	3	2	1

* Likely under-reporting of corkscrew strandings in these years

Table 3: The number of years required for a population to increase from 100 to 600 individuals, at various annual growth rates. The final column is the number of additional years required to balance out the present population decline continuing at 19% for one additional year.

Annual growth rate	Approximate recovery time	Additional years per year of delay
3%	60	7
4.5%	40	5
6%	30	4
12%	16	2

Figure 1: Map of northeast England and eastern Scotland showing the location of the Firth of Tay & Eden estuary (FTEE) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and neighbouring harbour seal population sites. Harbour seals counts from 2013 are presented.

Figure 2: Numbers of harbour seals counted during surveys of the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary. Solid circles indicate aerial surveys that were carried out during the annual moult in August. The hollow squares indicate an earlier boat-based survey method that counted animals hauled out during the breeding season in June/July, and therefore may not be truly comparable to counts post-1990. The solid line is an estimated trajectory from a GLM where the rate of exponential population growth changed after 2000. The dark shaded region around it shows the associated 95% confidence intervals. The dashed curve (and 95% confidence interval) is the result of a GAM that assumes changes in the population growth rate changed smoothly over the period.

Figure 3: Numbers of grey seals counted during summer surveys of the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary Special Area of Conservation. Solid circles indicate aerial surveys that were carried out during the annual harbour seal moult in August. The hollow square indicates an earlier boat-based survey method that counted animals hauled out during the harbour seal breeding season in June/July, and therefore may not be truly comparable to counts post-1990. The dashed line is an estimated trajectory from a GAM, and shows a steady exponential decline. The shaded region around the trajectory shows the associated 95% confidence intervals.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

757 **Figure 4:** Projection of the GLM model (and 95% confidence intervals) of the harbour
758 seal counts in the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary shown in the red shaded region after
759 2013.
760

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4 761 **Figure 5:** Simulated trajectories for the decline of the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary
5
6 762 harbour seal population. Each line shows the numbers of females aged at least 1.
7
8 763 Populations that appear to recover from zero abundance are those that were reduced to
9
10 764 contain only juveniles. By neglecting the possibility of extinction through total loss of
11 765 males, this model is likely to overstate the length of time this population will survive.
12 766
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

635x423mm (72 x 72 DPI)

635x423mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Review

635x423mm (72 x 72 DPI)

635x423mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Review