

1 ***Title: Patterns of space use in sympatric marine colonial predators***
2 ***reveals scales of spatial partitioning***

3 **Authors:** Esther L. Jones^{1,2}, Bernie J. McConnell¹ (bm8@st-andrews.ac.uk), Sophie Smout^{1,2} (scs10@st-
4 andrews.ac.uk), Philip S. Hammond^{1,2} (psh2@st-andrews.ac.uk), Callan D. Duck¹ (c.duck@st-andrews.ac.uk),
5 Christopher D. Morris¹ (cdm21@st-andrews.ac.uk), David Thompson¹ (dt2@st-andrews.ac.uk), Deborah J.F.
6 Russell^{1,2} (dr60@st-andrews.ac.uk), Cecile Vincent³ (cecile.vincent@univ-lr.fr), Michelle Cronin⁴
7 (michelle.cronin@ucc.ie), Ruth J. Sharples⁵ (rjsharples@gmail.com), & Jason Matthiopoulos⁶
8 (jason.matthiopoulos@glasgow.ac.uk)

9 1. *Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 8LB*

10 2. *Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling, The Observatory, Buchanan Gardens*
11 *University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9LZ*

12 3. *CEBC, UMR 7372 CNRS/University of La Rochelle, Institut du Littoral et de l'Environnement (ILE), 2 rue*
13 *Olympe de Gouges, 17 000 La Rochelle, France*

14 4. *Coastal & Marine Research Centre, University College Cork, Naval Base, Haulbowline, Co. Cork, Ireland*

15 5. *Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, IMAS Sandy Bay, Private Bag 129,*
16 *Hobart, TAS, 7001, Australia*

17 6. *University of Glasgow, Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine, Graham Kerr*
18 *Building, Glasgow, G12 8QQ*

19 **Corresponding author:** Esther Jones, Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St
20 Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 8LB, el298@st-andrews.ac.uk, 01334 462663

21 **Running title:** grey & harbour seal usage

22 **Word count:** Title: 14, Abstract 217, Keywords 13, Main text 5,265 , Acknowledgements 122, References
23 1,744, Tables 186, Figure Legends 264.

24 1 table and 7 figures

25 ***Abstract***

26 Species distribution maps can provide important information to focus conservation efforts and enable spatial
27 management of human activities. Two sympatric marine predators, grey seals *Halichoerus grypus* and harbour
28 seals *Phoca vitulina* have overlapping ranges on land and at sea but contrasting population dynamics around
29 Britain: whilst grey seals have generally increased, harbour seals have shown significant regional declines. We
30 analysed two decades of at-sea movement data and terrestrial count data from these species to produce high
31 resolution, broad-scale maps of distribution and associated uncertainty to inform conservation and management.
32 Our results showed that grey seals use offshore areas connected to their haul-out sites by prominent corridors
33 and harbour seals primarily stay within 50km of the coastline. Both species show fine-scale offshore spatial
34 segregation off the east coast of Britain and broad-scale partitioning off western Scotland. These results
35 illustrate that for broad-scale marine spatial planning, the conservation needs of harbour seals (primarily
36 inshore, the exception being selected offshore usage areas) are different from those of grey seals (up to 100km
37 offshore and corridors connecting these areas to haul-out sites). More generally, our results illustrate the
38 importance of detailed knowledge of marine predator distributions to inform marine spatial planning; for
39 instance, spatial prioritisation is not necessarily the most effective spatial planning strategy even when
40 conserving species with similar taxonomy.

41 *Keywords: Halichoerus grypus, Phoca vitulina, density estimation, propagating uncertainty, species*
42 *distribution, telemetry, area-based conservation.*

43 ***Introduction***

44 The marine environment is affected to an increasing spatial extent and intensity through direct impacts of
45 anthropogenic activities including fisheries, energy extraction and shipping traffic (Merchant et al. 2014) and
46 through indirect impacts such as prey depletion due to fisheries or the effects of climate change (Guénette et al.
47 2006). Apex predators are particularly vulnerable to such impacts because their K-selected life histories limit the
48 speed at which they can respond to reductions in population size. Anthropogenic activities at sea can affect
49 marine predator distributions, particularly in the context of area-based conservation of species, and in relation to
50 the management of these activities, such as the rapid development of renewable energy extraction. One focus of
51 area-based conservation in the marine environment involves identifying areas with a high abundance of apex
52 predators (Hooker et al. 2011). However, areas shared by multiple predator species may not include optimal

53 habitat for any of those species (Williams et al. 2014). Williams et al. (2014) found that, at a regional scale,
54 areas of greatest overlap in marine mammal distributions excluded areas of highest density for all species.
55 Marine mammals are commonly used as indicators of ecosystem health (Boyd et al. 2006, Piatt & Sydeman
56 2007) and a good understanding of how their abundances are distributed is essential if marine protected areas for
57 them are to be effective.

58 There are a number of habitat-based methods for mapping species distributions (Matthiopoulos & Aarts
59 2010). However, these methods require covariate data, which may limit the geographical area over which
60 predictions can be made. When the focus is purely on spatial patterns, density estimation methodology offers a
61 flexible alternative in which the spatial extent is not restricted by external covariates (Silverman 1986).
62 Combining density-estimation methods with simple habitat models using only (distance-based) covariates that
63 are universally available to predict to areas where movement data are absent, we develop a generalised
64 framework to produce species distribution maps for terrestrial and marine animals integrating animal movement
65 and population data. Obtaining robust population-level insights from individual animal data is challenging
66 because such data can be difficult and expensive to collect and because the sample must be proportional to the
67 animals' prevalence in the population. Many factors affect the precision of inference from limited sampling such
68 as the underlying population structure and consistency in spatio-temporal behaviour. We propagate uncertainty
69 through the entire analysis from movement and population data to estimated space use distributions.

70 Our study focusses on grey and harbour seals, two sympatric species that inhabit much of the coasts and
71 continental shelf waters of northwest Europe. They are listed under Annex II of the European Habitats
72 Directive, which requires designation of marine protected areas (MPAs); these exist for terrestrial sites but
73 marine sites have not yet been proposed (JNCC 2010). As central place foragers, grey and harbour seal access to
74 the marine environment is restricted by the need to return to shore periodically between foraging trips
75 (Matthiopoulos et al. 2004). The two species have overlapping ranges on land and at sea, similar but variable
76 diets, and comparable but asynchronous life-cycles (McConnell et al. 1999, Sharples et al. 2009, Brown et al.
77 2012). They may therefore be expected to display spatial niche partitioning to some extent. If the spatial
78 component of niche partitioning at sea is strong, with little overlap in areas of highest density, this would have
79 implications for designation of marine MPAs based on relative abundance. Designating MPAs for multiple
80 species, sometimes known as “double badging”, is one way for management authorities to strengthen
81 conservation measures within limited resources. However, this would not be effective if there were strong
82 evidence of spatial partitioning.

83 An issue of particular interest in our study area is that although grey and harbour seals are sympatric
84 species and are therefore likely to be facing the same environmental stressors, they show opposing population
85 trends in some areas around Britain. Grey seal numbers have generally increased since at least 1984 and,
86 although stable in the Western and Northern Isles, are still increasing in the North Sea (Thomas 2013). Harbour
87 seals have declined in Orkney, Shetland and the east coast of Scotland since around 2000 but are stable in the
88 Western Isles (Lonergan et al. 2007, Duck et al. 2013). Possible causes of declines in harbour seal numbers
89 include direct mortality from vessel interactions (Bexton et al. 2012), the effects of infectious diseases (Hall et
90 al. 2006, Harris et al. 2008), biotoxin exposure (Hall & Frame 2010) or interspecific competition with grey seals
91 (Bowen et al. 2003, Svensson 2012). Knowledge of regional variation in the extent of overlap in the at-sea
92 distributions of grey and harbour seal populations could help to inform whether the two species compete for
93 food.

94 Here, we synthesise more than two decades of population and movement data around the continental shelf
95 of Britain, Ireland and France for two sympatric seal species. We describe species distributions for grey and
96 harbour seals, defined as ‘usage’, with robust estimates of uncertainty and investigate patterns of spatial
97 partitioning between the species. Our results are thus important to inform the placement of areas for
98 conservation, including in the context of concern about harbour seal population declines. They are also
99 important to inform other aspects of marine spatial planning, including local developments such as wind farms
100 and tidal turbines. The methods developed here can readily be used in other situations where the ranges of
101 central-place foragers (e.g. other pinnipeds, breeding seabirds, and terrestrial predators) overlap, and may be
102 useful for informing marine spatial planning issues in these cases.

103 *Methods*

104 Figure 1 shows a schematic flowchart of the analytical process, which synthesises movement and population
105 data to produce usage maps with accompanying uncertainty. Analyses were conducted using R 3.0.2 (R Core
106 Team 2014) and maps were produced using Manifold 8.0.28.0 (Manifold Software Limited 2013).

107 (1) **Population data:** Grey and harbour seals are surveyed during August when harbour seals are moulting and
108 haul-out on land for an extended period. During standard aerial surveys all seals along a specified coastline
109 are counted and coordinates are recorded to an accuracy of up to 50m. Surveys take place within two hours
110 of low tide when low tide is between 12:00 and 18:00 hours (Thompson et al. 2005, Lonergan et al. 2011).

111 Ground and boat-based count data collected by other organisations were also used in the analysis, and all
112 sources of data collection are summarised in Table 1. Figure 2 shows the locations of terrestrial counts.

113 (2) **Movement data:** Telemetry data from grey and harbour seals were obtained from two types of logging
114 device: Satellite Relay Data Logger (SRDL) tags that use the Argos satellite system for data transmission
115 and GPS phone tags that use the GSM mobile phone network with a hybrid Fastloc protocol (McConnell et
116 al. 2004, Argos 2011). Telemetry data were processed through a set of data-cleansing protocols to remove
117 null and missing values, and duplicated records from the analysis. Details of telemetry data are available in
118 Supplementary material, Appendix 1.

119 (3a) **Positional corrections:** Positional error, varying from 50m to over 2.5km affects SRDL telemetry points.
120 Errors were assigned by the Argos system to six location quality classes. We developed a Kalman filter to
121 obtain position estimates accounting for observation error (Royer & Lutcavage 2008). SRDL data were
122 first speed-filtered at 2ms^{-1} to eliminate outlying locations that would require an unrealistic travel speed
123 (McConnell et al. 1992). Observation model parameters were provided by the location quality class errors
124 from Vincent et al. (2002), and process model parameters were derived by species from the average speeds
125 of all GPS tags. GPS tags are generally more accurate than SRDL tags, and 75% of these data have an
126 expected error of less or equal to 55m (Dujon et al. 2014). However, occasional outliers were excluded
127 using thresholds of residual error and number of satellites.

128 (3b) **Interpolation:** Movement SRDL data were interpolated to 2-hour intervals using output from the Kalman
129 filter and merged with linearly interpolated GPS data that had been regularised to 2-hour intervals. A
130 regular grid of 5km resolution was created to encompass all telemetry data. 5km was selected based on the
131 computational trade-off between the resolution and spatial extent of the final maps. Data from 259 grey
132 seal tags (Supplementary material, Appendix 1 Table A1; Figure 3) and 277 harbour seal tags were used
133 (Supplementary material, Appendix 1 Table A2; Figure 3). The patterns of movement of the tagged
134 animals were assumed to be representative of the whole population (Lonergan et al. 2011). Tag
135 deployment occurs outside each species breeding and moulting seasons, and tags usually fall off when
136 animals moult. Therefore, telemetry data were primarily collected between June and December for grey
137 seals, and between January and June for harbour seals.

138 (3c) **Haul-out detection:** Haul-out events for both SRDL and GPS tags were defined as starting when the tag
139 sensor had been continuously dry for 10 minutes and ending when the tag had been continuously wet for

140 40 seconds. Haul-out event data were combined with positional data using date/time matching by
141 individual animal. Each event was then assigned to a particular geographical location. In the intervening
142 periods between successive haul-out events, a tagged animal was assumed to be at sea (if the tag provided
143 such information) or in an unknown state (if the tag did not).

144 (3d) **Haul-out aggregation:** Haul-out sites (defined by the telemetry data as any coastal location where at least
145 one haul-out event had occurred) were aggregated into 5x5km² grids (defined above). Haul-out events
146 occur on land or intertidal sandbanks. Haul-out sites were associated with a terrestrial count in order to
147 scale the analysis to population level. Firstly, telemetry haul-outs were linked to terrestrial counts based on
148 matching their grid cells. Secondly, if no match could be found, the nearest valid haul-out site visited by
149 the animal either directly before or after the unmatched haul-out site event was chosen. Thirdly, if an
150 animal had never been to a haul-out with associated terrestrial data during the time it was tagged, count
151 information was assigned from the nearest haul-out based on Euclidean distance.

152 (3e) **Trip detection:** Seals move between different haul-out sites. Individual's movements at-sea were divided
153 into trips, defined as the sequence of locations between defined haul-out events. Each location in a trip was
154 assigned to a haul-out site. After spending time at sea an animal could either return to its original haul-out
155 (classifying this part of the data as a return trip), or move to a new haul-out (giving rise to a transition trip).
156 Journeys between haul-out sites were divided temporally into two equal parts and the corresponding
157 telemetry data were attributed to the departure and termination haul-outs.

158 (3f) **Kernel smoothing:** Telemetry data are locations recorded at discrete time intervals. To transform these
159 into spatially continuous data representing the proportion of time animals spend at different locations we
160 kernel smoothed the data. The KS library in R (Chacón & Duong 2010) was used to estimate spatial
161 bandwidth of the 2D kernel applied to each animal/haul-out map using the unconstrained plug-in selector
162 ('Hpi') and kernel density estimator ('kde') to fit a usage surface. Kernel smoothing can be sensitive to the
163 choice of smoothing parameter and serial correlation in the observations. However, thinning the data to
164 eliminate autocorrelation would have meant a significant loss of information. Instead, the average tag
165 duration (grey seals=124 days, harbour seals=99 days) was determined to be long enough to counteract
166 bandwidth sensitivity (Blundell et al. 2001, Fieberg 2007). Only at-sea locations were smoothed because
167 haul-outs were fixed locations and known without uncertainty at the scale of the analysis. Therefore, haul-
168 out locations were incorporated back into the maps as discrete grid square usages.

169 (3g) **Information content weighting:** To account for differences in tag operation duration, an Index of
170 Information Content (Supplementary material, Appendix 2) was derived. This ensured the importance of
171 animals with short tag-lifespans was reduced and animals with heavily auto-correlated location data were
172 not overrepresented. A ‘discovery’ rate was determined for each species, defined as the total number of
173 new grid cells visited as a function of tag lifespan, and modelled using Generalised Additive Models
174 (GAMs) (Wood 2006, 2011). Explanatory covariates were tag lifespan, type of tag (SRDL or GPS), and
175 (for grey seals) age of each animal (1+ or pup). Each animal/haul-out map was multiplied by a normalised
176 discovery rate (termed as an *Information Content Weighting*) and all maps connected to each haul-out were
177 aggregated and normalised to 1.

178 **4. Population scaling:** The population at each haul-out was estimated from terrestrial count data, which was
179 rescaled to allow for the proportion of animals that were at sea when surveys were carried out. Using the
180 mean species haul-out probabilities over all available months and their variances, we derived a distribution
181 (Supplementary material, Appendix 3) of population estimates ranging from the value of each terrestrial
182 count (minimum population size) to 100 times the count (maximum population size). The distribution was
183 sampled using parametric bootstrapping 500 times per count to produce a distribution of estimates. These
184 data were then processed through a decision tree to produce current population estimates and variances,
185 given the limitations in fine-scale data. From herein, population numbers are given based on these
186 estimates.

187 **5. Population uncertainty:** Population-level uncertainty incorporated observational, sampling, and scaling
188 errors (Supplementary material, Appendix 3). ‘Population scaling’ (explained above) produced estimates
189 of population variance for each haul-out.

190 **6. Individual-level uncertainty:** Within haul-out uncertainty accounted for the differences in the magnitude
191 of data collected by an animal over its tag lifespan, and for variation in the parameters of the tag itself.
192 Variance was modelled using data-rich sites (determined experimentally to be those sites which had 7 or
193 more animals associated with them) (Supplementary material, Appendix 3). Variance was estimated using
194 linear models with explanatory covariates of sample size (number of animals at the haul-out), and mean
195 usage of seals. The models predicted variance for data-poor and null usage sites (where population data
196 existed but movement data did not, see ‘Accessibility modelling’ below). Within-haul-out variance was
197 estimated for null usage sites by setting the sample size of the uncertainty model to 0. Individual and
198 population-level variances were combined to form uncertainty estimates for the usage maps

199 (Supplementary material, Appendix 3). Usage and variance by haul-out were aggregated to a total usage
200 and variance map for each species. Estimates of haul-out usage were then added to at-sea usage to generate
201 maps of total usage.

202 **7. Accessibility modelling:** For haul-outs that had terrestrial counts but did not have associated telemetry
203 data, we estimated usage in the form of accessibility maps (Supplementary material, Appendix 4). We
204 modelled the expected decay of usage with increasing distance from the haul-out in the absence of between
205 haul-out spatial heterogeneity. To ensure the spatial extent of the analysis was not restricted by availability
206 of environmental data, simple habitat models were built using covariates of geodesic and shore distance
207 from haul-out in a Generalised Linear Model (GLM) for each species (McCullagh & Nelder 1989).
208 Previous studies have shown that UK grey and harbour seal habitat preference is primarily driven by
209 distance to haul-out site (geodesic distance) (Aarts et al. 2008, Bailey et al. 2014). The model predicted
210 usage for each haul-out that was normalised and weighted by the mean proportion of time animals spent
211 not hauled out. Mean and variance were scaled to population size by combining each one with the
212 population mean and variance estimates of each haul-out and these were aggregated to the total usage map
213 for each species.

214 The methodology described above is based on (Matthiopoulos et al. 2004). However, the methodology was
215 changed significantly and extended to ensure the analysis could be resolved to a fine-scale, that all available
216 telemetry data could be included (see ‘Trip detection’), and that more sources of variability were incorporated
217 and propagated through the analysis to produce continuous uncertainty estimates.

218 *Spatial comparisons between species*

219 To compare spatial use between species, an index ($s_i = M_{i(Hg)} - M_{i(Pv)}$) was calculated to show the global
220 difference in the two species’ at-sea distributions, where estimated usage (M_i) was the number of animals
221 expected to use grid cell i . (Hg) refers to grey seals, (Pv) to harbour seals.

222 *Results*

223 Movement data were analysed from 259 grey seal and 277 harbour seal telemetry tags deployed between 1991
224 and 2013. These were combined with terrestrial counts collected between 1996 and 2013. Combined hauled-out
225 and at-sea usage of grey and harbour seals around Britain, Ireland, and France are shown in Figure 4, with
226 uncertainty. Both species’ usage is concentrated around Scotland, reflecting the terrestrial distribution of seals

227 around Britain, Ireland and France (Duck & Morris 2013). Grey seal distribution is widespread with high usage
228 areas close to the coast linked with high usage offshore (Figure 4a). In some areas these offshore areas coincide
229 with rocky ridges such as Stanton Banks south of Barra, west Scotland; and sandbanks such as West Bank in the
230 Moray Firth, and Dogger Bank in the southern North Sea (see Figure 7 for named locations). The linking
231 corridors of usage provide insight into how grey seals move between regions. Grey seal usage extends over the
232 continental shelf off the west coast of Scotland and Ireland. The largest aggregation of high usage was around
233 the Orkney Islands. Grey seal usage around Ireland was primarily coastal, with limited movement between
234 Ireland and other areas of high usage around Britain.

235 By contrast, Figure 4b shows that harbour seals remain close to the coast in a number of apparently discrete
236 local populations around Britain and Ireland, with little movement among them. However, in the Moray Firth
237 and Firth of Tay, eastern Scotland, they spent time offshore at Smith Bank and Marr Bank, and from The Wash,
238 England, they travelled to sandbanks up to 150km offshore (see Figure 7 for named locations). Offshore usage
239 from The Wash in particular can be seen in fine-scale detail due to the large sample size (59 tagged animals) in
240 this region. At-sea usage of each species calculated within buffers of increasing distance from the coast shows
241 that harbour seals were more likely to stay close to the coast, spending only 3% of their time at distances greater
242 than 50km from the coast (Figure 5). By contrast, grey seals spent 12% of their time at distances greater than
243 50km from the coast. Movements of harbour seals shown by the data underpinning the usage maps, confirm that
244 although they do not usually travel as far offshore as grey seals, they show considerable movement parallel to
245 the coast, resulting in concentrated patches of high coastal usage.

246 Figure 6 shows the difference, by grid cell, between the predicted abundance of grey and harbour seals as a
247 measure of the distribution of each species relative to the other. Grey seal prevalence is expected because the
248 population is much larger than that of harbour seals. From the usage maps, estimated total abundance of grey
249 seals is 109,500 (95% CI=75,900-185,400), and the estimate of harbour seals is 44,000 (95% CI=20,800-
250 68,000), which are similar to the published UK population estimates for 2012 for grey (O Cadhla et al. 2013,
251 Thomas 2013) and harbour seals (Duck et al. 2013). Harbour seals were dominant in the southernmost part of
252 the North Sea, around specific haul-out sites in northern France, west Scotland, parts of Ireland, and in localised
253 offshore patches in the Moray Firth, off the west coast Orkney, and around Shetland.

254 *Discussion*

255 We describe for the first time the species distributions of two sympatric marine predators in fine resolution and
256 at a broad-scale with estimates of uncertainty. Our analysis allows us to compare patterns of marine space use
257 between the two species to provide insight into the extent to which they divide or share the common space
258 available to them. In the context of variation in regional population trajectories, we can explore how patterns of
259 spatial overlap between the species at sea relate to recent declines in some harbour seal populations. An
260 application of our results is that they enable us to provide scientific advice on the areas of most importance to
261 each species to inform conservation and management. Our results show that at-sea usage of harbour seals is
262 heterogeneous with small patches of highly concentrated numbers of animals, indicative of the discrete regional
263 populations found around Britain, Ireland, and France (Vincent et al. 2010, Cronin 2011, Sharples et al. 2012).
264 On the east coast, harbour seals spend a high proportion of time at offshore sandbanks, indicative of foraging
265 areas (Thompson et al. 1996). In contrast, grey seal usage is characterised by a series of interconnected highly
266 utilised offshore areas that include known foraging sites (Matthiopoulos et al. 2004, McClintock et al. 2012).
267 These differences in the way the two species use the marine environment may have consequences for their
268 population dynamics in relation to changes in local prey availability (Sharples et al. 2009), disease transmission
269 (Herreman et al. 2011), and their vulnerability to metapopulation collapses (Coltman et al. 1998, Matthiopoulos
270 et al. 2005). In the south-eastern North Sea, where there is a separation of usage between grey and harbour seals,
271 harbour seal numbers are increasing. This pattern is repeated at a finer-scale in the Moray Firth, an area where
272 the harbour seal population has historically fluctuated but has appeared to stabilise in recent years (Duck et al.
273 2013). In both these areas, harbour seals utilise different offshore sandbanks, which are likely foraging areas
274 (Tollit et al. 1998, McClintock et al. 2012). However, in the Firth of Tay (see Figure 7), where the population of
275 harbour seals has declined to fewer than 200 animals (Duck et al. 2013), both species utilise the same offshore
276 patch. West of Scotland and around Ireland, harbour seal populations are stable and use coastal areas (such as
277 sea lochs and harbours) that grey seals do not, suggesting an inshore foraging distribution. These patterns give
278 an indication that offshore spatial overlap may be detrimental to harbour seals but further studies incorporating
279 information on seal diet and body condition, and prey distribution and abundance are required before
280 conclusions can be reached. However, there is corroborating evidence from other populations where the species
281 co-exist to demonstrate that interspecific competition between grey and harbour seals is prevalent. Within their
282 range, grey and harbour seals co-exist in the northeast Atlantic and along the east coasts of North America and
283 Canada. A decline in harbour seals throughout the 1990s at Sable Island, Canada has been partly attributed to
284 inter-specific competition for shared food resources with grey seals (Bowen et al. 2003). On the east coast of the

285 US, in New England, seal haul-out sites that were once dominated by harbour seals are now designated as
286 shared sites, or dominated by grey seals (Gilbert et al. 2005, Waring et al. 2010). Recent abundance estimates
287 indicate the harbour seal population may be declining and therefore the increasing and spatially expanding grey
288 seal population needs to be evaluated (Gordon Waring, pers. comm.).

289 *Assumptions and limitations*

290 We assumed that the spatial distributions of each species were in equilibrium to allow 22 years of movement
291 data to be integrated. Inter-annual variability in the movement data was captured in the maps so that they show
292 the largest extent to distributions possible. However, population dynamics of both species have changed
293 considerably in recent history, and therefore pressures of density dependence at some haul-outs may have
294 altered, speculatively leading to changes in the metapopulation dynamics of each species. Therefore, we
295 recommend that future telemetry deployments should carry out repeat tagging for each species in similar areas
296 to enable estimates of temporal heterogeneity in spatial distribution that could be integrated into haul-out
297 uncertainty estimates. Parameters differed between telemetry tags depending on the purpose for which they were
298 built. Two processes enabled the tags to be directly compared: Regularising the tracks accounted for differences
299 in call attempts, call abortions, haul-out sampling rates, and the minimum number of satellites needed;
300 weighting individual animals by their ‘Information Content Weighting’ (Supplementary material, Appendix 2)
301 accounted for the cut-off date for call attempts and the wet/dry sensor failure criteria.

302 The at-sea and on-land distributions of grey and harbour seals vary seasonally (Thompson et al. 1996)
303 and annually (Duck & Morris 2013, Duck et al. 2013). Therefore, to directly compare distributions at a
304 population-level we used terrestrial count data from August. There were seasonal gaps in the telemetry data for
305 each species at different times of the year. However, our examination of spatial partitioning between the two
306 species is based on the assumption that patterns of usage remain constant. Grey seals show high pupping site
307 fidelity to aggregated colonies during the breeding season (Pomeroy et al. 2005). However, some animals travel
308 to a site to pup but return after only a few weeks to non-breeding haul-out regions (Russell et al. 2013). This
309 suggests that animals providing telemetry data during the breeding season may deviate from their non-breeding
310 behaviour for only a short time, having little impact on grey seal usage distribution. Male and female harbour
311 seals have been shown to restrict their foraging range during the breeding season (Thompson et al. 1994, Van
312 Parijs et al. 1997). However, lactation lasts around 24 days (Bowen et al. 1992), so this temporary behaviour is
313 also unlikely to impact harbour seal usage distribution. To explore changes in the way that distributions of both

314 species may vary annually and seasonally, more data collection is required. In future, this may be possible
315 through telemetry devices encompassing new technology such as extended tag lifetimes (years rather than
316 months) and with the advent of more affordable devices so that tags could be deployed to many more animals.

317 *Informing conservation and management*

318 Quantifying species distributions and understanding the differences in the way apex predators utilise the marine
319 environment has important implications for the impacts of anthropogenic activities and management action to
320 mitigate them. Grey and harbour seals are both listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive, which has led to the
321 designation by the governments of the UK and the Republic of Ireland of a number of terrestrial marine
322 protected areas (MPAs), where grey or harbour seals are a qualifying feature (JNCC 2012), NPWS, unpublished
323 data). No offshore MPAs have been proposed yet for these species, primarily because of the lack of robust
324 science to inform this process. Here, we provide valuable new information, which together with other recent
325 work (e.g. Russell et al. 2013), will allow governments to move towards selecting suitable sites to propose as
326 marine MPAs for grey and harbour seals. We have shown that both species of seal spend the majority of their
327 time at sea up to 50km from the coast but these areas are more important to harbour seals because they rarely
328 move further from the coast; conservation and management action for harbour seals should therefore be focused
329 in this zone. The exceptions are off The Wash and in the Moray Firth, where harbour seals spend more time
330 further offshore. Grey seal distribution is more extensive and our results show that both offshore (presumed)
331 foraging habitat and the transition corridors that link these foraging areas to haul-out sites are important to
332 consider in the process of selecting marine MPAs. An important practical point arising from our results is that
333 the uncertainty estimate for each grid square provides information about how representative the mean is of the
334 underlying population. This provides information on the need for further data collection in areas of interest to
335 conservation and management. Additionally, they can be used directly in conservation planning tools such as
336 Zonation software (<http://cbig.it.helsinki.fi/software/zonation/>) that identifies areas important for habitat quality
337 retention.

338 One issue of increasing conservation concern is the continuing rapid increase in marine renewable
339 energy extraction in European waters (Edrén et al. 2010, Skeate et al. 2012, Thompson et al. 2013). Our results
340 show that the impact of these developments on grey and harbour seals may vary because of differences in their
341 spatial distributions. The effects of near-shore devices will potentially have a greater impact on harbour seals
342 because a relatively greater proportion of the population will be exposed to the development. Conversely, a

343 larger proportion of the grey seal population will be exposed to developments far offshore where corridors of
344 usage form networks among offshore areas of high usage and haul-out sites. Through comparing grey and
345 harbour seal distributions, we found spatial partitioning over varying spatial scales showing that sympatric apex
346 predators have dissimilarities in their spatial patterns in this case. Therefore, it should not be assumed that
347 spatial prioritisation can be used effectively to conserve species at similar trophic levels or taxonomic groups,
348 and there is a requirement for careful analysis of their distributions, as presented here, to properly inform spatial
349 planning mechanisms.

350 ***Broader applications***

351 Animal-borne sensors have developed and advanced over the past 25 years, allowing many species to be tagged
352 and producing large amounts of movement data (e.g. movebank.org). The species density estimation combined
353 with simple habitat model framework presented here is applicable to a range of applications and datasets. This
354 methodology will be pertinent to species where movement patterns of the whole population cannot be observed
355 but population count data can be linked explicitly. In studies of marine central-place foragers, both sexes of
356 seals and some seabirds can be counted reliably on land, tagged, and then tracked at sea, allowing insight into
357 their spatial distribution. In the terrestrial environment, the methodology can be applied more widely as many
358 terrestrial predators tend to be central-place foragers (e.g. wolves (*Canis lupus*) Sand et al. 2005) and so relevant
359 movement and population data are more readily available. Additionally, for environments where covariate data
360 are spatially extensive and continuous, the accessibility modelling framework presented here could be extended
361 to include readily available environmental covariates.

362 ***Acknowledgements***

363 We thank the following people and institutions: Professor Paul Thompson, University of Aberdeen; Dr Carol
364 Sparling, SMRU Marine; Ed Rowsell and Barry Collins, Chichester Harbour Conservancy; Jolyon Chesworth,
365 Langstone Harbour Authority; Industry Nature Conservation Association; ZSL; Marine Current Turbines Ltd;
366 Northern Ireland Environment Agency; Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht and the Islands; Countryside
367 Council for Wales; Welsh Assembly Government; Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH); National Environmental
368 Research Council (NERC); Lisa Morgan, RSPB; Kate Lock and the Skomer Island wardens, Natural Resources
369 Wales.

370 E.L.J. and D.J.F.R. was funded under Scottish Government grant MMSS001/01. D.J.F.R. was funded by the UK
371 Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) as part of their Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental
372 Assessment programme. S.S. was part-funded by the EU MYFISH project.

373

374 **References**

- 375 Aarts G, Mackenzie ML, McConnell BJ, Fedak M, Matthiopoulos J (2008) Estimating space-use and habitat
376 preference from wildlife telemetry data. *Ecography* 31:140–160
- 377 Argos (2011) Argos User’s Manual 2007-2011. CLS
- 378 Bailey H, Hammond PS, Thompson PM (2014) Modelling harbour seal habitat by combining data from multiple
379 tracking systems. *J Exp Mar Bio Ecol* 450:30–39
- 380 Bexton S, Thompson D, Brownlow A, Barley J, Milne R, Bidewell C (2012) Unusual Mortality of Pinnipeds in
381 the United Kingdom Associated with Helical (Corkscrew) Injuries of Anthropogenic Origin. *Aquat*
382 *Mamm* 38:229–240
- 383 Blundell GM, Maier Julie A K, Debevec EM (2001) Linear home ranges: effects of smoothing, sample size, and
384 autocorrelation on kernel estimates. *Ecol Monogr* 71:469–489
- 385 Bowen WD, Ellis SL, Iverson SJ, Boness DJ (2003) Maternal and newborn life-history traits during periods of
386 contrasting population trends: implications for explaining the decline of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*), on
387 Sable Island. *J Zool* 261:155–163
- 388 Bowen WD, Oftedal OT, Boness DJ (1992) Mass and energy transfer during lactation in a small Phocid, the
389 Harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*). *Phys Zool* 65:844–866
- 390 Boyd IL, Wanless S, Camphuysen CJ (Eds) (2006) Top predators in marine ecosystems: their role in monitoring
391 and management. Cambridge University Press
- 392 Brown SL, Bearhop S, Harrod C, McDonald RA (2012) A review of spatial and temporal variation in grey and
393 common seal diet in the United Kingdom and Ireland. *J Mar Biol Assoc UK* 92:1711–1722
- 394 Chacón JE, Duong T (2010) Multivariate plug-in bandwidth selection with unconstrained pilot bandwidth
395 matrices. *Test* 19:375–398
- 396 Coltman DW, Bowen WD, Wright JM (1998) Birth weight and neonatal survival of harbour seal pups are
397 positively correlated with genetic variation measured by microsatellites. *Proc Biol Sci / R Soc* 265:803–
398 809
- 399 Cronin MA (2011) The conservation of seals in Irish waters: How research informs policy. *Mar Policy* 35:748–
400 755

401 Duck CD, Morris CD (2013) Grey seal pup production in Britain in 2012: First complete survey using a digital
402 system. SCOS Briefing Paper

403 Duck CD, Morris CD, Thompson D (2013) The status of UK harbour seal populations in 2012. SCOS Briefing
404 Paper

405 Dujon AM, Lindstrom RT, Hays GC (2014) The accuracy of Fastloc-GPS locations and implications for animal
406 tracking. *Methods Ecol Evol* 5:1162–1169

407 Edrén SMC, Andersen SM, Teilmann J, Carstensen J, Harders PB, Dietz R, Miller LA (2010) The effect of a
408 large Danish offshore wind farm on harbor and gray seal haul-out behavior. *Mar Mammal Sci* 26:614–634

409 Fieberg J (2007) Kernel density estimators of home range: smoothing and the autocorrelation red herring.
410 *Ecology* 88:1059–1066

411 Gilbert JR, Waring GT, Wynne KM, Guldager N (2005) Changes in abundance of harbor seal in Maine, 1981-
412 2001. *Mar Mammal Sci* 21:519–535

413 Guénette S, Heymans SJJ, Christensen V, Trites AW (2006) Ecosystem models show combined effects of
414 fishing, predation, competition, and ocean productivity on Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) in
415 Alaska. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 63:2495–2517

416 Hall AJ, Frame E (2010) Evidence of domoic acid exposure in harbour seals from Scotland: A potential factor in
417 the decline in abundance? *Harmful Algae* 9:489–493

418 Hall AJ, Jepson PD, Goodman SJ, Härkönen T (2006) Phocine distemper virus in the North and European Seas
419 – Data and models, nature and nurture. *Biol Conserv* 131:221–229

420 Harris CM, Travis JMJ, Harwood J (2008) Evaluating the influence of epidemiological parameters and host
421 ecology on the spread of phocine distemper virus through populations of harbour seals. *PLoS One* 3:e2710

422 Hassani S, Dupuis L, Elder JF, Caillot E, Gautier G, Hemon A, Lair JM, Haelters J (2010) A note on harbour
423 seal (*Phoca vitulina*) distribution and abundance in France and Belgium. *NAMMCO Sci Publ* 8:107–116

424 Herreman JK, McIntosh AD, Dziuba RK, Blundell GM, Ben-David M, Greiner EC (2011) Parasites of harbor
425 seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in Glacier Bay and Prince William Sound, Alaska. *Mar Mammal Sci* 27:247–253

426 Hooker SK, Cañadas A, Hyrenbach KD, Corrigan C, Polovina JJ, Reeves RR (2011) Making protected area
427 networks effective for marine top predators. *Endanger Species Res* 13:203–218

428 JNCC (2010) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.
429 Available [online] <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1374>. [Accessed 19/07/2012]

430 JNCC (2012) 1365 Harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*). Available [online]
431 <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/ProtectedSites/SACselection/species.asp?FeatureIntCode=S1365>. [Accessed
432 19/07/2012]

433 Leeney RH, Broderick AC, Mills C, Sayer S, Witt MJ, Godley BJ (2010) Abundance, distribution and haul-out
434 behaviour of grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) in Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly, UK. *J Mar Biol Assoc*
435 *United Kingdom* 90:1033–1040

436 Lonergan M, Duck CD, Thompson D, Mackey BL, Cunningham L, Boyd IL (2007) Using sparse survey data to
437 investigate the declining abundance of British harbour seals. *J Zool* 271:261–269

438 Lonergan M, Duck C, Thompson D, Moss SE, McConnell BJ (2011) British grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*)
439 abundance in 2008: an assessment based on aerial counts and satellite telemetry. *ICES J Mar Sci* 68:2201–
440 2209

441 Manifold Software Limited (2013) Manifold System Ultimate Edition 8.0.28.0.

442 Matthiopoulos J, Aarts G (2010) The spatial analysis of marine mammal abundance. In: Boyd IL, Bowen WD,
443 Iverson SJ (eds) *Marine Mammal Ecology and Conservation: A Handbook of Techniques*. Oxford
444 University Press, p 68–97

445 Matthiopoulos J, Harwood J, Thomas L (2005) Metapopulation consequences of site fidelity for colonially
446 breeding mammals and birds. *J Anim Ecol* 74:716–727

447 Matthiopoulos J, McConnell BJ, Duck C, Fedak M (2004) Using satellite telemetry and aerial counts to estimate
448 space use by grey seals around the British Isles. *J Appl Ecol* 41:476–491

449 McClintock BT, King R, Thomas L, Matthiopoulos J, McConnell BJ, Morales JM (2012) A general discrete-
450 time modeling framework for animal movement using multistate random walks. *Ecol Monogr* 82:335–349

451 McConnell BJ, Beaton R, Bryant E, Hunter C, Lovell P, Hall AJ (2004) Phoning home - A new GSM mobile
452 phone telemetry system to collect mark-recapture data. *Mar Mammal Sci* 20:274–283

453 McConnell BJ, Chambers C, Fedak MA (1992) Foraging ecology of southern elephant seals in relation to the
454 bathymetry and productivity of the Southern Ocean. *Antarct Sci* 4:393–398

455 McConnell BJ, Fedak MA, Lovell P, Hammond PS (1999) Movements and foraging areas of grey seals in the
456 North Sea. *J Appl Ecol* 36:573–590

457 McCullagh P, Nelder JA (1989) *Generalized Linear Models*. Chapman & Hall, London

458 Merchant ND, Pirota E, Barton TR, Thompson PM (2014) Monitoring ship noise to assess the impact of coastal
459 developments on marine mammals. *Mar Pollut Bull* 78:85–95

460 O Cadhla O, Keena T, Strong D, Duck C, Hiby L (2013) Monitoring of the breeding population of grey seals in
461 Ireland, 2009 - 2012. *Irish Wildl Manuals*

462 Parijs SM Van, Thompson PM, Tollit DJ, Mackay A (1997) Distribution and activity of male harbour seals
463 during the mating season. *Anim Behav* 54:35–43

464 Piatt JF, Sydeman WJ (2007) Seabirds as indicators of marine ecosystems. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 352:199–204

465 Pomeroy PP, Redman PR, Ruddell SJS, Duck CD, Twiss SD (2005) Breeding site choice fails to explain
466 interannual associations of female grey seals. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 57:546–556

467 R Core Team (2014) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical
468 Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>

469 Royer F, Lutcavage M (2008) Filtering and interpreting location errors in satellite telemetry of marine animals. *J*
470 *Exp Mar Bio Ecol* 359:1–10

471 Russell DJF, McConnell BJ, Thompson D, Duck C, Morris C, Harwood J, Matthiopoulos J (2013) Uncovering
472 the links between foraging and breeding regions in a highly mobile mammal (A Punt, Ed.). *J Appl Ecol*
473 50:499–509

474 Sand H, Zimmermann B, Wabakken P, Andren H, Pedersen HC (2005) GPS Technology Using GPS technology
475 and GIS cluster analyses to estimate kill rates in wolf-ungulate ecosystems. *Wildl Soc Bull* 33:914–925

476 Sayer S, Hockley C, Witt MJ (2012) Monitoring grey seals (*Halichoerus grypus*) in the Isles of Scilly during the
477 2010 pupping season. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR103

478 Sharples RJ, Mackenzie ML, Hammond PS (2009) Estimating seasonal abundance of a central place forager
479 using counts and telemetry data. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 378:289–298

480 Sharples RJ, Moss SE, Patterson TA, Hammond PS (2012) Spatial Variation in Foraging Behaviour of a Marine
481 Top Predator (*Phoca vitulin*) Determined by a Large-Scale Satellite Tagging Program. *PLoS One* 7

482 Silverman BW (1986) Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis, 1st edn. Chapman & Hall

483 Skeate ER, Perrow MR, Gilroy JJ (2012) Likely effects of construction of Scroby Sands offshore wind farm on
484 a mixed population of harbour *Phoca vitulina* and grey *Halichoerus grypus* seals. Mar Pollut Bull 64:872–
485 881

486 Svensson CJ (2012) Seal dynamics on the Swedish west coast : Scenarios of competition as Baltic grey seal
487 intrude on harbour seal territory. J Sea Res 71:9–13

488 Thomas L (2013) Estimating the size of the UK grey seal population between 1984 and 2012, using established
489 and draft revised priors. SCOS Briefing Paper

490 Thompson PM, Brookes KL, Graham IM, Barton TR, Needham K, Bradbury G, Merchant ND (2013) Short-
491 term disturbance by a commercial two-dimensional seismic survey does not lead to long-term
492 displacement of harbour porpoises. Proc Biol Sci

493 Thompson D, Lonergan M, Duck C (2005) Population dynamics of harbour seals *Phoca vitulina* in England :
494 monitoring growth and catastrophic declines. J Appl Ecol 42:638–648

495 Thompson PM, McConnell BJ, Tollit DJ, Mackay A, Hunter C, Racey PA (1996) Comparative distribution,
496 movements and diet of harbour and grey seals from Moray Firth, NE Scotland. J Appl Ecol 33:1572–1584

497 Thompson PM, Miller D, Cooper R, Hammond PS (1994) Changes in the distribution and activity of female
498 harbour seals during the breeding season : implications for their lactation strategy and mating patterns. J
499 Anim Ecol 63:24–30

500 Tollit DJ, Black AD, Thompson PM, Mackay A, Corpe HM, Wilson B, Parijs SM, Grellier K, Parlane S (1998)
501 Variations in harbour seal *Phoca vitulina* diet and dive-depths in relation to foraging habitat. J Zool
502 244:209–222

503 Vincent C, McConnell BJ, Delayat S, Elder J-F, Gautier G, Ridoux V (2010) Winter habitat use of harbour seals
504 (*Phoca vitulina*) fitted with FastlocTM GPS/GSM tags in two tidal bays in France. NAMMCO Sci Publ
505 8:285–302

506 Vincent C, McConnell BJ, Ridoux V, Fedak MA (2002) Assessment of SRDL Location Accuracy From
507 Satellite Tags Deployed on Captive Gray Seals. Mar Mammal Sci 18:156–166

508 Waring GT, Gilbert JR, Belden D, Atten A Van, Digiovanni RA (2010) A review of the status of harbour seals
509 (*Phoca vitulina*) in the Northeast United States of America. NAMMCO Sci Publ 8:191–212

510 Westcott SM, Stringell TB (2004) Grey seal distribution and abundance in North Wales, 2002-2003. Bangor,
511 CCW Marine Monitoring Report No. 13. 80pp

512 Williams R, Grand J, Hooker SK, Buckland ST, Reeves RR, Rojas-Bracho L, Sandilands D, Kaschner K (2014)
513 Prioritizing global marine mammal habitats using density maps in place of range maps. *Ecography* (Cop)
514 37:212–220

515 Wood SN (2006) *Generalized Additive Models: an Introduction with R*. Chapman & Hall

516 Wood SN (2011) Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric
517 generalized linear models. *J R Stat Soc Ser B (Statistical Methodol)* 73:3–36

518

519

520

521 **Figures & tables**


522 Table 1. Summary of grey and harbour seal terrestrial surveys. Unless specified otherwise in the description, all
 523 surveys took place during August.

Area surveyed	Method	Description	Data used
Scotland	Aerial survey (helicopter)	Both species surveyed every 1-5 years using SMRU protocol	1996-2013
Moray Firth, Firth of Tay, Donna Nook, The Wash in East Anglia, and Thames estuary	Aerial survey (fixed-wing)	Both species surveyed annually using SMRU protocol	1996-2013
Chichester and Langstone harbour	Ground counts through Chichester Harbour Authority	Harbour seals surveyed annually	1999-2012
Cornwall and Isles of Scilly, south-west England	Boat survey (Leeney et al. 2010)	Grey seals surveyed in April	2007
Isles of Scilly	Ground counts (Sayer et al. 2012)	Grey seals	2010
North Wales	Ground counts (Westcott & Stringell 2004)	Grey seals counts extended over 12 months	2002, 2003
Skomer Island, West Wales	Ground counts	Adult grey seals	2013
Ramsey Island, West Wales	Ground counts	Grey seals	2007-2011
Northern Ireland	Aerial survey (helicopter)	Both species surveyed using SMRU protocol	2002
Strangford Lough, Northern Ireland	Aerial survey (helicopter)	Both species surveyed using SMRU protocol	2006, 2007, 2008 and 2010
Republic of Ireland	Aerial survey (helicopter)	Both species surveyed	2003

		using SMRU protocol	
Northern France	Ground counts with extrapolation (Hassani et al. 2010)	Harbour seals surveyed annually	1996-2008

524


525




526

527 Figure 1. Flowchart representing high-level analytical methodology.

528





529
 530 Figure 2. (a) Grey and (b) harbour seal terrestrial counts between 1996 and 2013. GSHHG shoreline data from
 531 NOAA were used in figures 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7, available from to download from
 532 <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/shorelines/gshhs.html>.
 533



534
 535 Figure 3. (a) Grey seal telemetry tracks between 1991 and 2013 showing 259 animals; and (b) harbour seal
 536 telemetry tracks between 2003 and 2013 showing 277 animals.

537





539


540 Figure 4. (a) Grey seals; (b) harbour seals; showing the predicted number of seals in each 5x5km² grid square.

541 E.g. A yellow square denotes between 10 and 50 seals are within that grid square. White contour lines denote

542 standard deviation from the mean as a measure of uncertainty around the estimated usage. Labels show the

543 standard deviation value at each contour.


544



545

546 Figure 5. Cumulative spatial usage of grey and harbour seals as a function of distance from the coast.


547



548

549 Figure 6. Spatial at-sea comparisons between grey and harbour seals at $5 \times 5 \text{ km}^2$ resolution showing absolute
 550 difference in population numbers. Red denotes greater harbour seal usage, blue denotes greater grey seal usage.
 551 Traffic light indicator arrows show the population trajectories (2000-2010) of harbour seals in relation to each
 552 Seal Management Unit (SMU), and the accompanying text shows the per annum change in moult counts for
 553 harbour seals (Duck et al. 2013).

554



555
556

Figure 7. Map of the British Isles showing key areas and locations referred to in the text.

557