

1 The status of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in the United
2 Kingdom

3
4
5 Dave Thompson¹, Callan Duck¹, C.D. Morris¹ and D.J.F. Russell^{1,2}
6
7

8 ¹Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK.
9

10 ²Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling, Scottish Oceans Institute,
11 University of St Andrews, Scotland.
12
13
14

ACCEPTED MS

ABSTRACT

1. Estimates of population size and trends are essential for effective conservation and management of wildlife populations. For harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*), these data are required to fulfil statutory reporting obligations under national and international regulations.
2. Aerial survey counts of harbour seals hauled-out during their annual moult were used to estimate population sizes and trends at UK, regional (Seal Management Unit; SMU) and local (Special Area of Conservation; SAC) scales.
3. Results indicate that the current UK harbour seal population is similar to estimates from the late 1990s, but there were significant declines in some sub-populations and increases in others.
4. Fitted trends suggest that the UK harbour seal population can be divided into three geographically coherent groups: Southeast populations (Southeast and Northeast England SMUs) have shown continuous increases punctuated by Phocine Distemper Virus (PDV) epidemics in 1988 and 2002; Northeast populations (East Scotland, Moray Firth, North Coast & Orkney, and Shetland SMUs) have declined since the late 1990s; Northwest populations (West Scotland, Western Isles, and Southwest Scotland SMUs) have remained stable or increased. Similar geographical population substructure is evident in recent population genetics results.
5. Trends within SACs generally match SMU trends since 2002. Of the nine SACs designated for harbour seals, four declined (in East Scotland, Moray Firth and North coast & Orkney SMUs), four remained stable (in Shetland and West Scotland SMUs), and one increased (in Southeast England SMU).
6. Large changes in relative abundance have resulted from differences in regional trends: e.g. in 1996-1997 the West Scotland and North coast & Orkney SMUs each held c.27% of the GB population but now hold c.50% and c.4% respectively; in 1980, the Southeast England SMU population was c50% that of the Wadden Sea population but by 2016 was equivalent to <20% of the Wadden Sea count.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76

1. INTRODUCTION

Marine predators have been proposed as potential indicators of environmental health (Boyd, Wanless, & Camphuysen, 2006), but their utility has been limited by lack of population data and information on the drivers of changes in abundance at suitable temporal and spatial scales. The wide distribution and the existence of almost range wide monitoring programmes for harbour seals (Bjorge, Desportes, Waring, & Rosing-Asvid, 2010) means that the status of their populations could provide useful comparative indicators of environmental status. Indeed, within Europe, harbour seals have been selected as a key indicator species under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and a series of ecological quality indicators (EcoQOs) have been defined based on the status of harbour seal populations within management regions in the member states (OSPAR, 2005).

Harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) are widely distributed marine predators, occurring in temperate and sub-polar seas throughout the northern hemisphere. Throughout their range, regularly monitored populations of harbour seals have shown widely contrasting trends. For example in the Pacific sub-species (*P.v. richardii*), depleted populations in California, Oregon and Washington increased and appear to have reached carrying capacity sometime in the early 1990s while in Alaska, the 12 identified stocks (O’Corry-Crowe, Martien, & Taylor, 2003) have variously experienced rapid increases, rapid declines or stable populations (Muto et al., 2018). The eastern North Atlantic subspecies (*P.v.vitulina*), that includes the UK populations, has also shown widely contrasting regional dynamics since the 1970s; populations in the southern North Sea have shown rapid, continuous growth (punctuated by two discrete disease events that caused 50% reductions in 1988 and 2202) (Galatius et al., 2017), while over the same period, populations in Iceland have declined continuously (Þorbjörnsson, Hauksson, Sigurðsson, & Granquist, 2017)

The conservation legislation and management regimes relevant to harbour seals operate at various spatial and temporal scales. Harbour seals are listed in Annex II of the EU Habitats Directive (Council of the European Communities, 1992), which requires that specific areas in Member States be designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) to help maintain populations in a favourable conservation status. In the UK, harbour seals were the primary feature of designation for nine SACs, and a qualifying feature for a further three. The six-

77 yearly SAC reporting cycle requires formal status assessments for these sites, with the next
78 review due in 2019. At present, all SACs designated for seals are based on terrestrial haulout
79 sites, so population estimates and information on trends of harbour seals at those haulout
80 sites is a minimum requirement for the SAC assessments.

81 In the UK, harbour seals are also protected by the Conservation of Seals Act 1970 in England
82 and Wales, the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 and The Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985.
83 For management purposes, the UK harbour seal population is subdivided into Seal
84 Management Units (SMUs) (sometimes referred to as Seal Management Areas in Scotland)
85 (Figure 1) that were defined on the basis of the spatial distribution of haulout sites; e.g.
86 existence of clear separations between groups of haulout sites and/or pragmatic factors such
87 as ability to conduct synoptic surveys within a single survey window and recognition of
88 national boundaries to simplify reporting to various stakeholder.

89 The Conservation of Seals Act allows the taking of seals in England and Wales except during
90 a defined, closed period over the breeding season, but does allow seals to be shot for
91 protection of fishing operations at any time under the so-called netsman's defence (Gov.UK,
92 2015). In Scotland, seals may only be taken under a licence issued for a specific reason,
93 usually for protection of fisheries or aquaculture operations (Scottish Government, 2018).
94 The Conservation of Seals Act and The Marine (Scotland) Act allow for specific Conservation
95 Orders to ban any takes of seals in specific management units in order to protect vulnerable
96 populations. Such orders were established after the 1988 and 2002 Phocine Distemper Virus
97 (PDV) epidemics (SCOS, 2017), which caused a dramatic reduction in the populations in the
98 Southern North Sea, Baltic Sea and Wadden Sea (Härkönen et al., 2006).

99 Three such orders were established after the 2002 PDV epidemic (SCOS, 2017), providing
100 year round protection to harbour seals along the east coasts of England and Scotland and
101 throughout the Outer Hebrides, Shetland and Orkney. In Scotland, the conservation orders
102 were superseded by the designation of seal conservation areas under the provisions of the
103 Marine (Scotland) Act 2010; these areas provide the same effective protection and cover the
104 same sections of coast. The conservation orders are under annual review (SCOS, 2017) and
105 assessing the effectiveness and continuing requirement for these conservation actions again
106 requires reliable and regular estimates of population status.

107 In addition to providing supporting information for these statutory management
108 requirements, there are often additional requirements for population census data to support
109 management of specific interactions between seals and human activities. For example,
110 many countries have set ambitious targets for marine renewable energy generation, in
111 response to demands for low carbon energy generation. In Scotland in particular, this has
112 led to proposals to install tidal stream energy converters (tidal turbines) in tidally energetic
113 inshore sites (Callaghan, 2010; Lewis et al., 2011) that are frequented by harbour seals.
114 Concerns over potential lethal collisions between seals and the moving parts of tidal turbines
115 means that the potential population level consequences of resulting mortalities have to be
116 considered when permitting tidal energy developments. The fact that these developments
117 are likely to occur in areas with recorded population declines (Lonergan et al., 2007) means
118 that detailed, accurate and up to date information on population size and status is required
119 at spatial scales of relevance to managing impacts of localised developments/disturbances.

120 Although many of the potential threats to populations occur at sea, seals are notoriously
121 difficult to see and count in the water. Harbour seals do, however, haul out on land for a
122 significant proportion of their time, meaning that a proportion of the population is then
123 available to count. The wide geographical spread of haulout sites and their general
124 inaccessibility means that aerial surveys of haulouts provide the only practical method for
125 obtaining reliable indices of abundance over large parts of their range. Ideally, multiple
126 surveys would be carried out each year (Teilmann, Riget, & Härkönen, 2010; Thompson
127 et al., 1997) but in practice, the limited resources available mean that it is not possible to
128 carry out synoptic, range-wide surveys at such intensities. Aerial surveys of the UK harbour
129 seal population have been carried out regularly since the late 1980s with some irregular and
130 sparse monitoring in south-east England as far back as the late 1960s (Lonergan et al., 2007;
131 Thompson, Lonergan, & Duck, 2005, 2010). Lonergan et al. (2007) presented UK wide results
132 of surveys up to 2005. These showed the effects of the two Phocine Distemper Virus (PDV)
133 epidemics in the southern North Sea that dramatically reduced the south-east English
134 population by approximately 50% and 30% in 1988 and 2002 respectively (Lonergan et al.,
135 2007; Thompson et al., 2005). Lonergan et al. (2007) also noted that by 2006 the population
136 in south-east England was still in a decline initiated by the 2002 epidemic. This contrasts
137 with the rapid, 12% p.a. post 2002 epidemic increase recorded in the large Wadden Sea

138 population (Brasseur et al., 2018), and the relatively rapid recovery in the southeast England
139 population following the 1988 epidemic (Thompson et al., 2005). Although the 2002 PDV
140 epidemic did not appear to have had any noticeable impact on harbour seal populations
141 around Scotland, Lonergan et al. (2007) reported population declines in Orkney and Shetland
142 of 40% (95% CI: 30–50%) between 2001 and 2006, indicating that harbour seals in these
143 areas experienced substantially increased mortality and/or very low recruitment over this
144 period. More recently, Hanson, Thompson, Duck, Baxter and Lonergan (2015) reported a
145 continuing 19.9% p.a. decline in the local harbour seal population in the Tay and Eden SAC,
146 producing a decrease of approximately 94% between 2000 and 2013.

147 This paper reports the results of recent surveys of harbour seals around the UK and combines
148 these with the previously reported survey results to describe the current status of the UK
149 harbour seal population and to identify and quantify the trends in sub-populations at both
150 regional (SMU) and smaller (SACs) scales. These trends are then compared to population
151 estimates and trends in adjacent populations within Europe and the wider North Atlantic.

153 2. METHODS

154 2.1. Survey methods

155 All surveys were conducted during the annual harbour seal moult in August. Survey were
156 conducted using aerial photography of seals at haulout sites, with the exception of sites in
157 the Tees estuary (Figure 1) that were counted on land, by the Industry Nature Conservation
158 Association (INCA) (Bond, 2018). The aerial survey methods used varied depending on the
159 location and physical characteristics of the haulout sites.

160
161 *Surveys of east coast estuaries:* Seals are relatively easy to detect on sandbanks and in tidal
162 creeks and channels. Fixed-wing aircraft and conventional photography, either vertical with
163 a large format camera (prior to 2000) or oblique with a hand-held digital SLR camera, were
164 used to survey the estuarine haulout sites on the east coast of England and in eastern
165 Scotland (in the Firth of Tay and the Moray Firth); see Thompson et al. (2005) for detailed
166 methodology.

167

168 *Surveys of rocky shores:* Harbour seals hauling out on rocky or seaweed covered shores are
169 more difficult to detect. Surveys of Orkney, Shetland, West Scotland, and rocky shores on
170 the east coast of Scotland were therefore carried out by helicopter (operating at an altitude
171 of 150-250m and at a distance of 300-500m offshore) using a thermal imaging camera (Barr
172 and Stroud IR18) that can detect the infra-red signature of groups of seals at distances of
173 over 3km (depending on weather conditions). The thermal imager was mounted on a pan
174 and tilt head and operated out of the helicopter window. Simultaneous oblique photographs
175 were obtained of seal groups using a hand-held camera equipped with an image-stabilized
176 zoom lens. Both harbour and grey seals were digitally photographed and the images used
177 to classify species composition of groups of seals. The technique enables rapid and thorough
178 surveying of seals inhabiting complex coastlines allowing synoptic censuses of areas that
179 would not be possible by any other method; see Cronin et al. (2007) for detailed
180 methodology.

181

182 In 2016, this system was replaced by a custom-built, 3-camera system, based on Trakka
183 System's SWE-400 comprising a gyro-stabilized gimbal containing thermal imaging, HD video
184 and digital still cameras and a laser range finder. Video and still images are recorded on
185 laptops that display a moving map, highlighting areas that have already been surveyed
186 during the flight.

187

188 *Seasonal timing:* Historical information from the Wash (Thompson et al., 2005) suggested
189 that counts are high and consistent during the first 3 weeks of August, when harbour seals
190 are moulting (Thompson & Harwood, 1990; Thompson & Rothery, 1987). Earlier surveys in
191 England had been carried out in the early part of August since the 1970s. In order to ensure
192 that the current data are consistent with earlier data, surveys were restricted to the month
193 of August.

194

195 Counts of harbour seals during the moult may not be fully representative of their distribution
196 at other times of the year. However, surveys during the breeding season in both the Moray
Firth (Cordes & Thompson, 2015) and The Wash and Southeast England (SCOS, 2017) show

197 that the breeding season distribution is similar to that of the moult. The purpose of the
198 monitoring programme is to track population trajectories to assess their status. Local
199 redistributions will not affect the population indices for SMUs.

200 *Time of day:* There is evidence for a slight temporal effect on numbers of seals hauled out,
201 with higher numbers associated with low tides occurring in the afternoon (Thompson &
202 Harwood, 1990; Russell et al., 2015). Although these studies did not cover the harbour seal
203 moult, the surveys were further restricted to low tides occurring in the afternoon. This
204 restriction was occasionally relaxed for the English east coast and Moray Firth surveys where
205 a large proportion of the haulout sites are within military restricted airspace that can only be
206 accessed at weekends.

207
208 *Tidal state:* Haulout patterns relative to local tidal times in the Moray Firth and telemetry
209 data from seals in Orkney and West Scotland, during the August moult period (Lonergan,
210 Duck, Moss, Morris, & Thompson, 2013; Thompson et al., 2005), showed that the number of
211 seals on individual haulout sites exceeded 90% of the maximum count for approximately 1.5
212 hours before low water until at least two hours after low water. Similar haulout patterns
213 have been described for Moray Firth harbour seals during the pupping season in June and
214 July (Thompson et al., 1997). The surveys described here were carried out within the period
215 from two hours before to two hours after the predicted times of local low tides (derived from
216 POLTIPS, National Oceanographic Centre, NERC).

217
218 *Weather:* Surveys were carried out only during periods of good visibility and with light to
219 moderate winds. Surveys were not carried out in heavy or persistent rain because the
220 probability of detecting hauled out seals with the thermal imager is reduced in rain. Light
221 rain is not thought to have a significant effect on haulout numbers; although Grellier,
222 Thompson, & Corpe (1996) counted significantly fewer seals on days with precipitation the
223 effect size was small and did not cover the moult and in other studies, e.g. Granquist &
224 Hauksson, (2016), no effect of precipitation was detected.

225

226 *Extent and frequency of Surveys:* Based on previous boat-based surveys and reports from
227 wildlife conservation and naturalist groups around the UK it is clear that harbour seals are
228 effectively absent from the UK coast line between Dover and the Solway Firth, with the
229 exception of a small group that haul out in Chichester Harbour on the south coast and
230 occasional sightings of individuals or small groups of seals in Cornwall and the Dee estuary
231 in North Wales (SCOS, 2017). SMUs 10, 11, 12 and 13 (Figure 1) were not regularly surveyed
232 for harbour seals and are not included in this study.

233
234 The frequency and spatial extent of surveys was determined by both practical and financial
235 constraint; it is not possible to survey the entire UK population in a single season with
236 available resources. As far as possible, entire SMUs are surveyed within one year (August).
237 In order to provide both national population estimates and finer temporal resolution data
238 for areas where rapid population changes were thought to be occurring, the survey effort
239 was stratified. Southeast England, Moray Firth and East Scotland SMUs were areas of
240 particular historical interest because of seal hunting (Vaughan, 1978) or seal/fishery conflict
241 (Butler, Middlemas, Graham, & Harris, 2011). These are all areas where seals haul out on
242 sand banks, mud flats and tidal creeks, and can be surveyed at relatively low cost. They have,
243 for the most part, been surveyed annually, with one to three surveys each year from 1988
244 to 2016.

245
246 Areas requiring helicopter mounted thermal imagery take longer to cover and surveys are
247 substantially more expensive. As the primary aim of the survey programme was to provide
248 a UK wide estimate approximately every five years, the SMUs in Scotland and Northern
249 Ireland were surveyed more sporadically (Duck, 2006). However, surveys in 2006 indicated
250 a major decline occurring within the Orkney population, so more intensive survey effort was
251 applied to that management region as a consequence.

252
253
254

2.2 Population estimates

The count data represent an index of population size, as not all animals are hauled out during the survey. Population estimates presented are derived from scaling the counts by estimates of the proportion of harbour seals hauled out during the survey period. The probability of a seal being hauled out during the survey window was estimated using flipper tag mounted satellite telemetry transmitters that continued to transmit through the moult (Lonergan et al., 2013). The probability of being hauled out during the survey window was higher for tagged females (0.84; 95% CI: 0.63–0.99) than males (0.61; 95% CI: 0.34–0.86). However, as the aerial survey images do not provide sex ratio information, an averaged proportion of 0.72 (95% CI: 0.54–0.88) was used to convert seal counts to total population. The conversion factor used here, was close to the middle of the range (0.6 to 0.8) of values estimated for other populations in Europe and North America (e.g. Harvey and Goley, 2011; Huber, Jeffries, Brown, DeLong, & VanBlaricom, 2001; Simpkins, Withrow, Cesarone, & Boveng, 2003; Reis, Hiby, & Reijnders, 1998). UK wide and regional population estimates were generated by scaling the most recent counts summed across all areas.

2.3 Trends in count data

Trends in moult counts were estimated, where possible, for each SMU and SAC in which harbour seals were a primary reason for designation (Figures 1 & 2). The starting dates of the time series varied between regions, with regular surveys beginning in the late 1980s or early 1990s in most SMUs (Table 2). In some regions, primarily the estuarine sites on the East coast, frequent surveys (usually at least one per year) have been carried out, but in rocky shore habitats surveys were carried out at approximately five yearly intervals. Where possible entire SMUs were surveyed synoptically (i.e. within a single August survey season). However, in some cases it was not possible to survey an entire SMU in one season and counts had to be combined across multiple years – the resulting count was assigned to the year that encompassed the majority of the total (focal year). In most of these cases over 95% of the count was from the focal year and combining across years would likely have little effect on the resulting trend. However, the large size of West Scotland SMU meant that it was rarely surveyed in a single year. For this SMU, the focal year accounted $\geq 64\%$ of the combined count, and together with the two surrounding years accounted for a $\geq 90\%$ of the count.

286 Similarly, in the large central sub-region, for two years (1989 and 2007), the focal year
287 accounted for only 90% of the count ($\geq 95\%$ when including the two surrounding years). The
288 necessary combining of data across years in these two regions likely led to a reduced power
289 to detect trends.

290
291 Where the limited number of years with counts prohibited robust model fitting for a
292 particular SMU, the largest subset of sites within it (i.e. the subset of haulout sites with the
293 largest proportion of the SMU total), for which the monitoring was frequent enough to allow
294 model fitting, was used as a proxy for the SMU. The relationship between the SMU and
295 subset counts in years when the whole area was surveyed can be used to assess how
296 representative the subset trends are of the regional trends.

297
298 All models were fitted within R (R Core Team, 2017). Following Lonergan et al. (2007), counts
299 were modelled as a function of year assuming negative binomial errors. Generalised linear
300 models (GLMs) with negative binomial errors were fitted using the function `glm.nb` in the
301 MASS library (Venables & Ripley, 2002). For some datasets, the limited number of data points
302 resulted in problems estimating the theta parameter for the negative binomial distribution.
303 In these cases, a Poisson distribution was assumed; examination of the residual plots
304 confirmed that use of a Poisson error distribution was appropriate for these datasets.
305 Generalised additive models (GAMs) were fitted within `mgcv` (Wood, 2011). Model selection
306 by AICc was used to select a final model.

307
308 The model formulations fitted during model selection were dependent on the SMU/SAC. For
309 all datasets, at least three models were fitted: an intercept only GLM (null model), a linear
310 year effect within a GLM, and a non-linear smooth year effect within a GAM. Additional
311 models were fitted to the datasets from the north and east coasts. For the Northeast and
312 Southeast England SMUs trends were punctuated by sudden falls in abundance following the
313 PDV epidemics; such trends may not be captured within a GLM with a single trend or even
314 using a GAM. SMUs of the east and north coasts of Scotland (East Scotland, Moray Firth,
315 North Coast & Orkney, and Shetland SMUs), also showed a potential change in trend
316 coincident with 2002 (the year of the second PDV epidemic). Thus for these datasets,
317 individual trends were fitted (constant, linear or smooth) prior to, and following, the PDV

318 epidemics (1988 and 2002). For SMUs with clear drops in abundance following PDV
319 epidemics (Northeast and Southeast England), a step change in abundance coincident with
320 the PDV epidemics was also offered. For datasets for which there was a gap in data around
321 this time (2002 to 2005; Shetland SMU, North Coast & Orkney SMU, Sanday SAC), trends
322 were fitted either side of the data gap; i.e. no trend was modelled within the gap. In each
323 time series, all linear trends were fitted within one GLM, which allowed selection by AICc to
324 be used to determine if the trend was the same before and after step changes associated
325 with the PDV epidemics. Any trends that were identified as being non-linear were fitted
326 separately within a GAM. AICc was then used to select the most appropriate model for that
327 part of the time series.

311 3 RESULTS

312 3.1. Total UK harbour seal population size

313
314 The most recent composite count for the entire UK was 31,300 based on counts from surveys
315 carried out mostly between 2014 and 2016 (2011 in the Western Isles and Northern Ireland)
316 (Table 1). Scaling this count by the probability of being hauled out (0.72 (95% CI: 0.54 - 0.88);
317 Lonergan et al., 2013) produces a total UK population estimate of 43,450 (95% CI: 35,550 -
318 57,900). Approximately 80% of the total were recorded in Scotland, 17% in England and 3%
319 in Northern Ireland.

320
321 No survey data were available for Northern Ireland before 2002, but the harbour seal
322 population of Great Britain (GB, i.e. the UK minus Northern Ireland) was surveyed in 1996-97.
323 The composite count in GB in 1996-97 (Table 1) produced a total population estimate of
324 45,550 (95% CI: 37,250 - 60,700). Although this earlier estimate was 7.5% higher than the
325 most recent estimate (42,100; 95% CI: 34,500 - 52,300) it is not significantly different.

326 3.2 UK harbour seal distribution

348 The distribution and relative abundance of harbour seals around the UK during the annual
349 moult is shown in Figure 3. The data are presented as numbers of hauled out seals counted
350 per 10km grid square and represent composites of the counts from surveys carried out in
351 1996 and 1997 (Figure 3a) and 2014 to 2016 (2011 in the Western Isles and Northern Ireland)
352 (Figure 3b).

353
354 The overall distribution, in terms of occupancy, has remained constant since the earliest
355 synoptic aerial surveys, comprising counts from 1996 and 1997 (Figure 3a) (N.B. as no counts
356 were available for Northern Ireland in 1996-1997 this comparison applies to the GB totals).
357 However, there have been large changes in relative abundance (Figure 4) driven by dramatic
358 differences in regional population trends. For example, in the 1996-1997 counts the West
359 Scotland and the North coast & Orkney SMUs each held 27% of the GB population. In the
360 most recent counts, they held 50% and 4% respectively.

361 362 363 3.3 Seal Management Unit trends

364 Based on AICc selection criteria all SMUs, sub-units and SACs were best fitted with GLMs,
365 with one exception; the time series of counts after 2002 in The Wash were best fit by a GAM.
366 A detailed list of estimated growth rates and associated confidence intervals for each SMU
367 and various sub units and the SACs within them are presented in Table 2 and briefly
368 described below.

369 *Southeast England Seal Management Unit*

370 The Southeast England SMU encompasses five geographically distinct haulout groups: Donna
371 Nook, The Wash, Blakeney Point, Scroby Sands, and the Greater Thames Estuary (Figure 1).
372 The Wash encompasses approximately 65% of the count in this unit and is within The Wash
373 and North Norfolk Coast SAC - the only SAC in England for which harbour seals were a reason
374 for designation. The Wash has been surveyed since 1968, whereas Donna Nook, Blakeney
375 Point, and Scroby Sands were not included in the survey programme until immediately
376 before the 1988 PDV epidemic. Sites in the greater Thames Estuary region have only been
377 sporadically surveyed until recently; a recent series of surveys of the Thames have been
378 completed by the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) and will be presented elsewhere, but

379 are not included in this analysis. Consequently, there are few complete, synoptic surveys of
380 the entire Southeast England SMU. The regional trends are therefore represented by the
381 trends in the combined counts from Donna Nook, The Wash, and Blakeney Point. These
382 combined counts represent over 90% of the total for the unit.

383 The combined counts for The Wash, Donna Nook and Blakeney Point, assumed here to
384 represent the Southeast England SMU, are available from 1988 to 2017 (Figure 5a). The 1989
385 count was approximately 50% lower than the pre-epidemic count in 1988. The selected
386 model for the combined counts incorporated two periods of exponential increase; 6.6% p.a.
387 (95% CIs: 5.3, 7.9) between 1989 and 2002 and 2.8% p.a. (95% CIs: 1.3, 4.3) between 2003
388 and 2017. These periods of exponential increase were separated by a step change decrease
389 of approximately 30% between 2002 and 2003 coincident with the second PDV epidemic.
390 For the period 2003-2017, though a GLM was marginally preferred by model selection ($\Delta AICc$
391 = 2), there was an indication of a non-linear trend with a constant abundance followed by an
392 increase and finally a levelling off in recent years.

393 Trends were also examined separately for The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC which
394 comprises the haulout sites in The Wash and at Blakeney Point. The Wash accounts for >85%
395 of the SAC population, and time series for The Wash began earlier (1968) than elsewhere,
396 thus trends were examined for The Wash as well for the SAC as a whole. The selected model
397 for The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC was similar to the overall SMU model, with similar
398 growth rates and a similar negative step change coincident with the 2002 PDV epidemic.

399 The best fitting model for the long time series of counts for The Wash included three distinct
400 trajectories (Figure 5b). From 1968 until 1988, the moult counts increased exponentially at
401 3.5% p.a. (95% CIs: 2.3, 4.76) reaching an estimated maximum count of c.3000 (95% CIs:
402 2500, 3500) in 1988. The counts then fell by approximately 50% between 1988 and 1989 as
403 a result of a PDV epidemic. This collapse was followed by a second period of exponential
404 increase, but at a higher rate of 6.0% p.a. (95% CIs: 4.2, 7.8), with counts reaching c.3100
405 (95% CIs: 2800, 3350) by 2002 before a recurrence of the PDV epidemic caused another
406 decrease. The counts from 2003 to 2017 are best described by a GAM that initially estimates
407 a decreasing trend until around 2006, increases rapidly until around 2010 and then levels
408 off, suggesting that the population is approaching an asymptote. The selection for the GAM

409 here but not in the other two Southeast England datasets may be a result of the higher
410 sample size of 24 for The Wash 2003 and 2017, compared to 19 for the other two datasets.
411 The recent counts for The Wash are similar to the levels in 1988 and 2002 immediately
412 before the two PDV epidemics.

413 *Northeast England Seal Management Unit*

414 The small population of harbour seals in the Northeast England SMU is split between
415 Lindisfarne in Northumberland where sporadic counts suggest between 6 and 20 seals
416 regularly haul out and the Tees estuary where a breeding group was re-established in the
417 late 1980s. Counts in the Tees have increased at approximately 7.4% p.a. (95% CIs: 6.07,
418 8.80) since 1989 (Figure 5c) punctuated by a drop of c. 40% between 2001 and 2003.

419 *East coast of Scotland Seal Management Unit*

420 In the East Scotland SMU the population is mainly concentrated in the Firth of Tay and Eden
421 Estuary SAC and in the Firth of Forth. Small groups are also present in the Montrose Basin
422 and at coastal sites in Aberdeenshire. Counts in the Firth of Forth have been sporadic and
423 therefore trends were only fitted to counts within the SAC. The selected model indicates that
424 counts in the SAC remained stable between 1990 and 2002, at which time they represented
425 approximately 85% of the total management region count. From 2002 to 2017 the counts
426 in the SAC declined rapidly and monotonically at approximately 18.6% p.a. (95% CIs: 17.1,
427 20.0) (Figure 6a, Table 2); over the 15 year period counts fell from approximately 680 to less
428 than 40, representing a 95% decline. By 2016 the SAC counts represented only approximately
429 15% of the SMU total.

430 *Moray Firth Seal Management Unit*

431 The Moray Firth SMU encompasses the stretch of coast from Duncansby Head (north-east
432 point of Scotland) to Fraserburgh. Counts between 2005 and 2016, showed no clear trend,
433 and were variable around a mean of c.900 (Figure 6b). The only count of the entire region
434 prior to this was in 1995 and was c.40% higher than the 2005 to 2016 mean. The majority of
435 the seals counted in the SMU wide surveys are at haulout sites between Loch Fleet and
436 Findhorn (c. 90% in 2016); this area has been surveyed more regularly than the region as a
437 whole and is presented here as a proxy for the SMU. The selected model for this area shows
438
439

440 that counts were decreasing at a rate of 5.6% p.a. (95% CIs: 2.5, 8.5) between 1994 and 2000,
441 followed by a step change with a drop of c.28% occurring between 2000 and 2003 and no
442 significant trend in counts thereafter (Figure 6b, Table 2). Counts of harbour seals within the
443 Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC site have shown a monotonic decline of c. 8.0% p.a.
444 (95% CIs: 6.3, 9.7) from the first surveys in 1992 to 2017.

445 446 *North Coast & Orkney Seal Management Unit*

447 The selected model for the North Coast & Orkney SMU indicates that counts were stable
448 until 2001, that the next count in 2006 showed a decline of 46% (Figure 6c) and that from
449 2006 onwards, there was a continued decline of 10.4% p.a. (95% CIs: 9.3, 11.5) (Table 2).
450 Overall, the composite counts for the North Coast & Orkney SMU have declined from
451 approximately 8800 in the mid-1990s to 1350 by 2016 (Table 1) representing an 85%
452 decrease in what was the largest single SMU population in the UK. The counts for the Sanday
453 SAC show a similar trend, with a step change between 2001 and 2006 and a continuing
454 declining at 17.8% p.a. (95% CIs: 13.3, 22.0) since 2006.

455 456 *Shetland Seal Management Unit*

457 The selected model for counts for the whole of Shetland incorporated a step change
458 involving a drop of approximately 40% occurring between 2001 and 2005 (Figure 6d). Counts
459 either side of the step change (1991-2001 and 2006-2015) do not show any obvious trend,
460 though in both cases the sample size was limited (n=4 and 3, respectively).

461 Counts at the two Shetland SACs show different trajectories. The Mousa SAC counts show a
462 monotonic exponential decline at an average rate of 11.1% p.a. (95% CIs: 8.7, 13.5) between
463 1991 and 2015 (Table 2). In contrast, an intercept only model was selected to fit the counts
464 (1991-2015) of the Yell Sound SAC. However, including only counts between 1995 and 2015
465 (i.e. excluding 1991 and 1993), the selected model showed a decline of 5.3% p.a.
466 (95% CIs: 2.6, 7.9).

467 *West Scotland, Southwest Scotland and Western Isles Seal Management Units*

468 Intercept only models were selected to fit the counts of the West Scotland, Southwest
469 Scotland, and Western Isles SMUs (Figure 7, Table 2). This may have been in part due to the

470 small sample sizes as only five or six counts were available for the 25 year period, and for the
471 West Scotland these counts were largely a result of combining counts across multiple years
472 (see Methods). Counts for the most recent surveys in each of the West Scotland, Southwest
473 Scotland and Western Isles SMUs are the highest counts obtained since the start of surveys
474 (Figure 7); in the West Scotland SMU, currently the largest SMU population in the UK (Table
475 1), the 2014 count was approximately double the 1990 count and, in the Southwest Scotland
476 SMU the 2015 count was approximately three times the 1989 count.

477 Although the West Scotland region is defined as a single SMU, it is very large geographically
478 in terms of total coastline and contains a large proportion of the UK harbour seal population,
479 i.e. 49% of the 2016 estimate of UK total count (Table 1). The trajectories of counts within
480 north, central and south sub-divisions (Figure 2) of this large region are shown in Figure 8. In
481 both the north sub-unit (Cape Wrath to Loch Ewe) and the central sub-unit (Loch Ewe to
482 Ardnamurchan), the selected models indicate that counts have increased since the early
483 1990s, by 4.86% p.a. (95% CI: 4.02, 5.70) and 4.0% p.a. (95% CIs: 3.1, 5.0) respectively (Figure
484 8a & 8b). The selected model for the Ascrib, Isay and Dunvegan SAC which is situated in the
485 central sub-region was an intercept only model indicating no trend.

486 In the south sub-region (Ardnamurchan to Scarba) an intercept only model was selected,
487 indicating that the overall population has remained stable since the early 1990s (Figure 8c).
488 Intercept only models were selected for both the Southeast Islay Skerries and the Lismore
489 SACs, though for Southeast Islay skerries a constant count was only marginally preferred over
490 an increasing trend ($\Delta AICc = 2$) of 2.67% p.a. (95% CIs: 1.31, 4.04).

491 *Northern Ireland Seal Management Unit*

492 Only two synoptic surveys have been carried out of the entire harbour seal population in
493 Northern Ireland. However, a subset of the population from Carlingford Lough to Copeland
494 Islands has been monitored more frequently from 2002 to 2011 (Figure 6d). This area
495 contained 80-85% of the total in the two years with complete coverage. This subset of the
496 population has declined slowly over the period at an average rate of 2.7% p.a. (95% CIs: 1.8,
497 3.5).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Geographical patterns

Previous studies have reported indications of a general decline in several of the large harbour seal populations in SMUs around Scotland (Lonergan et al., 2007) as well as dramatic declines in some important populations in SACs (Hanson et al., 2017; Thompson, Van Parijs, & Kovacs, 2001). The more extensive time series of survey results presented here have allowed a more robust analysis of these trends. Although there are significant declines in some important components of the UK harbour seal population, the picture of a general decline no longer holds true.

Significant numbers of harbour seals are present in ten SMUs; seven in Scotland, one in Northern Ireland, and two that cover the English east coast. The trends differ between SMUs, but there appears to be a strong geographical component determining, or at least associated with, the patterns. Based on the recorded trends it is possible to divide the UK harbour seal population into three geographically coherent groups with contrasting dynamics:

Populations along the English East coast, from Kent to the Scottish border have generally increased year on year, with those increases punctuated by major declines associated with two major PDV epidemics in 1988 and 2002. Recent trends, i.e. those that incorporate the last 10 years (2006 to 2016) show significant growth in both SMUs (Figure 5).

Populations along the East coast of Scotland and in the Northern Isles have generally declined. The recorded declines have differed in intensity but in all areas the current population size is at least 40 % below the pre-2002 level. Populations in North coast & Orkney, and East Scotland SMUs are continuing to decline. Although continued declines are not evident in Shetland or the Moray Firth, there is no indication of recovery (Figure 6).

Populations in western UK are either stable or increasing. Counts in the central section of the large West Scotland management region have been increasing since the 1990s and in all

525 other areas they have remained stable, with the exception of Northern Ireland which
526 appears to have declined slowly throughout (Figure 7).

527 A similar geographical population substructure is also evident in recent population genetics
528 results. Olsen et al. (2017) analysed DNA samples from approximately 300 harbour seals
529 from sites throughout the UK and the Wadden Sea. Their results suggested two distinct
530 groups, one in northern UK, and the other in southern UK and mainland Europe. The
531 northern UK group was further divided into a north-western cluster equivalent to the West
532 Scotland, Southwest Scotland and Western Isles SMUs and a north-eastern cluster
533 equivalent to Shetland, North Coast & Orkney, Moray Firth, and East Scotland SMUs. The
534 southern UK and mainland Europe group encompasses the Southeast England SMU and the
535 Wadden Sea. The three groups of SMUs exhibiting different population dynamics therefore
536 correspond with the groups identified by the genetic differences. The geographical pattern
537 in SMU population trends suggests that at least some of the factors driving the differences
538 in population dynamics may be acting on a larger scale than the individual SMUs. This
539 highlights the importance of considering possible impacts across these larger population
540 units when developing management actions for individual SMUs.

541 Apart from the clear impacts of the 1988 and 2002 PDV epidemics in the English SMUs, there
542 is at present no clear explanation for the different dynamics in these three areas. The
543 declines recorded in the Northern Isles and along the East coast of Scotland must ultimately
544 be due to reduced fecundity or increased mortality. Lonergan et al. (2007) and Hanson et al.
545 (2017) suggested that the observed declines in the North coast and Orkney SMU and the Tay
546 and Eden Estuary SAC could not be due purely to reduced reproduction; even repeated
547 complete reproductive failure would be unlikely to produce the sustained rapid rates of
548 decline suggesting that the declines, that have now persisted now for over 15 years, must be
549 due in part to loss of adults as well as pups.

550 4.2 Changes in Abundance

551 Here we have used counts of seals hauled out during the annual moult as an index of
552 population size in order to track population status. Various management actions, e.g. setting
553 management targets such as Potential Biological Removals (PBR) or estimating predation
554 pressure on fish stocks, require estimates of total population size. Here we have used a

555 correction factor for proportion of seals hauled out based on a study of haulout behaviour
556 of a sample of telemetry tagged seals in Orkney and the Inner Hebrides (Lonergan et al.,
557 2013) to scale the counts to total population size.

558
559 Different sex and age classes are thought to haulout at different times during the moult; it
560 has been shown that juvenile harbour seals tend to moult earliest and adult males latest
561 (Cronin, Gregory, & Rogan, 2014; Daniel, Jemison, Pendleton, & Crowley, 2003; Thompson
562 & Rothery, 1987). The age structure of the population may therefore influence the
563 proportion of the total population that are counted during the surveys. At present, we do
564 not know the sex and age composition of the seals counted during the surveys. However, it
565 is clear that changes in population trajectories must ultimately be due to changes in
566 demographic rates; e.g. increased pup mortality and reduced fecundity were identified as
567 the most likely factors driving the recorded declines in the Moray Firth SMU population
568 (Matthiopoulos et al., 2014). Such changes in demographic rates would have direct effects
569 on the population age structure. If there were large changes in the sex and/or age structure
570 (Härkönen, Harding & Lunneryd, 1999) or the timing of the moult, the counts might no longer
571 represent a constant proportion of the population. This could affect both the observed
572 trends and the count to total population scaling factor.

573
574 Significant changes in timing of the pupping season have been reported in the Wadden Sea
575 (Reijnders, Brasseur, & Meesters, 2010) and these may imply similar changes in timing of the
576 moult. Cronin et al. (2014) have shown that the timings of the moult differ between Ireland,
577 Scotland and the Wadden Sea, so it is possible that the timing of the moult varies throughout
578 the UK. It is therefore possible that the scaling factor between counts and total population
579 size may have changed over time and/or may differ between SMUs.

580
581 We do not have independent estimates of the timing of the moult in different SMUs within
582 our survey areas nor any information on temporal trends in the timing, so cannot rule out
583 the possibility of regional differences or temporal changes in scaling factors. However, it is
584 unlikely that the proportion of the population being counted would change in such a way as
585 to produce the observed range of patterns from rapid increases, to step changes, static
586 populations and rapid declines.

587

588 4.3 OSPAR convention compliance.

589 The OSPAR Convention EcoQO's for harbour seals have defined criteria for triggering
590 management action, i.e. that harbour seal population size in defined sub-units should not
591 decline by more than 10% over a five-year period (OSPAR, 2010) and in the longer term
592 should not decline by more than 25% relative to the baseline, in this case defined as the
593 population in the early 1990s. The SMUs considered here are synonymous with the defined
594 harbour seal EcoQO sub units.

595

596 The trends presented here show that the East Scotland and North Coast & Orkney SMUs fall
597 below the short term criteria as they both declined by more than 10% over the last 5 years
598 of data collection and all four of the EcoQO subunits along the east coast of Scotland and in
599 the Northern Isles fail the long term criterion, having declined by more than 25% from the
600 reference population in the 1990s. Conversely, the sites on the east coast of England and in
601 the west of Scotland would all pass against both short and long-term criteria.

602

603 The OSPAR convention requires management actions to be applied in the event that an
604 EcoQO indicates a problem. In Scotland a targeted research programme to investigate the
605 proximate and ultimate causes of local population declines has been initiated (Arso-Civil
606 et al., 2018). In addition, the East Scotland, Moray Firth, North coast and Orkney, Shetland,
607 and Western Isles SMUs have been designated as Conservation Areas for harbour seals and
608 a bespoke Seal Management Plan has been developed and operated to manage conflicts
609 between harbour seals and salmon fisheries in the Moray Firth (Butler, Middlemas, Graham,
610 & Harris, 2011). PBR calculations for these SMUs use minimum values for the recovery factor
611 (F_r) to ensure minimal impact of anthropogenic takes (SCOS 2017). These actions have
612 reduced directed takes of harbour seals to very low levels (Scottish Government, 2018), but
613 have not so far prevented the continued rapid declines in the north and east of Scotland.

614

615 4.4 SAC monitoring

616 One of the main drivers for counting harbour seal populations in Europe is the provision of
617 population status information needed to fulfil the reporting requirements for SACs

618 designated for seals under the EU Habitats Directive regulations. Assessing conservation
619 status depends on regular monitoring to determine population trends within SACs. With the
620 limited resources available for population monitoring, an unintended consequence of this
621 requirement will be a bias towards monitoring populations within SACs. SACs are therefore
622 likely to become de facto indicators of overall population status.

623
624 The survey programme presented here has produced extensive data for the nine SACs in the
625 UK where harbour seals are the primary feature, allowing the UK to fulfil its responsibilities
626 under the Habitats Directive. It has also produced similar data for larger SMUs that
627 encompass the SACs, allowing us to assess the effectiveness of SACs as population status
628 indicators. In both the Southeast England and East Scotland SMUs the single SACs include a
629 large proportion of the population, so the SAC and regional trends are similar. However, in
630 the East Scotland SMU the SAC is declining more rapidly than the overall SMU. In other SMUs
631 the SACs include smaller proportions of the overall population. Of the remaining seven SACs,
632 five have trends that are similar to the regional trend. However, the Mousa SAC in Shetland
633 reports an exponential decline whereas the SMU reports a stable population after a step
634 change in 2002 and the Ascrib, Isay and Dunvegan SAC in West Scotland central region
635 reports a static population whereas the wider population is increasing exponentially. These
636 comparisons suggest that SACs for harbour seals provide a reasonable indication of wider
637 population trends in most cases, including regions with increasing, stable and decreasing
638 populations. In the two cases where SAC and regional trends diverged, both reported lower
639 growth than the regions and were, in these cases, conservative indicators of regional trends.
640 However, the fact that there is substantial local variation in trends highlights the potential
641 risk of using SACs as de-facto indicator sites.

642 643 4.5 Robustness of trends

644 The results of the monitoring programme have allowed estimation of trends in harbour seal
645 populations at spatial scales appropriate to the statutory monitoring requirements.
646 However, while they generally address the requirements, there are clear differences in our
647 ability to assess trends in different SMUs.

648 Most of the UK east coast has been surveyed at least annually, providing rich data sets, with
649 between 25 and 57 data points. These data enable robust estimation of the effects of the
650 PDV epidemics and the intervening population trends. Even with these data, despite similar
651 patterns (Figure 5) between 2002 and 2017 across datasets within the Southeast SMU, using
652 AICc model selection criteria, GLMs were marginally preferred for the Southeast England,
653 and The Wash and North Norfolk coast SAC datasets over than the more flexible GAM that
654 was fitted to The Wash data. This was likely due to the lower sample sizes for these time
655 series (19 versus 24 in The Wash). Thompson et al. (1997) examined the effect of survey
656 frequency on the power to detect trends in the Moray Firth harbour seal population and
657 concluded that detecting trends of the magnitude reported here, in the short term, would
658 require multiple surveys each year. However in the longer term, e.g. over the 19 to 36 year
659 datasets for east coast sites presented here, there was clearly sufficient power to both detect
660 and quantify trends as well as catastrophic step changes when only one survey is carried out
661 in most years.

662
663 The sampling frequency for SMUs and SACs in the Northern Isles and Western Scotland was
664 much lower, with only 5 to 11 surveys carried out between the early 1990s and 2017. In the
665 Northern Isles these sparse data (n=7 to 11) still allowed detection of the rapid population
666 declines and/or large step changes that occurred between 2001 and 2006. For the three
667 SMUs in western Scotland (n=5 to 7) the selected models all suggested no significant trend
668 over the study period, although in the north and central sub regions of West Scotland, even
669 moderate trends (c. 4-5% p.a.) were detected with a similar sample size (n=6).

670 Counts in the West Scotland, Western Isles and Southwest Scotland SMUs have been variable
671 and although counts are now higher than at the start of the time series, there was not a
672 monotonic increase in counts across the time series. It possible that the variability in counts
673 represents more complex trends but such models (i.e. GAMs) could not be supported by the
674 limited data. For West Scotland (n=5), any trend may have been masked by the combining
675 of data across years (see Methods). Because multiple surveys are required to identify a trend,
676 the current survey frequency means that even rapid decreases would not be detectable for
677 a prolonged period of time. Further stratification of survey effort may need to be considered

678 to provide more sensitive metrics for the large and widely dispersed populations around
679 Scotland.

680 4.5 Possible reasons for declines

681 4.5.1 Grey seal competition

682 One putative explanation for the regional harbour seal population declines is competition
683 with grey seals. There are significant overlaps in both diet (Wilson & Hammond, This Issue)
684 and at-sea distributions (Russell, Jones, & Morris, 2017) so there is the potential for
685 competition for prey resources to occur. Grey seals are now known to be direct predators
686 of harbour seals (Brownlow, Onoufriou, Bishop, Davison, & Thompson, 2016; van Neer,
687 Jensen, & Siebert, 2015).

688 The populations of grey seals in the three broad geographical areas show different dynamics
689 to those of harbour seals (Russell et al., This issue, Thomas et al., This issue). Both pup
690 production and population estimates for grey seals in the West Scotland and the Western
691 Isles SMUs were increasing until the mid-1990s and have been stable since. In Orkney the
692 grey seal population increased until around 2000 and has been relatively stable since. In
693 contrast, the grey seal population in the North Sea continues to increase exponentially. The
694 levelling off of some regional grey seal populations is evidence of density dependence which
695 is most likely mediated through processes at sea (Russell et al., This Issue; Thomas et al., This
696 issue) and probably related to prey resources which would likely lead to increased
697 competition with harbour seals.

698 Harbour seal populations are apparently stable or locally increasing in the west, where grey
699 seals have been at their carrying capacity since harbour seal surveys began; they are
700 increasing in the southern North Sea where grey seal populations are growing at close to
701 their theoretical maximum; they are suffering serious declines in the northern North Sea
702 (Moray Firth and East Scotland SMUs) and Northern Isles (North Coast & Orkney and
703 Shetland SMUs) over a period when grey seals have approached their carrying capacity.
704 There is therefore no simple/clear link between the status of grey and harbour seal
705 populations.

706 However, the lack of a simple relationship does not necessarily rule out a competition effect.
707 Density dependent effects would presumably be operating as the populations approach their
708 carrying capacities. Assuming little change in the carrying capacity, any such density
709 dependence would have been fully operational before harbour seal surveys began in the
710 west of Scotland and therefore, competition from grey seals would have been relatively
711 constant throughout. The relatively stable harbour seal populations could represent the
712 steady state populations under that level of competition.

713 The rapid harbour seal declines in the northern North Sea and Northern Isles have occurred
714 over a period when the regional grey seal population has appeared to approach carrying
715 capacity (Russell et al. This issue; Thomas et al., This issue), a period where density
716 dependent effects could have led to increasing levels of interspecific competition. Observed
717 declines could therefore represent the effects of increasing levels of competition with grey
718 seals. Wilson and Hammond (This issue) have shown that in eastern Scotland and the
719 Northern Isles, where harbour seals have declined, a large proportion of their diet comprises
720 sandeels, and that declines in sandeel abundance may be a contributing factor driving harbour
721 seal declines. Sandeels are also important in grey seal diet in this area and increased
722 consumption by grey seals may further reduce sandeel availability to harbour seals.

723 The increasing trends in both species in the central and southern North Sea could simply
724 indicate that density dependent effects have not yet become evident. Recent reports from
725 the Wadden Sea (Galatius et al., 2017) suggest that the moult counts of harbour seals have
726 remained constant for the past five years, following a 15 year period of rapid increase. This
727 apparent stabilization of the Wadden Sea population has occurred at the same time as The
728 Wash counts appear to be levelling off. This may be an early indication that the rapidly
729 increasing grey seal population in the southern North Sea is beginning to influence harbour
730 seal populations.

731 4.5.2 Predation

732 4.5.2.1 Grey seal predation

733 Recent reports of grey seals as major predators of harbour porpoises, grey seal pups and
734 adult harbour seals (Brownlow et al., 2016; Haelters, Kerckhof, Jauniaux, & Degraer, 2012;
735

736 Leopold et al., 2014; Van Neer et al., 2015) have highlighted the potential involvement of
737 grey seal predation in the harbour seal declines. To date none of these studies has quantified
738 the level of predation.

739
740 The relative patterns of grey and harbour seal population changes suggest that predation by
741 grey seals on harbour seals is not likely to be a routine behaviour pattern, shared by a large
742 proportion of the grey seal population. If a significant proportion of grey seals are acting as
743 predators, the rapid increases in grey seal numbers in the Southeast England region would
744 have been expected to have led to increased predation. Recent summer counts of grey seals
745 suggest that up to a third of the UK's grey seal population is using haulout sites along the
746 east coast of England during the summer (SCOS, 2017). This is substantially more than are
747 found in Orkney at the same time of year and the Orkney grey seal counts have been stable
748 since the late 1990s (SCOS, 2017). In the late 1990s the Orkney harbour seal population was
749 around 12,000 and has fallen by approximately 85% since 2000. If that decline was due to
750 predation by the local grey seal population it seems unlikely that a much smaller harbour
751 seal population in south-east England could have been able to increase if subjected to similar
752 or greater predation pressure from the rapidly expanding local grey seal population.

753
754 This does not, however, exclude the possibility that predation by grey seals is a major
755 contributory factor in some declines. Hanson et al. (2017) pointed out that the observed
756 levels of mortality due to grey seal predation in the Firth of Tay and Eden SAC was
757 unsustainable and sufficient to account for the continuing decline there.

758
759 In the North Coast & Orkney SMU, the harbour seal counts have declined by approximately
760 6,500 since 2000, assuming that the counts represent approximately 70% of the total
761 population (Lonergan et al., 2013), this is equivalent to the removal of ~9,000 seals over 15
762 years or ~600 p.a. Counts of grey seals hauled out during the August harbour seal surveys
763 have remained relatively stable over that period, and suggest a summer population of
764 approximately 42,000 grey seals centred on Orkney (SCOS 2017). Assuming a sex ratio of
765 0.7♂:1♀ and an average survival rate of 0.95 for age 1+ animals (Thomas et al., This issue)
766 c.10,000 of these would be adult males. Observations at Blakeney Point in south-east

767 England and at Helgoland in Germany suggest that small numbers, possibly even individual
768 male grey seals can kill large numbers of harbour seals over short periods of time (Bexton et
769 al., 2012; Van Neer et al., 2015). The relative sizes of the populations of grey and harbour
770 seals in Orkney means that just 1% of adult male grey seals each taking six harbour seals per
771 year would be sufficient to account for the observed decline.

772 773 4.5.2.2 *Killer whale predation.*

774 Killer whales are known predators of harbour seals over most of their range in both the North
775 Atlantic and North Pacific (Bolt, Harvey, Mandleberg, & Foote, 2009; Deecke, Nykanen,
776 Foote, & Janik, 2011; Ford et al., 1998; Jourdain, Vongraven, Bisther, & Karoliussen, 2017).
777 Bolt et al. (2009) used sightings of killer whales in Shetland and estimates of field metabolic
778 rates to estimate the total energy requirement of the local population during the harbour
779 seal breeding season. They showed that a small number of whales relying on harbour seals
780 as prey would be sufficient to account for the reported declines in Shetland, but it was not
781 possible to confirm the proportion of the diet made up of harbour seals in Shetland. There
782 are no data on rates of predation by killer whales on harbour seals in other areas and it is
783 therefore not possible to assess the likelihood of such predation being a contributing factor
784 to declines in Orkney or East Scotland SMUs.

785 786 4.5.3 Effects of PDV epidemics

787 The 1988 PDV epidemic removed approximately 50% of the harbour seal populations in the
788 southern North Sea. This was followed by a period of sustained growth. The patterns of
789 decrease and recovery in the Southeast England SMU population were similar to those in the
790 only other major population in the southern North Sea, the Wadden Sea population. A
791 second PDV epidemic spread through the populations in the southern North Sea in late
792 summer and autumn 2002. However, despite the epidemic in The Wash starting at the same
793 time of year and with the population being effectively the same size as in 1988, the trajectory
794 of the population after the 2002 epidemic was different to that following the 1988 epidemic.

795 The GAM fitted to the detailed data set for The Wash after 2002 indicated that the counts
796 declined until 2006, falling by approximately 50% overall, before a period of rapid recovery
797 and eventual levelling off after 2010. In contrast, in the Wadden Sea, the pattern of decline

798 and recovery was similar to that seen after the 1988 epidemic with an initial drop of c50%
799 followed by a rapid increase at around 12% p.a. from 2003.

800 These two populations have been diverging since the 1970s. The growth rates in The Wash
801 before and after the 1988 epidemic were substantially lower than those estimated in the
802 Wadden Sea (Thompson et al., 2005). Although both populations suffered a dramatic 50%
803 decrease in 1988 and then both increased exponentially until 2001, the growth rate in the
804 Wadden Sea from 1989 to 2001 was approximately 12% p.a. compared to 7.9% p.a. in the
805 Southeast England SMU (Brasseur et al., 2018; Galatius et al., 2017).

806 In the early 1980s the Wadden Sea population was approximately twice the size of The Wash
807 population (no counts were available for other parts of the Southeast England SMU before
808 1988). As a consequence of these differing growth rates, although the Southeast England
809 population is currently close to its pre-epidemic level in 1988, the Wadden Sea population is
810 now approximately eight times larger than The Wash population (Figure 8) (Brasseur et al.,
811 2018; Galatius et al., 2017). This represents a large shift in the relative importance of these
812 two populations.

813 At present there is no clear explanation for the different population responses to the 2002
814 epidemic or for the substantially lower growth rates in the English harbour seal populations
815 throughout the time series. The continued decline between 2002 and 2006 is not thought
816 to have been due to direct mortality related to PDV as there is no indication that live virus
817 persisted in the population after 2002 (Härkönen et al., 2006). Differential sex or age linked
818 mortality may have contributed to an apparent decline, but pup counts for the Wash
819 population (SCOS 2017) did not show the same decline after the epidemic suggesting that
820 the number of breeding adult females at least did not decrease over that period. It is possible
821 the continued decline simply reflected a change in the proportion of the population choosing
822 to moult in the area, effectively a temporary emigration to alternative moulting sites. If this
823 did occur, the lack of a coincident increase in the counts at Blakeney and Donna Nook
824 suggests that any such movement must have been to sites outside the study area.

825 Interestingly the 2002 counts at all three sites in Southeast England SMU were lower than
826 the 2000 and 2001 counts. This may be coincidental, but could also indicate that the

827 epidemic was already influencing haulout behaviour of a proportion of the population some
828 weeks before the first mortalities were observed along the coast of south-east England. This
829 difference could be due to simple variability in seal counts, but could also be the result of
830 weather and currents keeping carcasses away from the shore before the moult surveys.
831 Alternatively, if a proportion of the seals destined to moult in the Wash forage close to the
832 European coast or haul out there, they could have become infected earlier and been included
833 in the mortality totals in mainland Europe. Despite large scale tracking studies in both
834 populations, there have, to date, been no records of telemetry tagged seals moving directly
835 between the Wadden Sea and The Wash in either direction. Unfortunately the timing of
836 tagging studies in which tags are usually applied post moult or early spring and usually fall
837 off prior to the breeding season, means that there is little information on movements during
838 the short period between breeding and moulting.

839 Although the effect of the 2002 PDV epidemic was most apparent in south-east England,
840 allowing models to fit different trajectories before and after the 2002 epidemic indicates
841 evidence of concurrent declines in all other SMUs on the east and north coasts. There are
842 no indications of a downturn in any of the SMUs or SACs in the west.

843
844 Few PDV cases were reported from the East Scotland or the Northern Isles in 2002, although
845 some sero-positive animals were recorded in East Scotland (Härkönen et al., 2006) indicating
846 that part of the population was exposed to PDV at the time. It is not clear how low level
847 exposure to a PDV epidemic could lead to a continual decline over a prolonged period. The
848 wide-spread change from stable to declining populations coincident with the 2002 epidemic
849 is unexpected, especially in areas that did not experience large scale mortality at the time.
850 There are no indications that PDV caused any direct mortality in the years following either
851 the 1988 or 2002 epidemics (Härkönen et al., 2006) so it is unlikely that the declines observed
852 in eastern and northern Scotland were due to direct infection mortality. If the declines are
853 related to the PDV epidemics it seems likely to be due to some change in geographical
854 patterns of recruitment of juveniles and/or migration of adult seals to the southern North
855 Sea or western Scottish SMUs. Other than occasional movements between adjacent SMUs
856 the available telemetry data do not indicate large scale, long distance movement of adult
857 harbour seals and there are few data on movements of juveniles. There is therefore no

858 independent evidence of movement of harbour seals out of the region of decline in the east
859 and north of Scotland.

860 4.5.4 Other diseases

861 In addition to PDV, an outbreak of avian influenza in 2014, killed at least 1600 harbour seals
862 in the Wadden Sea (Common Wadden Sea Secretariat, 2014) and 580 in the Kattegat-
863 Skagerrak (Krog et al., 2014; Zohari, Neimanis, Härkönen, Moraeus, & Valarcher, 2014). No
864 cases were reported in UK waters, but the fact that grey seals have been identified as a
865 possible wild reservoir for influenza-A (Puryear et al., 2016) means that there is clear
866 potential for such an outbreak in future and the possibility that such outbreaks could have
867 occurred and gone unreported in areas of decline.
868

869
870 *Brucella* infection is widespread in UK harbour seals; Kershaw et al. (2017) found that 16%
871 of a sample of 490 harbour seals tested positive for *Brucella* although there were no
872 pathological signs of infection. However, there was no evidence of higher sero-prevalence,
873 or circulating antibody levels in animals in the areas with the greatest declines. *Brucella*
874 infection is therefore unlikely to be a major contributing factor to recent declines.
875

876 4.5.5. Algal toxins

877 Algal toxins, have been proposed as potential causes or contributors to the regional declines
878 in harbour seals. Jensen et al. (2015) showed that harbour seals around Scotland are
879 exposed to both domoic acid (DA) and saxitoxins (STXs) at potentially lethal levels in their
880 diet. The proportion of positive samples and the toxin levels measured in the excreta were
881 significantly higher in areas where harbour seal abundance is in decline suggesting that algal
882 toxins may be factors in the regional harbour seal declines. Unfortunately there is insufficient
883 historical information on patterns of occurrence to relate changes in frequency of harmful
884 algal blooms to the start of local harbour seal declines.
885
886

4.6 Conclusions

This paper presents the results of a long-term monitoring programme designed to provide periodic estimates of the UK harbour seal population and to provide trend information through more frequent surveys of regional and local populations. The analyses demonstrate the importance of carefully targeting survey effort to provide long-term population monitoring at different temporal resolutions, for specific areas depending on the intended use of the results.

These results represent the current knowledge of one of the most intensively studied large mammal populations in Europe, and the trend analyses provide the necessary information to adequately fulfil reporting requirements under the current management and conservation legislation. However, to some extent that is a fortunate state of affairs. While probably representing the best use of available resources it is clear that the current survey regime's ability to detect or quantify quite large, short-term changes or more gradual, long-term changes is limited by the low frequency of surveys in some important populations. The ability to detect chronic impacts of future anthropogenic activities may require a re-assessment of the monitoring strategy and a more focused application of survey resources.

The apparent geographical structure of the UK harbour seal population may have significant implications for future population management. If the drivers of population trajectories are acting at scales larger than individual SMUs it may be possible and necessary, in some circumstances, to manage populations at these larger scales.

The fitted trends show that despite the imposition of conservation orders along the entire east coast of the UK, the harbour seal populations in some SMUs are continuing to decline. With the continuing rapid development of offshore activities this failure to recover despite strong conservation action is clearly a cause for concern.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Industry Nature Conservation Association (INCA) for providing counts in the Tees estuary, to the pilots and maintenance staff at PDG Helicopters Ltd, Giles Aviation Ltd and Highland Air Surveys for keeping us flying, and to the many volunteers who helped with surveys and counted so many seals on so many photographs. We are particularly grateful to the editor, John Baxter, and two referees for their comments and suggestions that greatly improved the paper. Surveys in England and the Moray Firth were funded by the UK Natural Environment Research Council (National Capability Grant no. SMRU1001). Surveys in the rest of Scotland were funded by Scottish Natural Heritage and surveys in Northern Ireland were funded by The Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), Marine Current Turbines (MCT) and Northern Ireland Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA).

928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971

5 REFERENCES

- Arso Civil, M., Smout, S.C., Duck, C., Morris, C., Cummings, C., Langley, I., ... Hall, A.J. (2018). Harbour Seal Decline – vital rates and drivers. *Report to Scottish Government HSD2*. Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St Andrews, pp. 63. Available at: <http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/research-policy/reports-to-scottish-government/>
- Bexton, S., Thompson, D., Brownlow, A., Barley, J., Milne, R. & Bidewell, C. (2012). Unusual Mortality of Pinnipeds in the United Kingdom Associated with Helical (Corkscrew) Injuries of Anthropogenic Origin. *Aquatic Mammals*, 38, 229–240.
- Bjorge A., Desportes, G., Waring, G. and Rosing-Asvid, A. (2010). The harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) – a global perspective. *NAMMCO Scientific Publications*, 8, 7-14
- Bodewes, R., Morick, D., de Mutsert, G., Osinga, N., Bestebroer, T., van der Vliet, S., ... Osterhaus, A. D. M. E. (2013). Recurring Influenza B Virus Infections in Seals. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 19(3), 511–512.
- Bolt, H.E., Harvey, P.V., Mandleberg, L., & Foote, A.D. (2009). Occurrence of killer whales in Scottish inshore waters: temporal and spatial patterns relative to the distribution of declining harbour seal populations. *Aquatic Conservation-Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 19(6): 671-675
- Bond, I. (2018). Tees Seals Research Programme Monitoring Report No.29 (1989 – 2017) available at: <http://www.inca.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Teesmouth-Seals-Report-2018-final.pdf>
- Boyd, I.L., Wanless, S., & Camphuysen, K. (2006). *Top Predators in Marine Ecosystems: Their Role in Monitoring and Management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brasseur S.M.J.M., Reijnders, P.J.H., Cremer, J., Meesters, E., Kirkwood, R., Jensen, L.F., ... Arts, G. (2018). Echoes from the past: Regional variations in recovery within a harbour seal population. *PLoS One* 13(1): [DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0189674](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189674)
- Brownlow, A., Onoufriou, J., Bishop, A., Davison, N., & Thompson, D. (2016). Corkscrew seals: grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) infanticide and cannibalism may indicate the cause of spiral lacerations in seals. *PLoS One*, 11(6): DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0156464
- Butler, J., Middlemas, S., Graham, I., & Harris, R. (2011). Perceptions and costs of seal impacts on Atlantic salmon fisheries in the Moray Firth, Scotland: Implications for the adaptive co-management of seal-fishery conflict. *Marine Policy*, 35, 317–323
- Callaghan, J. (2010). Future marine energy results of the marine energy challenge: Cost competitiveness and growth of wave and tidal stream energy. *Carbon Trust report*, 40 pp. <http://www.thecarbontrust.co.uk/carbontrust/about/publications/FutureMarineEnergy.pdf>

- 972 Common Wadden Sea Secretariat. (2014) Increased harbour seal mortality in the Wadden Sea.
973 Available at [http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/news-and-service/news](http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/news-and-service/news/14-21-11increased-harbour-seal-mortality-in-the-wadden-sea)
974 /14-21-11increased-harbour-seal-mortality-in-the-wadden-sea
975
- 976 Cordes, L. S., & Thompson, P.M. (2015). Mark-resight estimates of seasonal variation in harbor
977 seal abundance and site fidelity. *Population Ecology*, 57, 467-472.
978
- 979 Council of the European Communities. (1992) The Habitats Directive.
980 http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/habitatsdirective/index_en.htm
981
- 982 Cronin, M., Duck, C. D., O'Cadhla, O., Nairn, R., Strong, D., & O'Keefe, C. (2007). An assessment
983 of population size and distribution of harbour seals in the Republic of Ireland during the
984 moultseason in August 2003. *Journal of Zoology*. 273(2), 131- 139
985
- 986 Cronin, M., Gregory, S., & Rogan, E. (2014). Moulting phenology of the harbour seal in south-
987 west Ireland. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 94(6),
988 1079-1086.
989
- 990 Cunningham, L., Baxter, J. M., Boyd, I. L., Duck, C. D., M. Lonergan, Moss, S.E., & Mcconnell, B.
991 (2009). Harbour seal movements and haul-out patterns: implications for monitoring and
992 management. *Aquatic Conservation-Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 19, 398-407.
993
- 994 Daniel, R.G., Jemison, L.A., Pendleton, G.W., & Crowley, S.M. (2003). Moulting phenology of
995 harbour seals on Tugidak Island, Alaska. *Marine Mammal Science*, 19, 128–140.
996
- 997 Deecke, V.B., Nykanen, M., Foote, A.D., & Janik VM. (2011). Vocal behaviour and feeding
998 ecology of killer whales *Orcinus orca* around Shetland, UK. *Aquatic Biology*. 13(1):79–
999 U186.
1000
- 1001 Dietz, R., J. Teilmann, S. M. Andersen, F. Riget and M. T. Olsen. (2013) Movements and site
1002 fidelity of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in Kattogat, Denmark, with implications for the
1003 epidemiology of the phocine distemper virus. *International Council for the Exploration*
1004 *of the Seas Journal of Marine Science*, 70:186-195.
1005
- 1006 Duck, C. (2006). Results of the thermal image survey of seals around the coast of Northern
1007 Ireland. *Environment and Heritage Service Research and Development Series*, No. 06/09.
1008
- 1009 Duignan, P.J., Van Bresseem, M.-F., Baker, J.D., Barbieri, M., Colegrove, K.M., De Guise, S., ...
1010 Wellehan, J.F.X. (2014). Phocine Distemper Virus: Current Knowledge and Future
1011 Directions. *Viruses*, 6(12), 5093–5134.
1012
- 1013 Ford, J.K.B., Ellis, G.M., Barrett-Lennard, L.G., Morton, A.B., Palm, R.S., & Balcomb, K.C. (1998).
1014 Dietary specialization in two sympatric populations of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in
1015 coastal British Columbia and adjacent waters. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 76(8),1456–
1016 1471.
1017

- 1018 Galatius, A., Brasseur, S., Czeck, R., Jeß, A., Körber, P., Pund, R., ... Klöpper, S. (2017). Aerial
1019 surveys of Harbour Seals in the Wadden Sea in 2017: Population counts still in
1020 stagnation, but more pups than ever. [http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/
1021 sites/default/files/downloads/TMAP_downloads/Seals/17-
1022 1109_harboursealreport2017.pdf](http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/sites/default/files/downloads/TMAP_downloads/Seals/17-1109_harboursealreport2017.pdf)
1023
- 1024 Gov.uk (2015). Marine species protection: Guidance Seals. Up-dated June 2015.
1025 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/protected-marine-species/seals>
1026
- 1027 Granquist, S.M., & Hauksson, E. (2016). Seasonal, meteorological, tidal and diurnal effects on
1028 haul-out patterns of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in Iceland. *Polar Biology*, 39(12),
1029 2347-2359
1030
- 1031 Grellier, K., Thompson, P.M., & Corpe, H.M. (1996). The effect of weather conditions on
1032 harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) haulout behaviour in the Moray Firth, northeast Scotland.
1033 *Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue Canadienne De Zoologie*, 74, 1806-1811.
1034
- 1035 Haelters, J., Kerckhof, F., Jauniaux, T., & Degraer, S. (2012). The grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*)
1036 as a predator of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*)? *Aquatic Mammals*, 38, 343-
1037 353.
1038
- 1039 Hanson, N., Thompson, D., Duck, C., Baxter, J., & Lonergan, M. (2017). Harbour seal (*Phoca*
1040 *vitulina*) abundance within the Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary, Scotland: recent trends
1041 and extrapolation to extinction. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
1042 *Ecosystems*, 27(1), 268-281.
1043
- 1044 Härkönen, T.K., Harding, C., & Lunneryd, S.G. (1999). Age and sex specific behaviour in harbour
1045 seals *Phoca vitulina* leads to biased estimates of vital population parameters. *Journal of*
1046 *Applied Ecology*, 36, 825-841
1047
- 1048 Härkönen, T., Dietz, R., Reijnders, P., Teilmann, J., Harding, K., Hall, A., ... Thompson, P. (2006). A
1049 review of the 1988 and 2002 phocine distemper virus epidemics in European harbour
1050 seals. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms*, 68, 115-130.
1051
- 1052 Harvey, J.T., & Goley, D. (2011). Determining a correction factor for aerial surveys of harbor
1053 seals in California. *Marine Mammal Science*, 27: 719-735.
1054
- 1055 Huber, H.R., Jeffries, S.J., Brown, R.F., DeLong, R.L., & VanBlaricom, G. (2001). Correcting aerial
1056 survey counts of harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina richardsi*) in Washington and Oregon.
1057 *Marine Mammal Science*, 17: 276-293.
1058
- 1059 Jensen, S-K., Lacaze, J-P., Hermann, G., Kershaw, J., Brownlow, A., Turner, A., & Hall, A. J.
1060 (2015). Detection and effects of harmful algal toxins in Scottish harbour seals and
1061 potential links to population decline. *Toxicon*, 97, 1-14.
1062

- 1063 Jourdain, E., Vongraven, D., Bisther, A., & Karoliussen, R. (2017). First longitudinal study of seal-
1064 feeding killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in Norwegian coastal waters. *PLoS ONE* 12(6):
1065 e0180099. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180099>
1066
- 1067 Kershaw, J. L., Stubberfield, E. J., Foster, G., Brownlow, A., Hall, A. J., & Perrett, L. L. (2017).
1068 Exposure of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) to *Brucella* in declining populations across
1069 Scotland. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms*, 126(1), 12-23.
1070
- 1071 Krog, J. S., Hansen, M. S., Holm, E., Hjulsager, C. K., Chriél, M., Pedersen, K., ... Larsen, L. E.
1072 (2015). Influenza A(H10N7) virus in dead harbor seals, Denmark. *Emerging infectious*
1073 *diseases*, 21(4), 684-7.
1074
- 1075 Leopold, M., Bergeman, L., van Bleijswijk, J., Ijsseldijk, L., Witte, H., & Grone, A. (2015). Exposing
1076 the grey seal as a major predator of harbour porpoises. *Proceedings of the Royal*
1077 *Society. B*, 282, 2014.2429
1078
- 1079 Lewis, A., Estefen, S., Huckerby, J., Musial, W., Pontes, T., & Torres-Martinez, J. (2011). IPCC
1080 special report on renewable energy sources and climate change mitigation. Pages 497-
1081 533 *Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* Cambridge University
1082 Press, Cambridge (New York).
1083
- 1084 Lonergan, M., Duck, C.D., Moss, S., Morris, C., & Thompson, D. (2013). Rescaling of aerial survey
1085 data with information from small numbers of telemetry tags to estimate the size of a
1086 declining harbour seal population. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
1087 *Ecosystems*, 23(1), 135-144
1088
- 1089 Lonergan, M., Duck, C.D., Thompson, D., Mackey, B.L., Cunningham, L., & Boyd, I.L. (2007). Using
1090 sparse survey data to investigate the declining abundance of British harbour seals.
1091 *Journal of Zoology*, 271(3), 261-269
1092
- 1093 Matthiopoulos, J., Cordes, L., Mackey, B., Thompson, D., Duck, C., Smout, S., ... Thompson P.
1094 (2014). State-space modelling reveals proximate causes of harbour seal population
1095 declines. *Oecologia*, 174, 151–162.
1096
- 1097 Muto, M.M., Helker, V. T., Angliss, R. P., Allen, B.A., Boveng, P.L., Breiwick, J.M., ... Zerbin, A.N.
1098 (2018). Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2017. *U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA*
1099 *Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-378*, 382 p.
1100
- 1101 O’Corry-Crowe, G. M., Martien, K. K., and Taylor, B. L. 2003. The analysis of population genetic
1102 structure in Alaskan harbor seals, *Phoca vitulina*, as a framework for the identification of
1103 management stocks. *Southwest Fisheries Science Center Admin. Rep.* LJ-03-08. 54 pp.
1104
- 1105 Olsen, M. T., Islas, V., Graves, J. A., Onoufriou, A., Vincent, C., Brasseur, S., ... Hall, A. J. (2017).
1106 Genetic population structure of harbour seals in the United Kingdom and neighbouring
1107 waters. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 27(4), 839-845.
1108

- 1109 OSPAR (2005). North Sea Pilot Project on Ecological. Quality Objectives. Background Document
1110 on the. Ecological Quality Objective for Seal. Population Trends in the North Sea
1111 <https://www.ospar.org/documents?v=7009>
1112
- 1113 OSPAR (2010) Evaluation of the EcoQO system and relation with Marine Strategy Framework.
1114 Ecological Quality Objectives in the North Sea (OSPAR publication 2007/307)
1115 https://qsr2010.ospar.org/media/.../p00406_Evaluation_EcoQO_2010_update.pdf
1116
- 1117 OSPAR (2017). Intermediate-assessment 2017: Biodiversity Status: Seal Abundance and
1118 distribution ([https://oap.ospar.org/en/ospar-assessments/intermediate-assessment-
1119 2017/biodiversity-status/marine-mammals/seal-abundance-and-distribution/](https://oap.ospar.org/en/ospar-assessments/intermediate-assessment-2017/biodiversity-status/marine-mammals/seal-abundance-and-distribution/)).
1120
- 1121 Þorbjörnsson J. G., Hauksson, E., Sigurðsson, G.M., & Granquist, S.M. 2017. Aerial census of the
1122 Icelandic harbour seal (*Phoca vitulina*) population in 2016: Population estimate, trends
1123 and current status. Available from:
1124 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315110781_Aerial_census_of_the_Icelandic
1125 _harbour_seal_Phoca_vitulina_population_in_2016_Population_estimate_trends_and_
1126 current_status](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315110781_Aerial_census_of_the_Icelandic_harbour_seal_Phoca_vitulina_population_in_2016_Population_estimate_trends_and_current_status) [accessed Feb 07 2019].
1127
- 1128 Puryear, W.B., Keogh, M., Hill, N., Moxley, J., Josephson, E., Davis, K.R., ... Runstadler, J. (2016).
1129 Prevalence of influenza A virus in live-captured North Atlantic gray seals: a possible wild
1130 reservoir. *Emerging Microbes and Infections*. 3;5(8):e81. doi: 10.1038/emi.2016.77.
1131
- 1132 R Core Team (2017) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. [https://www.R-
1133 project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/)
1134
- 1135 Reijnders, P.J., Brasseur, S.M., & Meesters, E.H. (2010). Earlier pupping in harbour seals (*Phoca
1136 vitulina*). *Biology Letters*, 6, 854–857.
1137
- 1138 Ries, E.H., Hiby, L.R., & Reijnders, P.J.H. (1998). Maximum likelihood population size estimation
1139 of harbour seals in the Dutch Wadden Sea based on a mark-recapture experiment.
1140 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 35: 332–339.
1141
- 1142 Russell, D. J. F., Jones, E. L., & Morris, C. (2017). Updated Seal Usage Maps: The Estimated at-
1143 sea Distribution of Grey and Harbour Seals. *Scottish Marine and Freshwater Science*.
1144 8(25). Scottish Government. DOI: 10.7489/2027-1
1145
- 1146 Russell, D. J. F., McClintock, B. T., Matthiopoulos, J., Thompson, P., Thompson, D., Hammond, P.
1147 S., ... McConnell, B. J. (2015) Intrinsic and extrinsic drivers of activity budgets in
1148 sympatric grey and harbour seals. *Oikos*, 124(11), 1462-1472.
1149
- 1150 Russell, D.J.R., Morris, C.D., Duck, C.D., Thompson, D., & Hiby, L. (This issue). Monitoring long-
1151 term changes in UK grey seal pup production. *Journal of Aquatic Conservation: Marine
1152 and Freshwater Ecosystems*
1153
- 1154 SCOS (2017) Scientific advice on matters related to the management of seal populations.
1155 Natural Environment Research Council, 144pp.

1156 <http://www.smru.st-andrews.ac.uk/files/2018/01/SCOS-2017.pdf>

1157
1158 Scottish Government (2018) Seal licensing. Accessed 16/08/2018

1159 <https://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Licensing/SealLicensing>

1160
1161 Simpkins, M., Withrow, D.E., Cesarone, J.C., & Boveng, P.L. (2003). Stability in the proportion of
1162 harbor seals hauled out under locally ideal conditions. *Marine Mammal Science*, 19,
1163 791–805.

1164
1165 Teilmann, J., Riget, F., & Härkönen, T. (2010). Optimizing survey design for Scandinavian
1166 harbour seals: population trend as an ecological quality element. *International Council*
1167 *for the Exploration of the Seas Journal of Marine Science*, 67, 952-958.

1168
1169 Thomas, L., Russell, D. J. F., Duck, C., Morris, C. D., Lonergan, M., Empacher, F., ... Harwood, J.
1170 (This Issue). Estimating the size of the UK grey seal population between 1984 and 2010.
1171 *Journal of Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*.

1172
1173 Thompson, D., Duck, C.D., & Lonergan, M.E. (2010). The status of harbour seals in the United
1174 Kingdom. *NAMMCO Scientific Publication*, 8, 117-128

1175
1176 Thompson, D., Lonergan, M., & Duck, C.D. (2005). Population dynamics of harbour seals
1177 (*Phoca vitulina*) in England: growth and catastrophic declines. *Journal of Applied*
1178 *Ecology*, 42(4), 638-648

1179
1180 Thompson P.M., & Harwood J. (1990). Methods for estimating the population-size of common
1181 seals, (*Phoca vitulina*). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 27, 924-938.

1182
1183 Thompson, P., & Rothery, P. (1987). Age and sex differences in the timing of moult in the
1184 common seal (*Phoca vitulina*). *Journal of Zoology*, 212, 597-603

1185
1186 Thompson, P.M., Tollit, D.J., Wood, D., Corpe, H.M., Hammond, P.S., & Mackay, A. (1997).
1187 Estimating Harbour Seal Abundance and Status in an Estuarine Habitat in North-East
1188 Scotland. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 34(1), 43-52

1189
1190 Thompson P.M., Van Parijs S., & Kovacs K.M. (2001). Local declines in the abundance of harbour
1191 seals: implications for the designation and monitoring of protected areas. *Journal of*
1192 *Applied Ecology*, 38(1), 117-125

1193
1194 Van Neer, A., Jensen, L. F., & Siebert, U. (2015). Grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) predation on
1195 harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) on the island of Helgoland, Germany. *Journal of Sea*
1196 *Research*, 97, 1–4

1197
1198 Vaughan, R.W. (1978). A study of common seals in the Wash. *Mammal Review*, 8, 25–34.

1199
1200 Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern Applied Statistics with S*. Fourth Edition.
1201 Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0

1202

- 1203 Wilson, L. & Hammond, P. S. (This Issue). The diet of harbour and grey seals around Britain:
1204 seeking evidence for the “ghost of competition past.” *Journal of Aquatic Conservation:*
1205 *Marine and Freshwater Ecolosystems*.
1206
- 1207 Wood, S. N. (2011). Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood
1208 estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
1209 *Society, Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73(1), 3-36.
1210
- 1211 Zohari S, Neimanis A, Härkönen T, Moraeus C, Valarcher J F. (2014). Avian influenza A(H10N7)
1212 virus involvement in mass mortality of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in Sweden, March
1213 through October 2014. *Euro Surveill.* 2014;19(46)
1214

ACCEPTED MS

Table 1. The most recent August counts of harbour seals at haul-out sites in Britain and Northern Ireland by Seal Management Area, compiled from surveys in 2014 to 2016 and 2011 in Northern Ireland and the Western Isles. Similar compilation counts are presented for three previous periods: 2007 to 2009, 2000 to 2006 and 1996 to 1997.

| Seal Management Unit / Country | | Harbour seal counts | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 2011- 2016 | 2007- 2009 | 2000- 2006 | 1996- 1997 |
| 1 | Southwest Scotland | 1,200 | 923 | 623 | 929 |
| 2 | West Scotland | 15,184 | 10,626 | 11,666 | 8,811 |
| 3 | Western Isles | 2,739 | 1,804 | 1,981 | 2,820 |
| 4 | North Coast & Orkney | 1,349 | 2,979 | 4,384 | 8,787 |
| 5 | Shetland | 3,369 | 3,039 | 3,038 | 5,994 |
| 6 | Moray Firth | 940 | 776 | 1,028 | 1,409 |
| 7 | East Scotland | 368 | 283 | 667 | 764 |
| SCOTLAND TOTAL | | 25,149 | 20,430 | 23,391 | 29,514 |
| 8 | Northeast England | 86 | 58 | 62 | 54 |
| 9 | Southeast England | 5,061 | 3,952 | 2,964 | 3,222 |
| 10 | South England | 23 | 15 | 13 | 5 |
| 11 | Southwest England | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Wales | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| 13 | Northwest England | 10 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| ENGLAND & WALES TOTAL | | 5,185 | 4,035 | 3,048 | 3,280 |
| GREAT BRITAIN TOTAL | | 30,334 | 24,462 | 26,471 | 32,794 |
| NORTHERN IRELAND TOTAL | | 948 | 1,101 | 1,176 | |
| UK TOTAL | | 31,282 | 25,563 | 27,618 | |

ACCEPTED MS

Table 2. Model estimated growth rates and associated confidence intervals for each Seal Management Unit, and various sub-units and the SACs within them. The number of years in which surveys occurred is shown, and for east coast sites where multiple surveys occurred in some years, the total number of survey counts (n) used in the analyses is shown. Trend values are average annual percentage change in counts of seals hauled out during the annual moult in August. All estimates were derived from GLMs fitted to counts over the periods indicated. See text for details of models fitted to the data and model selection criteria.

| Seal Management Unit | sub-unit | years (n) | first trend: | | second trend: | | third trend: | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| | | | years | trend % (95% C.I.) | years | trend % (95% C.I.) | years | selected model |
| Southeast England | Donna Nook, The Wash & Blakeney Point | 27 (34) | 1989-2002: | +6.61 (5.35, 7.89) | 2003-2017: | +2.82 (1.34,4.31) | | |
| | Wash & North Norfolk Coast SAC | 27 (35) | 1989-2002: | +6.41 (5.11,7.73) | 2003-2017: | +3.06 (1.54, 4.61) | | |
| | The Wash | 36 (57) | 1968-1988: | +3.51 (2.28, 4.76) | 1989-2002: | +5.99 (4.24,7.77) | 2003-2017: | GAM |
| Northeast England | The Tees | 29 | 1989-2002: | +7.43 (6.07, 8.80) | 2002-2017: | +7.43 (6.07,8.80) | | |
| East Scotland | Firth of Tay & Eden Estuary SAC | 22 (25) | 1990-2002: | constant | 2002-2017: | -18.58 (17.25, 19.88) | | |
| Moray Firth | Loch Fleet to Findhorn | 19 (25) | 1994-2002: | -5.55 (2.47, 8.53) | 2002-2017: | constant | | |
| Moray Firth | Dornoch Firth & Morrich More SAC | 20 (26) | 1992-2017: | -8.00 (6.30, 9.66) | | | | |
| North Coast & Orkney | | 9 | 1993-2001: | constant | 2006-2016: | -10.41 (9.29,11.52) | | |
| | Sanday SAC | 11 | 1993-2001: | constant | 2006-2016: | -17.75 (13.29,21.99) | | |
| Shetland | | 7 | 1991-2001: | constant | 2006-2015: | constant | | |
| | Mousa SAC | 7 | 1991-2015: | -11.13 (8.69,13.5) | | | | |
| | Yell Sound Coast SAC | 7 | 1991-2015: | constant | | | | |
| Western Isles | | 7 | 1992-2017: | constant | | | | |
| West Scotland | | 5 | 1990-2014: | constant | | | | |
| West Scotland; North | | 6 | 1991-2017: | +4.86 (4.02, 5.70) | | | | |
| West Scotland; Central | | 6 | 1989-2014: | +4.02 (3.08, 4.97) | | | | |
| | Ascrib, Isay and Dunvegan SAC | 11 | 1990-2017: | constant | | | | |
| West Scotland; South | | 5 | 1990-2014: | constant | | | | |
| | Eileanan agus Sgeiran Lios mor SAC | 9 | 1990-2014: | constant | | | | |
| | South-East Islay Skerries SAC | 6 | 1990-2015: | constant | | | | |
| Southwest Scotland | | 5 | 1989-2015: | constant | | | | |
| Northern Ireland | Carlingford Lough to Copeland Islands | 6 | 2002-2011: | -2.66 (1.79, 3.52) | | | | |




Figure 1 Map showing the Seal Management Units (SMUs) in the UK. Geographical locations mentioned in the text and locations of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), where seals were a primary feature for designation, are also shown. SAC sites in Scotland are detailed in Figure 2 below.




Figure 2 Map showing the Seal Management Units, West Scotland sub-units and the locations of SACs in Scotland where harbour seals are identified as a main qualifying feature. SAC locations identified by black letters are a) Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary; b) Dornoch Firth and Morrich More, c) Sanday, d) Mousa, e) Yell Sound, f) Ascrib, Isay and Dunvegan, g) Eileanan agus Sgeiran Lios mor, h) South-East Islay Skerries.




Figure 3 Distribution of harbour seals on haulout sites in August around the British Isles: a) Surveys carried out in 1996-1997; b) Surveys carried out in between 2014 and 2016 (2011 for Northern Ireland and Outer Hebrides). Small numbers of harbour seals (<20) are anecdotally but increasingly reported for the South-West England & Wales management unit, but are not included on this map.




Figure 4 Distribution of harbour seals on haulout sites in August at sites around Scotland. Counts from the most recent survey round (2011-2016, dark red circles) are shown superimposed on the counts from the first synoptic survey round (1996-1997, faint red circles). Size of circle (area) indicates the magnitude of the count. Seal management region boundaries are shown; see figure 1 for region names.




Figure 5 Survey counts and fitted trends for different seal management units and sub-units of the English harbour seal population. Counts and fits for each SMU or sub-unit are shown in black. Counts not used in model fits are shown as open dots. Where a robust model could not be fitted to the overall SMU, the counts and model fit for a subset of the region is shown in red: a) The combined South East England region (1988-2017); b) The Wash and North Norfolk SAC (1988 – 2017) and The Wash (1967 – 2017); c) North East England SMU and the Tees SAC (1990-2017).




Figure 6 Survey counts and fitted trends for different seal management units and sub-units of the Scottish harbour seal population on the East coast and Northern Isles. Counts and fits for each SMU or sub-unit are shown in black. Counts not used in model fits are shown as open dots. Where a robust model could not be fitted to the overall SMU, the counts and model fits for subsets of the region are shown in red and blue: a) The combined East Scotland SMU and the Firth of Tay and Eden estuary SAC (1990-2017); b) The Moray Firth SMU, Inner Moray Firth and the Dornoch Firth and Morrich More SAC (1993 – 2017); c) Orkney and North Coast SMU and the Sanday SAC (1993 – 2016); d) Shetland SMU and the Mousa and Yell Sound SACs (1993-2015).




Figure 7 Survey counts and fitted trends for different seal management units of the harbour seal populations on the Scottish West coast and in Northern Ireland. Counts and fits for each SMU are shown in black. Counts not used in model fits are shown as open dots. The counts and model fits for subsets of the region are shown in red: a) The West Scotland SMU (1990-2014); b) The Western Isles (Outer Hebrides) SMU (1992 - 2017); c) South-West Scotland SMU (1989 - 2015); d) Northern Ireland SMU (2002 - 2011).




Figure 8 Survey counts and fitted trends for sub-sections of the harbour seal population in the West Scotland SMU (see Figure 1 for section boundaries). Counts and fits for each sub-region are shown in black. Where a robust model could not be fitted to the overall region, the counts and model fits for subsets of the region are shown in red and blue: a) West Scotland north (1992-2017); b) West Scotland central and the Ascrib, Islay and Dunvegan SACs (1989 – 2016)); c) West Scotland south and the Lismore and S.E. Islay Skerries SACs with a single model fit to the entire time series (1990 – 2015).




Figure 9 Comparison of moult counts for the harbour seal population in The Wash, and the Wadden Sea from 1968 to 2016. (Wadden Sea data from Galatius et al., 2017).