A combination of empirical and modelled datasets reveals associations between deep diving seabirds and oceanographical processes at fine spatiotemporal scales in a high energy habitat



J.J. Waggitt ¹: P.S. Bell ²: P. Cazenave ³: R. Torres ³: B.J Williamson^{1, 4}: B.E. Scott¹

¹ Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Zoology Building, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 2TZ, UK

- ² National Oceanography Centre, Brownlow Street, Liverpool L3 5DA, UK
- ³ Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Prospect Place, The Hoe, Plymouth PL1 3DH, UK
- ⁴ Department of Physics, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, UK

Collision Risks and Spatial Overlap

•Impacts of tidal stream turbines on seabird populations unknown.

•Quantifying collision risks between deep diving seabirds and devices prioritised.

•Estimating spatial overlap an essential component of quantifying collision risk

•Understand and predict seabird foraging distributions within the tidal pass habitats favoured for installations





Fall Of Warness, Orkney, UK

Typical tidal pass habitat
Strong bidirectional currents
Complex topography
Complex bathymetry





Bathymetry is from multibeam sonar Seabed characteristics are from echosounder

Fall Of Warness, Orkney, UK

Ebb-Flood Tidal Cycle
Variations in feature location
Upwelling/Downwelling
Turbulence
Current Speeds



FVCOM 3D Hydrodynamic Model Outputs



Fall Of Warness, Orkney, UK

•Neap-Spring Tidal Cycle Spring (Ebb) Neap (Ebb) •Variations in feature extent •Upwelling/Downwelling •Turbulence Upwelling (cm/s) •Current Speeds -5 1.25 1.05 **Turbulence** (Eddy Viscosity) 0.75 0.75 0.5 0.25 0.25 Speed 2.5 (m/s) 1.5 FVCOM 3D Hydrodynamic Model **Outputs**

Understanding and Predicting Seabird Distributions

•Seabird associate with physical conditions that promote prey availability.

•Prey availability difficult to collect and quantify over entire tidal pass habitats.

•Understanding associations between seabirds and physical conditions enables predictions of distributions.

•Concurrent seabird and physical datasets need collecting over several seasons and tidal states. Suitable Physical Conditions

Predictions of foraging Distributions Increased Prey Availability

Presence of Foraging Seabirds

Vessel Based Observers

103 transects

May and October

2012 and 2013

Zigzag route against currents

Only seabirds upon the sea surface recorded

Positions calculated to an estimated accuracy of several hundred metres







4 Abundant Deep Diving Species Behavioural Differences Ecological Differences





Atlantic Puffin Fratercula arctica Feed primarily within water column Present during May

4 Abundant Deep Diving Species Behavioural Differences Ecological Differences





Common Guillemot Uria aalge Feed primarily within water column Present during May

4 Abundant Deep Diving Species Behavioural Differences Ecological Differences





Black Guillemot Cepphus grylle Feed primarily upon seabed Present during May and October.

4 Abundant Deep Diving Species Behavioural Differences Ecological Differences





European Shag Phalacrocorax aristotelis Feed primarily upon seabed Present during May and October.

General Linear Mixed Effect Models

Seabird Abundances

Atlantic Puffin (May) Black Guillemot (May, Oct) Common Guillemot (May) European Shag (May, Oct)

Environmental Variables

Speed Turbulence Upward Currents Seabed (Roughness/Hardness)

Random Variables DateTime

Run Model Poisson Distribution Selected Models using p-values

Predictions Used Model Coefficients



Physical Conditions

Dataset





Model Outputs

•Variations in microhabitat associations among species.

•Seasonal variations in species microhabitat associations.

•Variations in microhabitat associations complexities.

•Benthic foragers always associated with soft/rough substrate.

•Pelagic foragers always associated with fast current speeds

Season	Species	Speed	Turbulence	Upwelling	Substrate
Summer	Atlantic Puffin	Positive	Positive		
Summer	Common Guillemot	Positive			
Summer	Black Guillemot	Negative	Positive	Downwelling	Soft/Rough
Winter	Black Guillemot	Positive		Neither	Soft/Rough
Summer	European Shag			Downwelling	Soft/Rough
Winter	European Shag	Negative			Soft/Rough

Atlantic Puffin (Summer)

High Spatial Overlap Increases during spring tides Increases during ebb tides

Black Lines = Turbine Area





Common Guillemot (Summer)

High Spatial Overlap Increases during spring tides Increases during ebb tides

Black Lines = Turbine Area













Conclusions

Differences in associations among species and within species over time.

Several ecological explanations relating to resource competition and foraging behaviours

However, results highlight which and when species are most likely to forage near tidal stream turbines.

Quantitative measures enable predictions of spatial overlap at population levels



Atlantic Puffin Summer Resident High Spatial Overlap Increases in Ebb and Spring Tides

Common Guillemot Summer Resident High Spatial Overlap Increases in Ebb and Spring Tides

Black Guillemot Summer and Winter Resident Moderate Spatial Overlap in Winter



European Shag

Summer and Winter Resident Low Spatial Overlap



Acknowledgements

Marine Scotland Eric Armstrong Ian Davies Mike Stewart Robert Watret

Seabird Observations Marianna Chimienti Ciaran Cronin Stuart Thomas Tim Sykes

Bathymetric Data Russell Wynn

Discussions Paul Fernandes Kirsty Lees Alex Robbins Jane Reid Helen Wade Statistical Advice Thomas Cornulier Alex Douglas James Grecian Samantha Patrick

EMEC

Cristina Bristow Matthew Finn Jennifer Norris

> Openhydro Sue Barr

Eday Community Jenny Campbell Adam Cockram Kate Cockram Louise Cockram Mark Cockram Mike Cockram