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Abstract

Seabird-fishery interactions are important to seabird ecology and conservation since some species obtain a significant amount of food from fisheries, but mortality from bycatch is a primary cause of population declines in several species. While the availability of high resolution GPS data for both seabirds and vessels over the past few years has allowed analyses of fine-scale behavioural responses of seabirds at fishing vessels, little information is available on the distance at which seabirds respond to vessels. Indeed, previous studies focused on the foraging behaviour of individuals within the vicinity of vessels but did not consider the approach phase of birds. Here we provide such an estimate by examining changes in the flight direction of GPS-tracked wandering albatrosses breeding on the Crozet Islands, in response to the toothfish fishing fleet operating around the breeding grounds, monitored through GPS Vessel Monitoring System. We show that although we detect increases in feeding behaviour only when albatrosses are within 3km of boats, they display clear changes in flight direction, towards vessels, at distances up to 30km. This distance is nearly three times as large as previous estimates, almost reaching the theoretical maximum visual range of an albatros. We discuss these results in the light of previous estimates and pinpoint factors likely to affect the attraction distance. We suggest that this simple estimate of attraction distance could be investigated in other seabird-fishery systems, to improve our understanding of the factors affecting seabird interaction behaviour, and thus better predict when overlap will lead to interactions.
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**Introduction**

A large number of seabird species attend to fishing vessels, to access abundant and easy food, sometimes representing a substantial part of their diet (Garthe et al. 1996, Arcos & Oro 2002, Arata & Xavier 2003, Colabuono & Vooren 2007, Bugoni et al. 2010, Tew Kai et al. 2013). These interactions are however presenting severe conservation issues (e.g. Oro et al. 1996, Votier et al. 2004, Grémillet et al. 2008, Bertrand et al. 2012), in particular because they are linked with accidental mortality through bycatch (e.g. Brothers et al. 1999, Tuck et al. 2003, Anderson et al. 2011), which is one of the primary threats to seabird populations worldwide (Croxall et al. 2012).

To determine whether birds are likely to interact with fisheries, the probability of encountering fishing vessels is generally estimated by comparing the overlap between the distributions of foraging birds with those of fisheries activities (e.g. Nel et al. 2002, Pichegru et al. 2009, Reid et al. 2013). These proxies can in turn be used to more accurately model the impact of bycatch on population dynamics (e.g. Tuck et al. 2001). However overlap does not necessarily equate to interaction, nor to bycatch. Hence it appears essential to understand when overlap will lead to interaction, and for that purpose a crucial parameter to take into account is the distance around vessels within which these interactions occur. However, very little work has been dedicated to precisely estimating at what distance birds react to and interact with fishing vessels (Ryan & Moloney 1988, Skov & Durinck 2001, Bodey et al. 2014, see also Thiebault et al 2014), leading authors to rely on relatively arbitrary distances.

Recently, several authors used simultaneous GPS tracking of seabirds and fishing boats (Vessel Monitoring System data: VMS) to conduct detailed analyses of individual-level behavioural interactions at fine spatial and temporal scales (Votier et al. 2010, 2013, Granadeiro et al. 2011, 2013, Torres et al. 2011, 2013, Bodey et al. 2014). Most authors noted changes in foraging behaviour in relation to the presence of fisheries, but Bodey et al (2014) were the first to estimate directly from their data the distance from boats at which individual birds switched to foraging behaviour. Based on speed, acceleration and sinuosity, they distinguished two behavioural modes (Wakefield et al. 2013, Bodey et al. 2014): ‘foraging’ (sudden accelerations, or high turning rates and low speed) or ‘commuting’ (relatively straight trajectory and constant high speed). Using state space models they established that the presence of vessels increased the probability to switch from “commuting” to “foraging” at distances up to 11km from boats. However while this approach identified changes in behavioural state, it did not attempt to detect shifts in flight direction within a single behavioural state. Indeed, it is likely that seabirds start their approach from a greater distance, flying towards detected vessels (“commuting-like” behaviour) before really engaging in foraging behaviour.

Here we investigate the behavioural interactions of wandering albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*) breeding on the Crozet Islands with the longline toothfish fisheries operating in the French Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) around Crozet. Wandering albatrosses are known to overlap widely and to suffer bycatch mortality from fisheries worldwide (Nel et al. 2002, Xavier et al. 2004, Cuthbert et al. 2005, Walker et al. 2006, Otley et al. 2007, Reid et al. 2013), including the Crozet population (Weimerskirch et al. 1997, Barbraud et al. 2013). In this study we look at the distance from vessels at which birds start to switch towards more frequent foraging behaviour (“feeding distance”), but also at the distance at which they start to fly towards vessels. We thus provide the first estimate of the “attraction distance”: the distance at which seabirds show an approach response to fishing vessels.

**Material and Methods**

*Albatross tracking data*

The study was carried out on Ile de la Possession (Crozet Archipelago 46°S, 52°E). 69 incubating adult birds were equipped with GPS tags (igotU mobile technology): 43 in 2011 (from 14th of January to 19th of March) and 26 in 2012 (from 25th of January to 11th of March). Birds were caught on their nest and the GPS encased in heat shrink tubing were attached on back feathers using adhesive Tesa tape. During equipment or recovery, birds were either restrained on nest, or removed away while the egg was secured, depending on cases. The total mass of attached devices (<32g including the final package) was well under the 3% recommended threshold (Phillips et al. 2003). Birds were caught on the nest before they started a foraging trip to attach devices and on their return to the nest to recover tags. All GPS had a recording frequency of 15 minutes (for an expected battery life duration of more than 40 days, covering the wide range of incubation trip duration in this species). In total, 72 tracks were recorded (3 birds made 2 successive trips before being recaptured).

*Fisheries data*

In the Crozet EEZ, the 7 French long liners targeting Patagonian toothfish were the only legally active vessels operating during the study period. They usually alternated their periods of activity so that vessel density in the area rarely exceeded 3 or 4 at any given time. Data on vessel positions (using GPS technology) for each of these boats was obtained from VMS equipment made available from the Terres Australes et Antarctiques Françaises (TAAF) administration. Vessel positions were recorded every hour. In addition, the exact setting and hauling positions with times were available for all longlines from the Pecheker data base, hosted at the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle in Paris (Martin & Pruvost 2007, Gasco 2011, Pruvost et al. 2011). We combined VMS data with fisheries activity data to recreate vessel trips with fishing events. We then made a linear interpolation of positions to obtain one position every 10 minutes.

*Attraction distance: directed flight towards vessels*

We assumed that a bird attracted to a vessel will demonstrate a flight precisely directed towards it. Therefore, for every GPS location for each bird, we considered each of the heading directions towards all surrounding vessels, together with the related distances to the boat. As we have estimated boat locations every 10 minutes, any bird position would fall within 5 minutes of an estimated position of any vessel, giving a temporal resolution of “simultaneous locations” of ± 5 minutes.

For each bird position, we considered the difference between the real direction followed by birds (direction from bird position t to bird position t+1) with the list of all possible directions the bird could have followed to reach one of the vessels present in the EEZ (boats positions at time t ± 5min). These angular differences α (Figure 1), between 0 (bird flying towards a boat) and 180° (bird flying away from a boat), should be uniformly distributed between 0 and 180° if seabirds are not reacting to vessels (and assuming boats and vessels are randomly distributed over the same area). However this value will be near 0° for a bird flying towards a vessel, so that the α distribution will become more 0-skewed at distances where vessels attract birds. We thus looked at how the α distribution changed depending on the distance from vessels, to estimate the range of attraction distances. To do so, we computed the ratio of bird locations that were within 10° of the direction of a vessel (i.e. probability α<10°), as a function of the distance (by bins of 1km) from that vessel. We only used in-flight locations for this ratio (location where the calculated speed is >10km/h, as albatrosses are unable to sustain flight at lower speeds; Weimerskirch et al. 2002) since travelling abilities and visibility of the boats are considerably reduced for birds sitting on the water, and strongly affected by drift and ocean currents. Each ratio point was established from more than 290 bird positions.

The proportion of α<10° showed a steep decline followed by a more constant shape in function of distance, with a clear and sudden transition. We thus modelled it with a piecewise linear regression (Toms & Lesperance 2003), which fits a segmented line to the data and estimate the most likely position of the change in slope. This break point was used as the estimate of the attraction distance: it is the threshold beyond which we do not observe more flights directed towards the boats than “usual”. This “baseline” value was compared to the random expectations (10/180=0.056) under a uniform distribution. The R package segmented (Muggeo 2008) was used to apply the piecewise linear regressions (we initialized the break point at 1km, and *a priori* fixed the number of break points to 1). The results were not significantly affected if we used a 5° threshold for α, or if we binned distances every 2 or 5km.

*Feeding distance: Switches to very low apparent speed*

Albatrosses have to sit on the water to capture their prey. They may also sit on the water behind a fishing vessel when they wait for offal releases. Thus any feeding behaviour will result in increased time spent sitting on the water, possibly interspersed with flight phases remaining over a small profitable spot. These behaviours associated with feeding will thus result in successive positions with very low apparent speed. Because albatrosses can not sustain flight at speed <10km/h (Weimerskirch et al. 2002), positions where the apparent speed was lower than this threshold were considered to reflect feeding behaviour. To determine the distance from boats at which we observe that birds start to engage in feeding behaviour, we thus looked at the ratio of the number of low speed locations (<10km/h) offset against the number of high speed locations (>10km/h), in relation to the distance from boats (in bins of 0.5km). We expect this ratio to increase when birds scavenge around vessels. We only considered daylight locations for this ratio. Indeed, at night, wandering albatrosses mainly rest on the sea surface, (Weimerskirch, Wilson, et al. 1997), and thus low speed positions are more likely to reflect resting than feeding, so that including them would possibly weaken the signal. For each distance bin, the ratio was established over >100 bird positions. As this low/high speeds ratio also showed a steep decline followed by a more constant shape with distance, a piecewise linear regression model was again applied to determine the distance from vessels at which this increase in the ratio began (with one break point, initialized at 500 meters). Binning distances every 1km did not qualitatively change the results.

All calculations were conducted in the R environment (Team R. Core 2012), using routines that we developed.

*Effects of GPS sampling regimes and errors in boat estimated position on our results*

Both birds and vessels tracks were recorded here with a frequency relatively low compared to the time and spatial scale at which changes in bird behaviour could occur. Interpolating vessel positions partly overcomes this issue, but introduces some errors in estimated vessel locations. However, we argue here that this is unlikely to affect the conclusions of our study.

A first argument is that by taking a 10° threshold for analysing the α distribution, we overcome the potential lack of sensitivity caused by vessel location incertitude in the axis perpendicular to the bird direction. At a distance of 30km, a 10° arc covers a field of more than 5km long (2.5km long at 15km), which we estimate to cover the magnitude of potential error in vessel positions. Indeed, to have a quantitative idea of the magnitude of errors created by interpolation, we compared the interpolated tracks with inserted fishing events that we used in our analyses, to tracks likewise interpolated to the 10 minutes, but without inserting fishing events. The distance between simultaneous estimated locations of the same boats by the two different methods was in 95% of cases lower than 3km (max 12km, 70% less than 1km; see also estimates of errors in interpolation of trawlers VMS data by Granadeiro et al. 2011).

However, it could be objected that these small but non negligible errors in boat positions are potentially causing inaccurate measurements of bird-vessel distances and directions. Our second argument, based on the assumption that errors in boat locations are independent of birds’ locations, is that these errors are averaged out to a null value by our statistical treatment. As stated above, each ratio point used in our analyses (and illustrated in our two figures) is established over some hundreds of bird-vessel couples of locations. The apparent distances are *a priori* equally likely to be over or underestimated relative to the real bird-vessel distance, so that on average our points should truly represent the distance bin in which they fall in. Moreover, these ratio points are not themselves analysed, but used to reveal a general trend with distance, through regression. A similar reasoning applies to inaccurate measurements of apparent directions.

Finally, because we calculate bird direction *a posteriori* by looking at its next position, there remains a possibility that a fly directed towards a boat at an apparent large distance would have actually started only at a closer distance. This is a limit of the bird track sampling regime. However we believe again that the statistical treatment will largely compensate for this overestimation risk. Having more frequent bird GPS positions might ascertain this, but at least in the case of albatrosses, it could also complicate the analyses because depending on wind strength and direction, goal-directed flight might not look as straight at lower spatio-temporal scales.

**Results**

*Attraction distance*

The proportion of bird positions directed towards boats, presented a steep decline followed by a more constant shape with increasing distance from boats (Fig.1). The break point between these two phases, which we use as an estimate of the attraction distance, was 29.2km (95% CI: 25.5km – 32.9km).

At distances larger than this threshold, birds did not show any sign of attraction to boats: the proportion of in-flight positions directed towards boats was very close to the value expected under a uniform angular distribution (10°/180°=0.056, Fig.1), suggesting random directions with respect to vessels locations outside of this range.

*Feeding distance*

The ratio of low versus large apparent speed positions steeply declined with distance from vessels, up to a threshold of 3.1km (95% CI: 2.9km – 3.2km), which we use as an estimate of the feeding distance. Beyond this threshold distance, the ratio of low versus high apparent speed positions was relatively constant.

**Discussion**

We propose here a new method to estimate the attraction distance of seabirds to fishing boats. This method specifically considers the phase during which birds are approaching vessels, which had to our knowledge never been precisely quantified (Ryan & Moloney 1988, Skov & Durinck 2001, Spear et al. 2004, Bodey et al. 2014). Wandering albatrosses were shown to be attracted to the Crozet fishing fleet from distances up to 30km, while they started to display feeding behaviour only at much closer distances (3km). This highlights the importance of taking this approach phase into account when considering behavioural reactions of seabirds to vessels, as previous estimates of “reaction distances” (using various definitions or methodology) were generally of the order of magnitude of 10km (Wahl & Heinemann 1979, Ryan & Moloney 1988, Skov & Durinck 2001, Bodey et al. 2014).

The attraction distance is likely to vary across different seabird-fisheries systems. It could depend on a number of factors, such as the relative quality and quantity of resources available to birds at vessels (themselves linked to fisheries type, boat and bird densities, “natural” prey availability, etc; Bartumeus et al. 2010, Tew Kai et al. 2013); flight energetics (albatrosses fly at virtually no cost, and might thus more easily afford large distance attractions) or detection capacities. It would thus be of great interest to investigate it in other systems in order to determine which factors are more influential, or how plastic this behavioural response is. It could also be useful in theory to help assessing the bias in ship-based seabird counts to estimate seabird densities (Hyrenbach 2001, Spear et al. 2004).

Our attraction distance estimate is that of a maximum attraction distance, with actually few birds reacting to vessels at 30km (Fig.1). It can also be used as an estimate of the minimum detection distance capacity: our results indicate that some individual albatrosses seemed to be able to detect boats as far as 30km. This value is close to the theoretical distance (32km; Thiebault et al. 2014) at which fishing boats (approximately 15m high above the sea here, with possibly aggregations of feeding birds flying around) would fall below the horizon for the eye of an albatross, which flies below 20m from the sea surface (Tickell 2000). This suggests that vision could play a central role in this species for interactions with boats. Wandering albatrosses are thought to rely on olfaction to catch some of their preys (Nevitt et al. 2008, Mardon et al. 2010), but scent experiments also suggest that in contrast to a number of other seabird species, they are not attracted by odours of dimethyl sulphide produced at fisheries (Lequette et al. 1989, Nevitt et al. 1995). It would suggest that detection capacities could sometimes be a limiting factor in the attraction of albatrosses or other seabirds to vessels, which would indicate a high attractiveness of these boats.

This study highlights the relative complexity of behavioural responses of seabirds to fisheries, made available to investigation by GPS tracking data. We urge others to investigate these behavioural reactions in different seabird-fisheries systems, to better understand the factors modulating behavioural responses. This will ultimately help policy-makers to adopt more accurate and efficient measures to conciliate seabird conservation with fisheries practices, by more accurately assessing risks of interactions from overlap information.
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Figure 1: The proportion of bird movements directed within 10° towards a vessel location. α measures the angular difference between the actual bearing followed by a bird at time t (to reach the location at time t+1) and the hypothetical bearing it should have followed to reach the boat location (at the same moment t). The y-axis shows the probability that α<10°, in function of the distance from vessels. Each point is a ratio established over all positions falling into the corresponding distance bin (>290 positions to calculate each point). This is used to estimate the “attraction distance” of albatrosses to vessels. This proportion is modelled by a 2-part piecewise linear regression (solid black line). A proportion of 0.056 (as expected from a uniform distribution 10/180=0.056) would suggest random movement and this is shown by the solid red line. The vertical dashed line shows the breaking value of the piecewise regression at 29.2km (95% CI 25.5km – 32.9km). N=72 tracks (69 individuals).



Figure 2: The ratio of the number of locations with low apparent speed (<10km/h, indicative of sitting and thus feeding) divided by the number of locations with high apparent speed (>10km/h, indicative of travel-flight) in relation to distance from vessels is used to estimate the “feeding distance” of albatrosses. Each point in the graph is established over >100 bird-vessel relative positions that fall into the corresponding distance bin. This ratio is modelled in function of distance by a 2-parts piecewise linear regression (solid black line). The vertical dashed line shows the breaking value of the piecewise regression at 3.1km (95% CI 2.9km – 3.2km). N=72 tracks (69 individuals).