Abundance and survival estimates of the southeastern Pacific humpback whale stock from 1991–2006 photo-identification surveys in Ecuador
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ABSTRACT

Southeastern Pacific humpback whales (Breeding Stock G) breed along the northwestern coast of South America and farther north up to Costa Rica. Photo-identification surveys conducted aboard whalewatching vessels during the migration/breeding season from June to September between 1991 and 2006 off the coast of Ecuador (2°S, 81°W) have produced a database of 1,511 individual whales. Comparisons of photographs produced 190 between-year re-sightings of 155 individual whales. Closed and open capture-recapture models were used to estimate abundance and survival. The best estimate of abundance in 2006 with the Chapman modified-Petersen was 6,504 (95% CI: 4,270–9,907; CV = 0.21). Abundance estimates from open population models were considerably lower due to heterogeneity in capture probability which produced a ‘transient’ effect. Our best estimate of true survival was 0.919 (95% CI: 0.850–0.958). Heterogeneity most likely occurred from inter-annual variation in sampling and unknown structure and variation in the migration timing and corridor. A more extensive collaborative effort including other wintering areas further north as well as integrating breeding-feeding data will help to reduce heterogeneity and increase precision in abundance and survival estimates.
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INTRODUCTION

Humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae) migrate in the southeast Pacific between their feeding grounds located around the Antarctic peninsula (Steick et al., 2004) and south of Chile (Gibbons et al., 2003) and their breeding grounds located along the coasts of Ecuador, Colombia, Panama and south of Costa Rica (Clarke, 1962; Félix and Haase, 2001a; Flórez-González, 1991; Rasmussen et al., 2007; Scheidat et al., 2000). This southern stock, also known as west South American or Breeding Stock G (IWC, 2006), was extensively exploited during the 20th Century in Antarctic waters and along the coasts of Chile and Peru until the mid-1960s (Clarke, 1980; Ramírez, 1988). Although for a long time the southeastern Pacific stock has been considered distinct from the other six southern Hemisphere stocks, its discreteness was only recently confirmed through molecular biology studies (Caballero et al., 2001; Olavarria et al., 2007) and photo-identification (Steick et al., 2004). By the mid-1960s, it was thought that only a few hundred individuals remained in each southern humpback whale stock (Chapman, 1974). The current status and the level of recovery of the Southeast Pacific humpback whale stock are still poorly known.

The first attempts to estimate the size of the southeastern humpback whale stock at the breeding grounds were made during the mid-1980s around Gorgona Island, Colombia, using mark-recapture models (e.g. Capella et al., 1998; Flórez-González, 1991; Ojeda and Hurtado, 1992) and the coast of Ecuador using direct counts (Haase, 1990). As whalewatching activities developed by the mid-1990s, studies on humpback whales increased on the coast of Ecuador using tourist vessels as platforms of opportunity for research. This allowed several research groups to develop long-term photo-identification programs. New population estimates, albeit with wide confidence intervals, were obtained on the central coast of Ecuador using mark-recapture models during the mid-1990s (Félix and Haase, 2001b; Scheidat et al., 2000) and early 2000s (Castro et al., 2004, 2003, 2005). These latter estimates indicated that the population contained around 3,000 whales in 2003. Recent mark-recapture estimates of Breeding Stock G using photo-identification data from both breeding and feeding grounds (Steick et al., 2006) and from line transect data collected during the International Whaling Commission IDCR/SOWER circumpolar surveys (Branch, 2011) showed similar estimates (3,851 CV = 0.02 and 3,337 CV = 0.21, whales respectively) by the mid-1990s. Photo-identification and genetic studies have demonstrated that a biased sex ratio occurs at breeding grounds, with males outnumbering females in a proportion of 1.67–1.95:1 (Olavarría et al., 2007; Palsbøll et al., 1997; Smith et al., 1999), which would explain the difference found between breeding and feeding grounds sampling approaches.

New abundance and survival estimates are presented here for the southeastern Pacific humpback whale stock using mark-recapture models for both closed and open populations. The database pools the data from two research teams and includes 16 years of fieldwork conducted off Ecuador. It is at least three times larger than those previously used in breeding-breeding estimates for this stock and as a result, the level of uncertainty was reduced considerably.

The study area

The study area includes two sites on the central coast of Ecuador. The northern site comprises ca. 700 km² between La Plata Island and two fishing villages, Puerto López and Puerto Cayo (1°26’S, 80°50’W). The latter two sites are located...
22km apart whereas La Plata Island is located approximately 40km offshore. The second study site is Salinas, located 80km south of the former site (2°10’S, 81°05’W) on the westernmost tip of the Santa Elena peninsula. The surveyed area in Salinas comprises around 150km² over a narrow platform around the peninsula (Fig. 1).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Survey effort
Photographs of the ventral side of whales’ flukes (see Katona et al., 1979) were obtained for individual identification during the breeding season (June–October) between 1991 and 2006 onboard whalewatching vessels. For this purpose, both film and digital cameras equipped 70–300mm zoom lenses were used.

Vessels departed from three different ports: Puerto Lopez, Puerto Cayo and Salinas. In the first years, whalewatching trips were not conducted on a regular basis but were opportunistic, taking place when tourists were more numerous, especially on weekends. As the whalewatching industry became more established and more boats were available, trips were more regular and so the field season extended from a few days in the first years of the study to 69 days of fieldwork in 2006 off Salinas (Table 1). In Puerto López the sampling period has been continuous since 1991 and in Salinas since 2002. Puerto Cayo was sampled in only two field seasons (1996–1997), but for the same number of days as in Puerto López. In general, effort was more uniform after 2004 in both Puerto López and Salinas. Most of the effort within the season was concentrated in July and August (29% and 41% of the effort, respectively), then in September (22%); only 7.62% of the trips were in the remaining three months sampled (May, June and October) (Table 2).

In Puerto López, trips lasted between 8 and 10 hours, including a 3-hour stop at La Plata Island and then a return to port in the evening. From 2002 a land station on top of a cliff was used for whale tracking and trips were conducted around La Plata during the 3-hour period that passengers visited the island. Researchers on the boat were guided to the whales by an observer from the coastal station. In Puerto Cayo, trips lasted 2–3 hours and were carried out mainly over a shallow platform west of the port. In Salinas, trips lasted between 2 and 3 hours and occasionally longer. In this port up to two trips were conducted per day during the peak of the tourist season. Additional information on the trip methodology and complementary data taken during the trips are available (e.g. Castro and González, 2002; Félix and Haase, 2001a; 2001b; 2005; Scheidat et al., 2000).

Analysis of photographs
Photographs used in this study are part of the catalogues maintained by the Ecuadorian Foundation for the Study of Marine Mammals (FEMM) and Pacific Whale Foundation-Ecuador (PWF), which contain multiple photographs of 1,839 different individuals.

The digitised catalogues were exchanged and analysed separately by the research teams of both institutions. Besides identifying common individuals, each group separated the photographs considered unsuitable for comparison due to poor quality (i.e. blurred, inappropriate angle) based on their expertise. However, no specific criteria for photographic quality or individual distinctiveness were used to evaluate photographs. Neither calves nor whales identified only by one lobe of the tail were included in the analysis. Photographs of 1,511 different adult individuals remained for the analysis (82% of the total animals originally considered) covering 16 years. The comparison of photographs produced 190 between-year re-sightings of 155 individuals: 129 individuals were re-sighted once, 23 individuals twice, 2 individuals three times, 1 individual four times and 1 individual five times.

Mark-recapture models
Whales were considered to be ‘captured’ for the year (sampling occasion) if they were identified in a photograph from one or more trips that extended anywhere during the breeding season of each year. The 16 years of data were used to construct a capture-history for each of the 1,511 unique whales. The capture-history data were evaluated with models for closed and open populations and then the results were compared.

Closed population
Closed population models assume that the population is closed demographically and geographically (i.e. N is constant), that all animals are equally catchable for specified subsets as defined by the model (e.g. during a sampling year), that marks are permanent and all marks are reported (Hammond, 1986; Seber, 1982). We used the Chapman (1951) modified-Petersen estimator for two occasions using consecutive field seasons 1996 and 1997 and from 2001 to 2006.
As with models for closed populations, abundance estimators from open population models can underestimate abundance if there is any unmodelled heterogeneity in capture probability. In addition, apparent survival will be lower than true survival if there is any ‘permanent’ emigration during the course of the study. Any transient animals that appear only once and then leave the study area will also reduce apparent survival and will lower the abundance estimate. Both of these influences were potentially important issues in modelling the capture-recapture data collected in this study. The sampled whales included some that might remain in or near the study area during the breeding season (‘local’) and others that would only migrate through the area to breed farther north. Whales that migrate through the area might travel through the sampled area in one year and be photographed but they might take a different course from that point on and would appear to be transient. Whales migrating to the north could easily pass through the 100km stretch of sampled coast in 1 to 2 days. Unless sampling occurred every day of the week many migrating whales would have 0 probability of being captured; whereas, whales that remained would have a much higher probability of being photographed. Undoubtedly, this was more important prior to 2004 when sampling occurred.

Table 2
Effort deployed by month as number of days of fieldwork by the two research teams (FEMM and PWF) during the period 1991–2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMM</td>
<td>PWF</td>
<td>FEMM</td>
<td>PWF</td>
<td>FEMM</td>
<td>PWF</td>
<td>FEMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
primarily on weekends. To address these issues, at least partially, we considered models in which transient behaviour was accommodated by fitting a separate survival for the interval following the first sighting of a whale. We also used within-year resightings of whales to assign whales to ‘local’ versus ‘migrant’ groups. Whales were initially assumed to be migrants and were only assigned to the local group once they were resighted on more than one day within a year separated by at least 3 days and not more than 50 days, if only seen twice. Those values were chosen to accommodate a migrating whale being seen close together in time as it migrated through and others that might be seen migrating north and then south (> 50 days). ‘Local’ whales were allowed to have a different and presumably higher capture probability for any year after their assignment to the local group.

We fitted and compared 36 POPAN models using the R (R Development Core Team, 2008) package RMark v1.7.7 (http://www.phidot.org/software/mark/rmark/; Laake and Rexstad, 2008) which constructs the model and runs MARK to fit the models. The 36 models were constructed from all combinations of the sub-models: 3 models for \( p \) (constant, time, time + local), 3 models for \( \phi \) (constant, time, transient) and 4 models for \( pent \) (constant, time, time bins, and Time-linear trend). The ‘time’ model contains a parameter for each of the 16 years whereas the ‘Time’ model contains an intercept and slope and assumes a linear trend over time. The time bins for \( pent \) were constructed to create a simpler reduced model with constant probability of entry (except \( pent(0) \)) for 1991–2002 and a time-varying rate for years 2003 to 2006. These times were chosen to reflect the expanded effort throughout the week that began in 2003. Models weights were calculated using Akaike Information Criterion (AICc) (Burnham and Anderson, 2002) and estimates of abundance were averaged across the models with \( \Delta \text{AICc} < 6 \). Chi-square tests 2 and 3 for the recapture-data were computed from RELEASE as a guide for goodness of fit test of a general model with full time-dependent effects.

RESULTS

Closed population model
Estimates were constructed using the 1996–1997 samples and consecutive years between 2001 and 2006 (Table 3). Capture probability in the other years was too low to provide reliable results. The most precise estimates were obtained using the 2004–2006 data when sampling effort was quite extensive; however, those estimates were dramatically larger than the estimates prior to 2004 and the implied increase was not biologically plausible (see Clapham et al., 2001).

Open population model
The goodness-of-fit test of the fully time-dependent model did not suggest any important lack of fit of \( \chi^2 = 42.0, \, df = 37, \, p = 0.26 \). Of the 36 fitted POPAN models, the top four models represented 99.99% of the weight of evidence (Table 4). All of the top models contained a transient effect in \( \phi \), time dependence in \( p \), and \( pent \) constant over the specified time bins or linear over time (Time). Otherwise, they only differed because the top two models also contained the effect of ‘local’ whales having higher recapture probability.

Estimated annual ‘apparent survival’ was 0.446 (95% CI: 0.320–0.579) in the year after a whale was first seen; whereas, annual survival for subsequent years was 0.919 (95% CI: 0.850–0.958). The low ‘apparent survival’ in the first year reflects transient behaviour in which the whales permanently emigrate from the population or more likely do not migrate through the area that was sampled in subsequent years and had very low subsequent recapture probability.

The transient effect in survival influences the estimates of abundance which are decreased because the model predicts the current abundance excluding those that have ‘left’ the population. The super-population size was estimated to be 5,494 (95% CI: 3,784–8,491, CV = 0.21) but the population size in 2006 was only estimated to be 3,333 (Table 5) or roughly two-thirds of the abundance estimate from the closed model. The difference is reflected in the estimated capture probabilities which are much higher in the POPAN models than the closed models for 2004–2006 (Fig. 2). The open models assume that the whales left (lower apparent survival) and has higher capture probabilities for the remaining whales; whereas, the closed model assumes the abundance is fixed and has lower capture probabilities. We re-fitted the best POPAN model but fixed \( \phi = 0.919 \) (assumed true survival) based on the assumption that the transients have the same true survival as the non-transients. The model does not fit the data as well but doing so provides an estimated abundance in 2006 of 5,456 which is much more consistent with the closed model result because it is estimating the size of the entire population.

DISCUSSION

The collaborative effort of two different research groups working in Ecuador (FEMM and PWF) has provided a more reliable estimation of the abundance of southeastern Pacific humpback whale stock (Breeding Stock G) on the breeding grounds. Based on closed models, the abundance estimate in 2006 was about 6,500 whales and 5,500 whales with open models if we assume constant true estimated survival of 0.919 for all whales. Our estimates are higher than previous estimates conducted at breeding grounds (e.g. Capella et al.,...
Model averaged estimates, 95% log-normal confidence intervals and coefficient of variation (CV) for humpback whale abundance from open population models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>268–5,929</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>294–5,053</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>325–4,301</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>364–3,677</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>410–3,158</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>465–2,742</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>525–2,396</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>597–2,156</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>686–2,026</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>788–1,982</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>904–2,044</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,017–2,240</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>1,102–2,613</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>1,486–2,962</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>2,043–3,833</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>2,326–4,775</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Model averaged capture probability estimates from POPAN models with 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines) and closed model capture probability estimates ("C") for 2004–2006.
photographed. However, an unknown structure in both the migration timing and corridor can introduce numerous sources of heterogeneity. This heterogeneity is being captured in the ‘transient’ effect in which estimated ‘apparent survival’ for the year after first ‘capture’ is only 0.446 which means about one-half of the whales are never seen again but most are alive. The whales have effectively emigrated from the study area ‘population’. The estimated survival rate in subsequent years of 0.919 is a better representation of true survival but it may also be biased low by remaining heterogeneity because it is lower than the survival reported for other humpback whale populations such as those in the Northeastern Pacific (Survival = 0.96) (Calambokidis and Barlow, 2004; Mizroch et al., 2004) and the North Atlantic (Survival = 0.95 and 0.96) (Barlow and Clapham, 1997; Clapham et al., 2003).

CONCLUSION

For management purposes, it is necessary to define whether the new estimates presented in this study are representative of the entire Southeast Pacific population (Breeding Stock G) or just a part of it. The available information suggests a complex migrating pattern and different habitat use by humpback whales in the breeding area that needs to be better understood for appropriate modelling. Despite the improvement in the estimates obtained, the current estimates likely represent only part of the population inhabiting the entire Southeast Pacific. Therefore, major efforts are still required to reduce the current level of uncertainty. One of the challenges in future assessments of this population at breeding grounds is obtaining a representative sample of a population distributed over 1,500km along the coast of South and Central America, from the north of Peru to Panama/Costa Rica and perhaps even further north (Flórez-González et al., 1998; Rasmussen et al., 2007). The easier alternative is to increase the photo-identification sample by bringing together catalogues of institutions working with this population in other countries (e.g. Colombia, Panama and Costa Rica). In addition, it would be useful to carry out an analysis using samples from breeding and feeding grounds. Such an approach has been demonstrated to be more consistent than those using only within-breeding or within-feeding grounds data (e.g. Smith et al., 1999; Stevick et al., 2006). A larger sample size would also help to improve our knowledge of other population parameters such as survival and birth rates, population growth rates and movements, all of which are still poorly known for this population.

It has been demonstrated here that whalewatching vessels are a valuable research platform for mark-recapture studies due to the near-coastal distribution of humpback whales. Although research activities are rather limited aboard whalewatching boats, they represented a unique and inexpensive opportunity for data collection. One advantage of using whalewatching boats was that (once the operations were well established in the country) there was the opportunity to work during the entire season with similar effort, thus improving data quality and reducing bias due to whale migration behaviour. On the other hand, the preference of whalewatching boats to approach more visible groups or groups with breaching individuals, as well as repeated surveying over the same coastal areas, likely violates the assumption of random sampling as required by mark-recapture models. The extent of such biases is difficult to assess in a study like this because the information came from three different sites and was taken onboard of different boats and therefore boat operations, geographic conditions and habitat use by the whales could not be the same in every studied site as we had originally assumed.
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