

Shifts in Southern Resident Killer Whale Phenology in the Salish Sea

August 6, 2019

A.K. Ettinger, C. Harvey, J. Samhouri, B. Hanson, C. Emmons, J. Olson, E. Ward

Target journal(s): Global change biology, Journal of Applied Ecology

Introduction

Phenology, or the timing of biological activities such as migration, growth, and reproduction, can have dramatic implications for fitness (Lane et al., 2012; Chuine, 2010). Consumer phenology that is out of step with its resource phenology can cause increased mortality (?) or reduced reproductive success (Post and Forchhammer, 2007). The critical nature of these “matches” or “mismatches” was originally described for fish and zooplankton (Hjort, 1914; Cushing, 1974, 1975), and has received renewed scientific interest as phenological shifts have been increasingly observed in conjunction with recent climate change (Durant et al., 2007).

Despite its importance, phenology of many organisms, even those of conservation concern, remains poorly understood and is rarely quantified, especially for marine organisms. A recent meta-analysis found that shifts in marine phenology are at least as dramatic as those observed in terrestrial systems (e.g. $\sim 4.4 \pm 0.7$ days per decade) (Poloczanska et al., 2013). The abundance of critical resources is more often a focus of natural resource management, yet the timing of resource peaks can be at least as important to consumers (Hipfner, 2008).

Southern resident killer whales (SRKWs, *Orcinus orca*) are a federally endangered population that spends time in the inland waters of Washington State, USA, and British Columbia, Canada. They have received widespread scientific and public attention in recent years as their numbers have declined (e.g., Seattle Times articles, Lusseau et al., 2009; Larson et al., 2018; Olson et al., 2018). Insufficient prey availability is believed to be one of the primary threats to this population, along with vessel traffic and pollutants (Krahn et al., 2007; Lusseau et al., 2009; Hanson et al., 2010). SRKWs differ from many orca whales in that their primary prey are salmon (*Oncorhynchus* species). SRKWs use inland waters to hunt for their prey when they are aggregated and locally highly abundant. Salmon have a distinct seasonality to their migration patterns, and SRKWs also vary seasonally in their use of inland waters: they travel between summer and winter core areas that can be separated by thousands of kilometers (??).

In recent decades, the abundance and phenology of the favored prey of SRKWs, salmon, has shifted in the western United States (Weinheimer et al., 2017; Reed et al., 2011; Ford et al., 2006; Satterthwaite et al., 2014)(add Nelson for chinook hatchery release timing), though patterns vary by species and location. We would therefore expect SRKW phenology to have shifted during this time, if prey is a primary driver of their activity in inland waters. If SRKW phenology has not shifted at a rate consistent with phenological shifts in

their prey, this mismatch could exacerbate the low prey availability they experience.

Here, we seek to quantify seasonal variation in SRKW activity and the extent to which these seasonal patterns have shifted over the past four decades. Specifically, we ask:

1. Has the timing of SRKW activity (phenology) shifted in the Salish Sea?
2. If there have been phenological shifts in SRKW activity, do these shifts coincide with shifts in phenology of their prey (chinook, coho, chum salmon)?

Methods

Focal species

: Add a paragraph here detailing SRKW biology and introducing the three separate pods, as well as the two regions (define them: North= Upper Salish Sea, South = South Puget Sound)

Data

SRKW: To quantify SRKW seasonal phenology over time, we used the OrcaMaster Database for Whale Sighting Data (Whale Museum), comprised of data from five main sources, including public sightings networks (e.g., OrcaNetwork), commercial whale watch data, and scientific surveys (e.g., SPOT data from satellite tracking units) (Olson et al., 2018). We used data from 1978-2017, because prior to this time there was no dedicated effort to track SRKW presence in the region (Olson et al., 2018). We used these sighting data to quantify detection of SRKWs in the two core areas: the Central Salish Sea, used primarily by SRKWs from May through September, and Puget Sound proper, visited by SRKWs most commonly from September through January (Olson et al., 2018). We used these seasonal definitions because they are most aligned with mean SRKW seasonal activity patterns over time (Fig 1). We also quantified number of whale days (i.e. days on which whales were observed) within a season and year for each region.

Salmon: To quantify SRKW prey phenology over time, we used adult salmon return ('escapement') data for coho, chum, and chinook salmon in Washington state (<https://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/management/hatcheries/escapement>), as well as data from the Albion Chinook test fishery on the lower Fraser River at Albion, British Columbia, Canada (<https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fm-gp/fraser/docs/commercial/albionchinook-quinnat-eng.html>). Daily or weekly WDFW data are available for 67 streams going back to 1997 and include wild and hatchery counts. We selected sites located close to Puget Sound or the central Salish Sea (i.e., within XX km) with the greatest available data (i.e., long time series with frequent monitoring), and with relatively large run sizes (range of average counts from trap estimates = 8,640-30,000/134-1,400 for hatchery/wild chum, 11,500/21-621 for hatchery/wild coho, and 550-13,350/36 for hatchery/wild chinook.)

Analysis

SRKW:

To identify trends over time in phenology for SRKWs in the Central Salish Sea and in Puget Sound proper, we summarized first-, last-, and mean- observation dates from 1978 through 2017 in each region.

To estimate effects of increased effort (i.e., increased numbers of sightings over time) on trends in phenology, we simulated data sets of whale presence during two seasons equivalent to those in our data set (summer,

which was 1 May through 31 Sept, or 153 days, and fall, which was 1 October through 1 Feb, or 123 days). We used whale presence probabilities of 0.85 for the Central Salish Sea and 0.6 for Puget Sound (the means in our data set for each region) and kept it constant over 40 simulated years. We then created an observation data set, in which effort (the number of observations), varied. During the low effort time period (years 1-20), the number of observations had a mean of 15 per year for Puget Sound and 104 per year in the Central Salish Sea (matching the means for these regions from 1978-1997 in the OrcaMaster database). During the high effort time period (years 21-40 in our simulated data set), the number of annual observations had a mean of 39 for Puget Sound and 133 for the Central Salish Sea (matching those in the OrcaMaster database from 1998-2017). We then calculated first- and last- observations dates for each simulated year. We ran these simulation 100 times and calculated the difference between the low effort and high effort time periods. We compared these to the mean differences first- and last-observation dates across time periods in the OrcaMaster database, for each region, to understand whether observed changes may be due to changes in effort over time, rather than changes in orca activity (Fig ??).

We quantify pod-specific phenology for J, K, and L pods in the north versus south regions using occupancy models. Occupancy models (MacKenzie et al. 2002) can estimate jointly species presence or abundance and detection probability (the probability to detect at least one individual present at site). We parameterized the model with annual occupancy probabilities (i.e., we did not fit a dynamic model, but a multiseason model (Royle and Kery 2007). The distribution submodel distinguishes true presence or absence of pod, p , (z , a latent state) in marine area i in year t , (add equation here). We assumed $z_{i,t}$ to be a Bernoulli random variable. We modeled detection probability as a function of year and date, with detectability modeled as a semi-parametric, smooth function of date using flexible thin-plate spline regression modelling (Strebel et al., 2014).

We fit separate occupancy models within each region and season, for each pod, and estimated annual first-, last-, and peak detection dates with each model. We defined first-detection date as the first DOY within the season when detection probability exceeded 0.5; last-detection date was the latest DOY within the season when detection probability exceeded 0.5. (Using a threshold probability lower than 0.5 did not qualitatively alter observed trends, Figure SX.)

Add analyses of subsets of data for which effort has not changed so dramatically: Lime Kiln observations for USS; West Seattle observations for PS. Salmon:

We used linear regression to identify trends over time in first, median, peak, and last dates of salmon adult migration timing.

Results

We found that SRKW phenology has shifted over the past four decades, though not necessarily in a linear fashion. Across the full time span, first-detection dates have gotten earlier by XX days per decade in Puget Sound and have not shifted in the Central Salish Sea (Fig. 2). Last-detection dates have gotten later by XX days in Puget Sound and by XX days per decade in the Upper Salish Sea (Fig. 2). Add trends in whale days.

We found that salmon phenology has shifted as well, though the patterns differ across species and regions. In the central Salish Sea, the return timing of wild chinook in the Fraser River has delayed by 8.0 days per decade (75 percent credible intervals: 5-11 days per decade) for first- observations dates from 1980-2018. Delays in peak return and median return dates are stronger (11.8 and 12.7 days per decade, respectively). Hatchery salmon also showed delays in first and median returns in the central Salish Sea (e.g., chum salmon).

In Puget Sound proper where data were available across more streams and the preferred prey of SRKWs are less known, the most common trend for wild and hatchery salmon was a shift toward earlier returns.

Discussion

The timing of SRKW activity has shifted. Across the full time-series SRKWs, especially J- and L-pods, are arriving earlier in Puget Sound and in the central Salish Sea. SRKWs are spending less time in recent years in the upper Salish Sea. Though the trend across the full time series is earlier first-detection and later last-detection dates, in the last 5-10 years, first-detection dates have gotten later in the upper Salish Sea region.

The timing of adult salmon returns has also shifted. Populations in the central Salish Sea are arriving later, whereas many populations in Puget Sound proper, especially hatchery-origin fish, are arriving earlier.

The timing of SRKW activity in central Salish Sea and in Puget Sound proper appears to be shifting in a manner that differs from shifts in salmon timing. This difference may lead to a mismatch between predator and prey that causes additional stress on SRKW populations, since the timing of resource availability can be as important as the amount of the resource (Brianna's work, Hipfner, 2008)

Observer effort has shifted over time. Its great that so many people are outside looking for whales! Recommend collecting absence data too. This would allow for more robust analyses of whale distributions. Challenge is increased time/money required for database maintenance with this extra data.

Conclusion

Needs/Questions

1. Intro: make a clearer case of the urgency faced by the SRKW pop and therefore the importance of this work
2. Intro: emphasize citizen science a bit more?
3. What other figures would be helpful?

References

- Chaine, I. 2010. Why does phenology drive species distribution? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 365:3149–3160.
- Cushing, D. 1974. The natural regulation of fish populations. *Sea fisheries research* .
- Cushing, D. H. 1975. *Marine ecology and fisheries*. CUP Archive.
- Durant, J. M., D. Hjermann, G. Ottersen, and N. C. Stenseth. 2007. Climate and the match or mismatch between predator requirements and resource availability. *Climate research* 33:271–283.
- Ford, M. J., H. Fuss, B. Boelts, E. LaHood, J. Hard, and J. Miller. 2006. Changes in run timing and natural smolt production in a naturally spawning coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) population after 60 years of intensive hatchery supplementation. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 63:2343–2355.
- Hanson, M. B., R. W. Baird, J. K. Ford, J. Hempelmann-Halos, D. M. Van Doornik, J. R. Candy, C. K. Emmons, G. S. Schorr, B. Gisborne, K. L. Ayres, et al. 2010. Species and stock identification of prey consumed by endangered southern resident killer whales in their summer range. *Endangered Species Research* 11:69–82.

- Hipfner, J. M. 2008. Matches and mismatches: ocean climate, prey phenology and breeding success in a zooplanktivorous seabird. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 368:295–304.
- Hjort, J. 1914. Fluctuations in the great fisheries of northern europe viewed in the light of biological research. ICES.
- Krahn, M. M., M. B. Hanson, R. W. Baird, R. H. Boyer, D. G. Burrows, C. K. Emmons, J. K. Ford, L. L. Jones, D. P. Noren, P. S. Ross, et al. 2007. Persistent organic pollutants and stable isotopes in biopsy samples (2004/2006) from southern resident killer whales. *Marine pollution bulletin* 54:1903–1911.
- Lane, J. E., L. E. Kruuk, A. Charmantier, J. O. Murie, and F. S. Dobson. 2012. Delayed phenology and reduced fitness associated with climate change in a wild hibernator. *Nature* 489:554.
- Larson, S., J. Olsen, and R. Osborne. 2018. Sightings of southern resident killer whales in the salish sea 1976-2014 .
- Lusseau, D., D. E. Bain, R. Williams, and J. C. Smith. 2009. Vessel traffic disrupts the foraging behavior of southern resident killer whales *Orcinus orca*. *Endangered Species Research* 6:211–221.
- Olson, J. K., J. Wood, R. W. Osborne, L. Barrett-Lennard, and S. Larson. 2018. Sightings of southern resident killer whales in the salish sea 1976–2014: the importance of a long-term opportunistic dataset. *Endangered Species Research* 37:105–118.
- Poloczanska, E. S., C. J. Brown, W. J. Sydeman, W. Kiessling, D. S. Schoeman, P. J. Moore, K. Brander, J. F. Bruno, L. B. Buckley, M. T. Burrows, et al. 2013. Global imprint of climate change on marine life. *Nature Climate Change* 3:919.
- Post, E., and M. C. Forchhammer. 2007. Climate change reduces reproductive success of an arctic herbivore through trophic mismatch. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 363:2367–2373.
- Reed, T. E., D. E. Schindler, M. J. Hague, D. A. Patterson, E. Meir, R. S. Waples, and S. G. Hinch. 2011. Time to evolve? potential evolutionary responses of fraser river sockeye salmon to climate change and effects on persistence. *PLoS One* 6:e20380.
- Satterthwaite, W. H., S. M. Carlson, S. D. Allen-Moran, S. Vincenzi, S. J. Bograd, and B. K. Wells. 2014. Match-mismatch dynamics and the relationship between ocean-entry timing and relative ocean recoveries of central valley fall run chinook salmon. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 511:237–248.
- Strebel, N., M. Kéry, M. Schaub, and H. Schmid. 2014. Studying phenology by flexible modelling of seasonal detectability peaks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5:483–490.
- Weinheimer, J., J. H. Anderson, M. Downen, M. Zimmerman, and T. Johnson. 2017. Monitoring climate impacts: Survival and migration timing of summer chum salmon in salmon creek, washington. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 146:983–995.

Figures




Figure 1: Southern resident killer whale activity in the Upper Salish Sea and Puget Sound varies by season.




Figure 2: Trends in first-, peak-, and last- observation dates for SRKWs and their prey.