

## **Chapter 1**

**PAMPower: Investigating the statistical power of passive acoustic monitoring  
networks to detect trends in cetacean abundance**

## **Abstract**

### **1.1 Introduction**

- Knowledge of trends in abundance can inform conservation and management
- Power to detect trends using visual surveys is typically poor
- Passive acoustic monitoring is a promising approach for sound-producing taxa
- Need quantitative design criteria to optimize passive acoustic monitoring networks
- Describe statistical power, pros and cons?
- Use the Monterey Bay population of harbor porpoise as a case study

### **1.2 Methods**

#### **1.2.1 Data collection**

##### **Aerial survey methods**

Aerial surveys have been conducted in the Monterey Bay region using a consistent survey methodology since the late 1980s (CITE FORNEY PAPERS). In the present study, we used aerial survey data collected during surveys for harbor porpoise and for leatherback sea turtles between 2000 and 2013 (Fig. 1.2, left panel; Table 1.1). All surveys were conducted from a Partenavia P-68 high-wing two-engine aircraft. During aerial surveys, two observers searched from bubble windows on either side of the aircraft while a third observer searched from a belly window in the rear of the aircraft. A data recorder transcribed verbal sighting information for cetaceans and turtles (including declination angle, species, and number of animals) and environmental (visibility conditions) information from the observers into a custom-written software program on a laptop computer (Toshiba T-1000, Japan) that was directly connected to a hand-held Global Positioning System (Garmin 12XL, USA).

## **Passive acoustic methods**

In 2013, 2014, and 2015 we installed a grid of PAM devices (C-PODs) in northern Monterey Bay (Fig. 1.2, right panel). Instruments were deployed between late July and late August and retrieved between early December and early February each year. In all years, instruments were consistently deployed for the months of September, October, and November, with exact deployment and retrieval dates dependent on suitable weather conditions and availability of a research vessel and required personnel. These seasonal deployments were designed to be consistent with historical aerial survey effort in the region, most of which has occurred in August, September, and October. The passive acoustic study area included waters from 10 to 100 m depth, north of  $36.8^{\circ}$  N and east of  $122.1^{\circ}$  W, with a total area of  $370 \text{ km}^2$ . The study design was a systematic, randomly positioned offset grid of 11 C-PODs spaced  $0.035^{\circ}$  latitude and  $0.07^{\circ}$  longitude apart and oriented to follow the shape of the coastline (see Fig. 1.2, right panel). Further details of passive acoustic instrument deployments can be found in ? and ?.

### **1.2.2 Data analysis**

#### **Aerial survey data processing**

Aerial survey line transect effort was divided first into segments with continuous effort in constant sighting conditions (Beaufort sea state) and then divided again into 1-km effort subsegments. Following ?, when it was not possible to divide effort segments exactly into 1-km subsegments, if the remainder of the effort segment was less than 500m it was added randomly to one of the subsegments, while if the remainder was greater than 500m a new subsegment was created and positioned randomly into the effort segment. Due to the low probability of observing harbor porpoise in high sea states, only data from the aerial survey effort obtained in Beaufort sea states 0–3 were included.

We used the package Distance (v. 0.9.4; ?) to fit a detection function to the aerial

survey data using a halfnormal key function with cosine adjustments. We considered models with and without Beaufort sea state as a covariate and used Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) to select the best model. Following ?, we calculated the point density of harbor porpoise at the midpoint of each subsegment of aerial survey effort. This calculation did not include a correction for the probability of seeing animals directly on the trackline,  $g(0) < 1$ .

To generate an average, decadal-scale harbor porpoise density surface in our study region, we used a generalized additive model (GAM) implemented in the package mgcv (v. 1.8-12; ?) to model porpoise density as a function of a two-dimensional thin-plate regression spline (?) on latitude and longitude (converted to km from the center of the study area). The smoothing spline was optimized using the outer Newton method and penalized for overparameterization with restricted maximum likelihood (REML).

### **C-POD data processing**

C-POD data were processed using the KERNO algorithm in the program CPOD.exe (v. 2.044; ?) to detect click trains. All narrowband, high-frequency (NBHF) click trains were classified as belonging to harbor porpoise, and we chose to include only high-quality click trains (as defined by the KERNO algorithm) in our analysis in order to minimize false positives in the dataset. Data were exported from CPOD.exe and all further analyses were performed in R (v. 3.2.2; R Core Team, 2016).

Following ?, we chose to use the proportion of porpoise positive seconds (PPS) per day as our passive acoustic metric. This metric is less likely to become saturated when multiple animals are present and it reduces the impact of animal orientation on detectability by effectively averaging over 1-s periods. This metric assumes that only one porpoise can be detected within any 1-s period. For each instrument and year, PPS was calculated as the number of porpoise positive seconds between September 1st and December 1st of each year (a time period of 91 days per year).

## Relating passive acoustic and aerial survey data


We used a generalized linear model (GLM; Eq. 1.1) to relate the log-transformed passive acoustic detection rate (PPS) at each instrument  $n$  and year  $y$  to the log-transformed average underlying harbor porpoise density at the location of each instrument ( $\hat{D}_n$ ) as estimated by the spatial smooth of aerial survey observations (described above). A covariate for year was included to account for a potential changes in passive acoustic detection rates over the 3-yr monitoring period (e.g., due to continuing population recovery from past impacts).

$$\log(PPS_{n,y}) \sim \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \log(\hat{D}_n) + \beta_2 Y_y + \epsilon \quad (1.1)$$

## Simulation methods

We used the observed relationship between passive acoustic detection rates and the density of harbor porpoise (as described by Eq. 1.1) to create simulated datasets for hypothetical passive acoustic monitoring networks over 10 year periods. Our simulation explored three possible survey designs and two possible behavioral responses to disturbance, resulting in six hypothetical scenarios. Each scenario was simulated with changes in abundance from -50% to +50% and 5 to 100 passive acoustic sensors. Each combination of survey design, response to disturbance, change in abundance, and number of passive acoustic sensors was repeated 10,000 times. Power was defined as the proportion of the 10,000 simulations in which a change in the population was detected.

Three possible survey design strategies were investigated. In the random sampling scenario, sensors were placed randomly throughout the study area in water depths 0 to 1000 m deep (Fig. 1.1, left panel). Harbor porpoise densities are highest near shore, so we also generated a stratified sampling strategy where sensors were only placed in water 0 to 100 m deep (Fig. 1.1, right panel). Finally, we developed a sampling strategy proportional to



**Figure 1.1:** Example simulated placement of 75 sensors in the Monterey Bay study area using random (left panel), scaled (center panel), and stratified (right panel) sampling design strategies.

the mean density of harbor porpoise in our study area, which we referred to as a scaled sampling design. First, we normalized the density values calculated using the aerial survey data to be between 0 and 1; i.e., locations with highest densities were assigned a value of 1. Then, we iteratively selected points at random and conducted a binomial trial where the probability of success was equal to the normalized harbor porpoise density at that point. If the trial was successful, that point was included as a location for sensor deployment; we repeated this process until we achieved the desired number of sensors. This method resulted in a distribution of sensors that mirrored the distribution of harbor porpoise. For each of the three possible survey designs, we simulated designs with 10-100 sensors.

We simulated two possible scenarios of harbor porpoise population response to disturbance. In the basic scenario, the population was assumed to decrease uniformly over the study area. In the range contraction scenario, we simulated a possible basin-type response to disturbance (*sensu* Gilpin?), where animals were hypothesized to contract their distribution to the highest-quality habitat as the population declined. To implement this, we again used the underlying mean density of harbor porpoise as calculated from the aerial survey data to inform a habitat quality score for each point in the study area. We assumed that density was positively and linearly related to habitat quality. We used this relationship

to scale the simulated impact, so that high-density, high-quality habitat areas experienced less decline than low-density, low-quality habitat areas.

The simulated rate of change was divided into linear, incremental changes  $r_y$  over  $y = 10$  years such that the product of the  $r_y$  was equal to the total desired change  $R$ . Because a population is unlikely to change in identical stepwise increments each year, we chose to add variability to the rate of change over time. We drew  $y - 1$  values from a normal distribution with mean  $= (1 + R)^{1/(y-1)}$  and standard deviation (SD) = 0.05. The choice of SD was arbitrary. The final  $r_y$  value was calculated so that  $R = \prod_{i=1}^y r_y$ . Finally, the values of  $r_y$  were randomly reordered. We simulated rates of change ranging from -50% (i.e., the population decreased by half) to +50% (i.e., the population increased by half).

For each simulation run, a single intercept term  $a$  was drawn from a normal distribution with a mean and standard error (SE) from the GLM model estimate  $\alpha_0$ . For each of  $n$  simulated sensors, a spatial location was drawn randomly according to the survey design and a simulated underlying density  $d_n$  was drawn from a lognormal distribution with mean and SE of the estimated  $\hat{D}$  at that spatial location. Coefficients for density at the location of each sensor  $b_{1,n}$  were drawn from a normal distribution with mean and SE from the model estimate of  $\beta_1$ . As described above, a cumulative rate of change  $\prod_{i=1}^y (1 - r_y)$  was applied in each time step. Because there was unexplained variance in the modeled relationship between harbor porpoise density and passive acoustic detection rate (see Eq. 1.1), we added an error term  $E_{n,y}$  drawn from a normal distribution with a mean of 0 and a SD equal to the residual SD of the GLM.

$$pps_{n,y} = e^{(a_0 + b_{1,n} \log(d_n) + E_{n,y})} \prod_{i=1}^y (1 - r_y) \quad (1.2)$$

Once data were generated for  $n$  moorings and  $y$  years, each simulated dataset was evaluated using a mixed effects model (Eq. 1.3) with  $\log(pps_{n,y})$  modeled as a function of year (fixed effect) and sensor (random effect).

$$\log(pps_{n,y}) \sim \lambda y + \gamma_n + \varepsilon \quad (1.3)$$

This model differs from the GLM in Eq. 1.1 in that the underlying mean density is assumed to be unknown, so a random effect was used to account for sensor-specific differences in detection rates. For each simulated dataset, if the year term in this mixed effects model was significant and the sign of the covariate  $\lambda$  matched the sign of the simulated change in the population, that particular iteration was marked as a success. This process was repeated for each of the 10,000 simulated datasets and statistical power was calculated as the proportion of those 10,000 datasets in which a change was detected. This was repeated for each combination of survey design, response to disturbance, number of sensors, and change in the population.

### **1.3 Results**

#### **1.3.1 Results of data collection**

##### **Passive acoustic data collected**

##### **Aerial survey data collected**

Survey coverage varied by year (Fig. ??).

#### **1.3.2 Results of data analysis**

### **1.4 Discussion**



**Table 1.1:** Aerial survey effort (km) and number of harbor porpoise sightings (groups) per year between 2000 and 2013.


<b>Year</b>	<b>Survey Effort (km)</b>	<b>No. Porpoise Sightings</b>
2000	342	11
2001	2972	200
2002	4017	252
2003	3837	300
2004	6840	528
2005	2124	202
2006	1178	76
2007	1271	91
2008	137	9
2009	1500	176
2010	951	161
2011	2566	202
2012	1014	94
2013	2973	383
<b>Total</b>	<b>31722</b>	<b>2715</b>

**Table 1.2:** Passive acoustic detection rates (PPS per day) recorded on each of 11 C-PODs (rows) during three years of data collection (columns). NA values indicate that the instrument was lost or that no data were recovered from the instrument.


<b>Instrument</b>	<b>PPS per day</b>		
	2013	2014	2015
CPOD1	198	162	476
CPOD2	116	NA	117
CPOD3	530	174	323
CPOD4	101	197	225
CPOD5	NA	829	636
CPOD6	648	725	576
CPOD7	39	146	105
CPOD8	76	120	112
CPOD9	252	728	414
CPOD10	30	122	208
CPOD11	NA	1320	827

**Table 1.3:** Power to detect a -25% decline over a 10 yr period with 75 passive acoustic sensors using three different sampling designs (random sampling, stratified sampling limited to water depths 0-100 m deep, and sampling proportional to porpoise density) under two different decline scenarios (uniform decline across the entire range and range contraction to preferred habitat).


Design	Power	
	Uniform	Range Contraction
Random	0.86	0.67
Stratified	0.87	0.71
Scaled	0.87	0.82




**Figure 1.2:** Map of completed aerial survey tracklines (left panel, black lines) and passive acoustic instrument deployments (right panel, black circles) in Monterey Bay, CA.




**Figure 1.3:** Visual representation of aerial survey and passive acoustic data collection in the Monterey Bay region in different months (x-axis) between 2000 and 2015 (y-axis). Circles indicate month/year combinations during which aerial surveys were conducted, while triangles indicated month/year combinations during which passive acoustic data were collected.



**Figure 1.4:** Harbor porpoise density ( $\text{km}^{-2}$ ) in water 0-1000 m deep estimated using a two-dimensional spline on aerial survey observations. Note that densities are not corrected for  $g(0)$ .



**Figure 1.5:** Estimated mean harbor porpoise density at the location of each C-POD ( $\text{km}^{-2}$ ; x-axis) and mean observed acoustic detection rate in each year (PPS; y-axis). The blue line is the modeled relationship between mean density and mean acoustic detection rate and the gray shading indicates the 95% confidence interval of the model fit.



**Figure 1.6:** Statistical power (y-axis) to detect simulated changes in the Monterey Bay population of harbor porpoise (x-axis) using 10-100 moorings (colored lines). The black line indicates typically accepted power of 0.8.