

International Commission for



the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries

Serial No. 5139
(D.c.11)

ICNAF Res.Doc. 77/XI/62 (Revised)

SPECIAL MEETING OF STACRES - NOVEMBER 1977

THE 1977 CENSUS OF WESTERN ATLANTIC HARP SEALS
PAGOPHILUS GROENLANDICUS

D.M. Lavigne, S. Innes and W. Barchard
Department of Zoology, University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario

and

W.G. Doubleday
Fisheries and Marine Service
Environment Canada, Ottawa

PREFACE

The results of this work must ultimately be discussed in relation to current management policy. However, for the sake of objectivity, only the census results will be discussed in this report. Discussion of related matters may be undertaken by one or more of the authors in future papers.

A preliminary report prepared for the Committee on Seals and Sealing, 21, 22 August 1977 and subsequently made public is reproduced in Appendix 1 to clarify any misconception generated by an article in the Vancouver Sun and a Canadian Press news release in September.

An earlier version of this report was submitted to the Special Advisory Committee on Seals and Sealing and to the Canadian Atlantic Fisheries Scientific Advisory Committee (CAFSAC Res.Doc. 77/27) on 21, 22 October 1977. A brief statement on the contents of this report was subsequently released in answer to enquiries from the general public and the media about the results of the census. This statement is reproduced in Appendix 2.

Publ. in ICNAF Sel. Papers No. 6: 55-70

INTRODUCTION

Although harp seals have been exploited for centuries, efforts to estimate their numbers and to manage the stocks are relatively recent developments. Aerial photographic surveys were first employed by Russian biologists working on harp seals in the White Sea about 50 years ago (Sergeant 1976). In the western Atlantic, aerial surveys using conventional black and white photography have been conducted at irregular intervals since the early 1950's (Fisher 1952, 1955; Sergeant 1975). In general, these aerial censuses have not however, produced "satisfactory" absolute estimates of pup production or population size (Sergeant 1975) which are necessary for the development of adequate management policies. Conventional black and white photography, used prior to 1974, accurately detects only adult seals on the surface of the ice (Lavigne 1976). On whelping patches the assumption has often been made that all adults on the ice are breeding females, each of which gives birth to a single pup. In reality, adult males have been observed on the ice at the time of parturition and during the nursing period. In addition, the number of adult seals on the ice varies with the time of day and it is difficult to estimate the number of animals in the water at any given time. Aerial surveys of moulting patches are plagued by similar problems because it is impossible to discriminate adult seals from immature seals, and male seals from female seals. Thus, although it is relatively easy to obtain photographs of large concentrations of animals, it is extremely difficult to know what, in fact, these seals represent.

In the case of the harp seal, the only factor that seems to remain constant for any time during the whelping season is the number of white-

coated pups. They remain on the ice for the first two or three weeks of life and tend not to enter the water in significant numbers. Consequently, once pupping is completed there is a brief period when virtually all the young of the year are on the surface of the ice together. However, young harp seal pups, being white animals on a white background of ice and snow have not been accurately detected in the past using conventional photographic techniques (Sergeant 1975). This problem has recently been overcome with the introduction of ultraviolet photography as an appropriate sensor for detecting certain white animals, such as white-coated seal pups and polar bears in white environments (Lavigne and Øritsland 1974a, b, Lavigne 1976). Although the white coat of the harp seal pup reflects all wavelengths in the visible spectrum, and appears white to the human eye, it absorbs much of the ultraviolet component in solar radiation. Snow not only reflects visible light and appears white to the eye, but also reflects much of the invisible (to the human eye) ultraviolet radiation. Thus, an ultraviolet photograph of a white harp seal pup on snow results in a black image of the animal against a grey-white background (Lavigne 1976a).

Ultraviolet photography was initially tested in the field in March 1974 (Lavigne et al. 1974). The following year an experimental aerial survey was conducted over all known whelping patches in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the "Front" off the coast of Labrador. The results of this preliminary census suggested that pup production was somewhat lower than generally expected, perhaps less than 200,000 animals, implying that the number of animals aged one and older in the stock might be less than 1 million seals (Lavigne et al. 1975a; 1975b, Lavigne 1976).

Further development of the ultraviolet aerial census technique was recognized as a priority for future research by the Scientific Advisors to

the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF) at their meetings in late 1975 and plans for a full scale census were made for March 1976. This survey was not completed because of unsuitable ice conditions in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and inclement weather on the Front. Nevertheless, the need for a complete census of western Atlantic harp seals was reiterated at the October 1976 ICNAF meetings (Benjaminson and Lett 1976; Capstick et al. 1976; ICNAF 1976).

A census was subsequently completed in March 1977. This report outlines the design of the aerial survey, the field operations, data analyses, and the resulting estimates of pup production for Western Atlantic harp seals in March 1977.

METHODS

Aerial Survey Design

The design of the aerial survey was based on the results of the 1975 experimental census (Lavigne et al. 1975a, 1975b). Discussion among various collaborators in preparation for the subsequently aborted 1976 census, and prior to the 1977 census, resulted in further refinements and minor modifications in the survey design.


A research proposal outlining the objectives and methodology was accepted by the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing, Energy, Mines and Resources Canada. The survey was subsequently conducted using a DC-3 (Dakota) aircraft operated by Innotech Aviation Ltd. in conjunction with Intera Environmental Consultants Ltd., Ottawa.

The following general procedure was used with minor modifications (necessitated by field conditions), for each of the remote sensing flights

in March 1977. Whelping patches were initially located and delineated as to approximate area and orientation by helicopter or small fixed-wing aircraft. Once pupping was judged to be virtually complete, and suitable weather conditions were obtained, the DC-3 flew to a position designated by one of the support aircraft as one corner of an imaginary rectangular grid superimposed over the entire whelping patch (Fig. 1, A). This position (A) was then entered into the inertial navigation system (INS) on board the DC-3. The supporting aircraft (usually a helicopter) would then fly a straight course along the apparent boundary of the whelping patch (Fig. 1, line AB). The DC-3 followed and entered a second position (B) into the INS. In this way, one side (AB) of the imaginary rectangle (ABCD) oriented in the direction of the long axis was established to provide a basis for constructing a grid over the entire whelping patch (Fig. 1). This grid was subsequently flown and photographed at 1220 m with 20 to 30% forward overlap between adjacent frames within each line. Attempts were made to obtain 20% overlap between adjacent lines to ensure complete coverage and to aid in mosaicing the imagery and reconstructing the whelping patch in the lab. For the 1220 m flights (scale 1:8000) the primary sensor was a Wild Heerbrugg RC-10, 23 cm x 23 cm format aerial survey camera with a 15.2 cm lens, a NAV filter, and Kodak Double-X Aerographic Film (2405).

While flying the survey at 1220 m observers in the DC-3 continually viewed the ice. If, upon completing the full programmed length of a line, there were still seals on the line of flight, then the line was continued until there were no seals in view. Similarly, although the width of the grid was initially estimated by observers in the support aircraft, observers in the DC-3 ultimately determined this as they ran out of seals on the ice.

Fig. 1. General procedure used to establish a survey grid over a whelping patch of harp seals.



Once the 1220 m coverage was completed, lower altitude samples were obtained at 305 m using ultraviolet photography as the primary sensor. A Hasselblad camera was equipped with a 105 m UV-Sonnar lens, a Kodak Wratten 18A filter (Lavigne and Øritsland 1974a) and Kodak Double-X Aerographic 2405 film produced imagery in 70 mm format at a scale of 1:2900.

The dimensions of the grid obtained at 1220 m defined the total number of possible sample lines which could be flown at 305 m, given unlimited time, fuel, and film. A single sample was then defined as one 305 m flight line running the complete length of the grid. For the purposes of stratification the grid was divided into a number of zones. The number of zones defined was dependent on the width of the grid, and the available flying time which remained.

The aerial survey flights were tentatively scheduled to begin about 1100 h local time and finish about 1500 h to take advantage of favourable sun angles and radiation intensities for photography and the fact that the largest proportion of adult seals congregates on the surface of the ice during this time (Lavigne 1976). The available flying time for obtaining the sample imagery was thus determined by the time of day the 1220 m imagery was completed, the amount of fuel remaining, and the transit time required for the DC-3 to return to base. Accordingly, the average time taken to fly each 1220 m flight line, including positioning times, was then used to estimate the maximum number of 305 m sample lines which could be flown in the remaining time. This in turn dictated the number of sampling zones to be used in the stratification of the grid. Two 305 m flight lines were then selected from each zone using a random number table.

The resulting imagery was later processed and annotated by the Canada

Centre for Remote Sensing before being shipped to Guelph.

Preliminary evaluation of the census

After the field work was completed, participants from the University of Guelph and the Fisheries Marine Service, Environment Canada independently assessed the apparent completeness of the aerial surveys in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Front. These evaluations, prepared prior to receiving the processed imagery from the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing, are documented in a memorandum from W.G. Doubleday to A.W. May (21 March 1977) and in a letter from K. Ronald to A.W. May (4 April 1977). Later, during the analysis of the aerial imagery, an interim meeting was held at the University of Guelph (6 June 1977) to discuss the above evaluations and various aspects of the field operations. The results of these discussions are recorded in the minutes of that meeting.

Preliminary results were discussed at a later meeting (17 August 1977) and an interim report was then submitted to the Committee on Seals and Sealing on 21 August 1977 (Appendix 1).

Evaluations and comments relevant to the analyses and interpretation of the survey results are summarized below.

RESULTS

Extent of photographic coverage

The remote sensing aircraft was positioned in Summerside, P.E.I. on 4 March. By this time two concentrations of whelping harp seals had been located, one to the west of the Magdalen Islands and another, east of Bird Rocks. Inclement weather and low cloud cover prevented any survey work however, from 5 through 8 March.

Suitable weather finally prevailed on 9 March and a survey was conducted over the whelping patch northwest (~47.30.4N, 62.45.1W) of the Grindstone Beacon on the Magdalen Islands. Twelve overlapping 1220 m flight lines were flown over this patch and six 305m samples were obtained using 70 mm ultraviolet photography (Table 1, Fig. 2).

On 10 March, an additional survey was conducted in the same general region as the previous day. The objective of this survey was to obtain coverage of whelping seals to the west and north-east of the area flown on 9 March. Details of the 1220 m flight lines, and the 305 m sample lines flown are given in Table 2 (also see Figs. 3 and 4).

On 11 March, an attempt was made to photograph the Bird Rocks' whelping patch. The support helicopter was not able to locate this patch, but after a systematic search the DC-3 remote sensing aircraft located and surveyed a whelping patch running east-west just north of Bird Rocks (Table 3, Figs. 5 and 6).

Having surveyed all reported whelping concentrations in the Gulf, the DC-3 moved its base of operations to St. John's, Nfld. on 12 March. No flights were conducted on 13 March due in part to weather conditions, and the fact that the whelping patches on the Front were not adequately delineated by 12 March to warrant a survey.

On 13 March, a reconnaissance flight by the support aircraft located and delineated the Front herd. The herd was essentially divided into two patches (see Curran, 1977) and located to the east of Belle Isle (Fig. 7). On 14 March the largest of the two patches was surveyed and sampled (Table 4, Fig. 7 and 8) and the remainder, essentially west of 54°34'W longitude, was surveyed on 15 March (Table 5, Figs. 7 and 8).

The Mecatina patch in the northern Gulf of St. Lawrence did not

TABLE 1
 Survey and Sample Line Positions for
 77.03.09
 305 m^b

Line no.	Displacement ^a (m)	Position		Random No.	Zone	No. Frames	Time (GMT) ^c	
		Commence	Finish				Commence	Finish
1	8.1	47.51.1 N 62.21.6 W	47.29.8 N 62.38.7 W	90	10	177	18:16	18:32
2	7.7	47.38.6 N 62.31.- W	47.23.1 N 62.43.5 W	86	10	236	18:47	18:59
3	6.7	47.40.0 N 62.28.1 W	47.28.1 N 62.38.0 W	75	9	190	19:13	19:22
4	6.5	47.38.1 N 62.29.5 W	47.28.9 N 62.36.8 W	73	9	140	19:30	19:37
5 ^d	6.3	47.36.7 N 62.30.1 W	47.29.6 N 62.33.9 W	70	8	109	19:45	19:50
6 ^d	3.7	47.38.1 N 62.24.6 W	47.30.7 N 62.30.7 W	41	6	127	20:00	20:06

^a Displacement from 1220 m - line 1.

^b No record was made of positions of 12 - 1220 m survey lines flown.

^c Local time (AST) = GMT - 4:00

^d Only one sample was obtained from each of zones 5 and 6 due to lack of time and low sunangle. Zones 1-5 were not sampled since lines 1-6 were outside herd area.

Fig. 2. 305 m sample lines obtained on 9 March 1977 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, west of the Magdalen Islands, as recorded by the inertial navigation system in the remote sensing aircraft.




TABLE 2
Survey and Sample Line Positions for
77.03.10

Line no.	Displacement ^a (nm)	Position		Random No.	Zone	No. Frames	Time (GMT) ^c	
		Commence	Finish				Commence	Finish
<u>1220 m</u>								
1	0	47.40.9 N 62.20.7 W	47.34.8 N 62.29.5 W	-	-	14	15:56	16:02
2	0.7	47.35.4 N 62.28.9 W	47.41.0 N 62.21.1 W	-	-	11	16:06	16:09
3	1.4	47.42.0 N 62.22.4 W	47.34.9 N 62.32.3 W	-	-	13	16:13	16:20
4	2.1	47.35.3 N 62.32.2 W	47.42.9 N 62.21.3 W	-	-	15	16:25	16:29
5	2.8	47.42.8 N 62.24.1 W	47.35.7 N 62.33.9 W	-	-	13	16:35	16:41
6	3.5	47.37.0 N 62.32.3 W	47.43.7 N 62.23.0 W	-	-	13	16:45	16:48
7 ^b	-	-	-	-	-	-	17:01	17:04
8	4.2	47.38.1 N 62.32.2 W	47.44.3 N 62.23.7 W	-	-	11	17:20	17:23
9	4.9	47.45.1 N 62.23.7 W	47.38.1 N 62.33.3 W	-	-	12	17:28	17:33
<u>305 m</u>								
1	1.1	47.40.9 N 62.22.9 W	47.34.9 N 62.31.4 W	13	1	126	18:14	18:21
2	1.5	47.41.0 N 62.24.0 W	47.35.4 N 62.31.3 W	17	1	79	18:28	18:34
3	2.0	47.41.1 N 62.24.4 W	47.35.7 N 62.32.1 W	23	2	73	18:41	18:46
4	2.7	47.41.6 N 62.25.4 W	47.36.9 N 62.31.8 W	30	2	65	18:53	18:57
5	3.0	47.41.3 N 62.26.3 W	47.37.6 N 62.31.4 W	34	3	47	19:04	19:17
6	3.8	47.41.6 N 62.27.3 W	47.38.9 N 62.31.2 W	43	4	35	19:16	19:18

^a Displacement from 1220 m - line 1.

^b 1220 m - line 7 aborted due to navigational malfunction.

^c Local time (AST) = GMT - 4:00

Fig. 3. 1220 m survey lines obtained on 10 March 1977 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, west of the Magdalen Islands, as recorded by the inertial navigation system in the remote sensing aircraft.




Fig. 4. 305 m sample lines obtained on 10 March 1977 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, west of the Magdalen Islands, as recorded by the inertial navigation system in the remote sensing aircraft.




TABLE 3
Survey and Sample Line Positions for
77.03.11
1220 m


Line no.	Displacement ^a (nm)	Position		Random No.	Zone	No. Frames	Time (GMT) ^d	
		Commence	Finish				Commence	Finish
1	0	47.51.9 N 61.22.5 W	47.49.3 N 61.10.7 W	-	-	11	16:41	16:44
2	0.7	47.49.7 N 61.08.2 W	47.53.0 N 61.23.4 W	-	-	18	16:46	16:53
3	1.4	47.53.7 N 61.24.8 W	47.50.0 N 61.05.6 W	-	-	17	16:56	17:01
4	2.1	47.50.6 N 61.05.9 W	47.54.7 N 61.26.3 W	-	-	19	17:04	17:12
5	2.8	47.55.5 N 61.26.6 W	47.51.4 N 61.06.7 W	-	-	19	17:19	17:24
6	3.5	47.51.7 N 61.03.8 W	47.55.7 N 61.23.6 W	-	-	18	17:27	17:35
7	4.2	47.56.5 N 61.24.4 W	47.52.7 N 61.05.7 W	-	-	17	17:37	17:42
8	4.9	47.46.2 N 60.57.5 W	47.50.3 N 61.05.0 W	-	-	10	19:24	19:28
<u>305 m</u>								
1	0.9	47.50.2 N 61.09.8 W	47.53.1 N 61.24.6 W	10	1	125	17:52	17:58
2	1.3	47.49.9 N 61.06.3 W	47.53.3 N 61.23.2 W	15	1	158	18:08	18:15
3	2.4	47.51.1 N 61.07.1 W	47.54.5 N 61.23.8 W	27	2	155	18:25	18:32
4	3.2	47.51.8 N 61.06.1 W	47.53.3 N 61.23.6 W	36	2	162	18:42	18:49
5 ^b	2.5	47.51.1 N 61.06.3 W	47.54.5 N 61.23.0 W	-	2	155	18:59	19:06
6 ^c	-	47.45.9 N 60.58.0 W	47.49.2 N 61.03.8 W	-	-	76	19:34	19:38

^a Displacement from 1220 m - line 1.

^b Sample not randomly chosen but instead, chosen to fall in seal concentrations.

^c No displacement recorded; sample was taken from center line of 1220 m - line 8 by line of sight.

^d Local time (AST) = GMT - 4:00






TABLE 4
 Survey and Sample Line Positions for
 77.03.14
 1220 m

Line No.	Displacement ^a (nm)	Position		Random No.	Zone	No. Frames	Time (GMT) ^c	
		Commence	Finish				Commence	Finish
1	0	51.52.0 N 54.02.6 W	51.39.0 N 54.08.0 W	-	-	19	15:01	15:06
2	0.7	51.37.6 N 54.10.0 W	51.55.1 N 54.02.5 W	-	-	25	15:09	15:20
3	1.4	51.55.1 N 54.03.5 W	51.37.9 N 54.10.8 W	-	-	25	15:23	15:29
4	2.1	51.35.9 N 54.13.0 W	51.55.7 N 54.04.7 W	-	-	29	15:32	15:44
5	2.8	51.54.5 N 54.05.9 W	51.35.6 N 54.14.2 W	-	-	30	15:47	15:55
6	3.5	51.33.8 N 54.16.3 W	51.55.8 N 54.06.8 W	-	-	31	15:58	16:11
7	4.2	51.55.7 N 54.08.1 W	51.33.2 N 54.17.6 W	-	-	31	16:19	16:28
8	4.9	51.32.3 N 54.19.0 W	51.55.1 N 54.09.7 W	-	-	29	16:31	16:45
9	5.6	51.55.1 N 54.10.5 W	51.34.8 N 54.19.1 W	-	-	29	16:47	16:55
10	6.3	51.34.0 N 54.20.7 W	51.54.8 N 54.12.1 W	-	-	30	16:59	17:11
11	7.0	51.54.6 N 54.13.2 W	51.40.8 N 54.18.9 W	-	-	20	17:13	17:19
12	7.7	51.39.5 N 54.20.5 W	51.48.4 N 54.17.0 W	-	-	13	17:22	17:27
<u>305 m</u>								
1	3.6	51.53.2 N 54.08.0 W	51.34.1 N 54.16.1 W	40	1	256	17:35	17:44
2 ^b	5.7	51.34.9 N 54.19.1 W	51.54.7 N 54.10.9 W	64	2	255	17:48	18:01

^a Displacement from 1220 m - line 1.

^b more 305 m sample lines were not flown due to lack of fuel.

^c Local time (NST) = GMT - 3:30


TABLE 5
Survey and Sample Line Positions for
77.03.15


Line No.	Displacement ^a (nm)	Position		Random No.	Zone	No. Frames	Time (GMT) ^c	
		Commence	Finish				Commence	Finish
<u>1220 m</u>								
1	0	51.44.3 N 54.48.3 W	51.37.7 N 54.30.0 W	-	-	19	14:24	14:30
2	0.7	51.42.1 N 54.39.4 W	51.37.9 N 54.28.2 W	-	-	12	15:09	15:11
3	1.4	51.37.9 N 54.25.7 W	51.41.1 N 54.34.8 W	-	-	10	15:13	15:17
4	2.1	51.42.3 N 54.36.0 W	51.38.1 N 54.24.3 W	-	-	12	15:20	15:23
5	2.8	51.37.9 N 54.21.3 W	51.42.8 N 54.34.9 W	-	-	13	15:26	15:31
6	3.5	51.43.5 N 54.34.7 W	51.38.1 N 54.20.2 W	-	-	15	15:33	15:38
7	4.2	51.38.3 N 54.18.4 W	51.43.7 N 54.33.2 W	-	-	13	15:40	15:46
8	4.9	51.44.4 N 54.32.8 W	51.38.4 N 54.16.5 W	-	-	16	15:50	15:55
9	5.6	51.38.1 N 54.13.2 W	51.44.8 N 54.31.6 W	-	-	18	15:58	16:05
<u>305 m</u>								
1	0.5	51.40.7 N 54.36.6 W	51.37.6 N 54.27.9 W	5	1	78	16:11	16:14
2	1.0	51.37.6 N 54.27.0 W	51.40.7 N 54.34.9 W	10	1	83	16:17	16:21
3	2.8	51.42.5 N 54.34.6 W	51.37.6 N 54.21.1 W	31	2	125	16:23	16:28
4	3.5	51.37.9 N 54.19.3 W	51.43.5 N 54.34.2 W	39	2	144	16:32	16:38
5	3.6	51.43.8 N 54.35.5 W	51.39.3 N 54.23.0 W	41	3	117	16:41	16:45
6	4.6	51.40.1 N 54.21.9 W	51.43.2 N 54.30.5 W	51	3	91	16:48	16:53
7 ^b	2.3	51.43.4 N 54.37.5 W	51.38.9 N 54.26.0 W	-	2	112	17:01	17:05
8 ^b	4.0	51.38.7 N 54.20.2 W	51.44.8 N 54.37.3 W	-	3	168	17:09	17:16

^a Displacement from 1220 m - line 1.

^b Samples not randomly chosen but instead, chosen to fall in seal concentrations.

^c Local time (NST) = GMT - 3:30





apparently form up in 1977, and plans to survey this patch were thus cancelled. Since all known concentrations of whelping harp seals in the western Atlantic off eastern Canada had been surveyed, the field work was terminated on 15 March 1977.

Preliminary evaluation of the census

It was generally agreed by all participants that the 1977 aerial survey of harp seals had been extremely successful (Doubleday, in Litt., 1977; Ronald, in Litt., 1977).

There were two large concentrations of whelping harp seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, one to the west of the Magdalen Islands and another off Bird Rocks (Figs.2-6). These two whelping patches were located by 4 March 1977 and remained in their respective positions, aside from relatively insignificant ice movements, until they were photographed between 9 and 11 March 1977.

A small group of seals was observed to the southwest of Bird Rocks and this group of seals may not have been photographed as part of the main Bird Rock patch. A report of harp seals to the west of Deadman's Island was followed up but no seals were located.

The main patch to the West of the Magdalen Islands was surveyed on 9 and 10 March. Using the sealing vessel Nadine, dye markers and recognizable leads, an attempt was made to obtain overlap between the two days, and extend coverage on 10 March to cover seals not photographed on the 9th.

The smaller Bird Rocks' patch was located and flown on 11 March 1977. In general, it was concluded that all known significant concentrations of harp seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence during March 1977 were photographed.

On the Front, systematic and thorough searches for seals from Cape St. Anthony to beyond Hamilton Inlet resulted in the location of only one

major concentration of seals. This patch was photographed on 14 and 15 March and it was concluded that "coverage of the Front herd was virtually complete with only scattered seals being missed" (Doubleday, in Litt., 1977). It was later suggested at the 6 June meeting that a source of error may have been introduced by flying the Front herd on successive days. This approach was necessitated because of the area of the patch, but ice movements from the 14th to the 15th made it difficult to be certain that total coverage was in fact, obtained.

It was agreed that a small group of seals (perhaps 1000 pups) south of the main Front patch, and the historical Mecatina patch in the north Gulf (about 30 seals) were not surveyed.

Doubleday (in Litt., 1977) concluded that "Even if the coverage is not 100% the estimates of pup production from this aerial survey should represent a proven reserve of harp seals not far from the total population".

A number of other comments were made which will be dealt with below in more detail. These included the possibility that disturbance of seals by sealing vessels in the Gulf on 10 March and on the Front on 15 March which should be considered during the statistical analysis of data. Similarly, the presence of carcasses on the ice around the boats might bias the estimates. However, daily kill records could be used to reduce this error or to at least identify the magnitude of probable error introduced by this unexpected complication. It was also suggested that correction factors for the number of whitecoats in the water at the time of the survey, for animals hidden from the view of the camera, and for the varying number of adults on the ice during the surveys, might be applied to the results of the census.

ANALYSIS OF PHOTOGRAPHIC IMAGERY

Preliminary assessment of the quality of the imagery obtained was made by the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing. The 70 mm ultraviolet imagery appeared to be of good quality. However, an apparent malfunction of the motor drive observed in the field, and attributed in part to the power pack, resulted in erratic movement of the film through the camera. When this occurred, less than 20 per cent forward overlap was obtained on adjacent frames, and in some instances there were small gaps between adjacent frames of the sample line coverage recorded on film. This did not cause major problems during the subsequent quantitative assessment of the imagery.

The Canada Centre for Remote Sensing also reported that the imagery obtained at 1220 m with the RC-10 camera was somewhat overexposed, and steps were taken to compensate for this during production of contact transparencies. Subsequently, when this imagery was being counted, it became obvious that image quality was much inferior to that obtained in 1974 and 1975 (Lavigne et al., 1974; 1975a). The main problem was a distinct lack of resolution, especially near the edges of each frame. The centre of the frame was in better focus but not of the quality obtained in previous years.

A comparison of ultraviolet imagery (305 m) and black and white imagery (1220 m) from identical areas on the ice confirmed that many adult seals detected at 305 m were present on the 1220 m imagery, but that they would not have been positively identified because of the lack of focus on this imagery.

Problems associated with the malfunctioning of the RC-10 camera which resulted in this poor quality imagery may have been due in part to a loss of vacuum in the camera detected on 15 March. However, the results are

not totally consistent with imagery problems associated with a loss of vacuum and other, unknown factors may have been involved. The limited usefulness of the 1220 m black and white imagery necessitated consideration of various estimation methods other than the original method proposed, i.e. ratio estimation, in the research outline.

305 m ultraviolet imagery

The ultraviolet imagery obtained from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Front in March 1977 is summarized in Table 6. For convenience, film roll numbers assigned in the field have been retained. The imagery will be referred to by either roll number or date, depending on the context of the reference. This imagery represents samples obtained at 305 m, using ultraviolet photography to detect adult harp seals and their pups, including whitecoats (Lavigne et al., 1975a). These samples were obtained on a random or stratified random basis using a random number table.

All of the ultraviolet imagery was assessed and counted by two or three photointerpreters. A variety of approaches was undertaken in order to investigate further, the most effective and efficient procedure for use in future surveys, if such surveys are undertaken.

Initially the photointerpreters spent approximately two weeks learning to recognize seals and to interpret correctly, various types of imagery at different scales. During this time they also assessed the imagery obtained from the experimental ground-truth work described elsewhere (Capstick et al., 1977).

The ultraviolet imagery was then analysed as follows. Rolls 478 and 483 were counted by all three photointerpreters to provide data on variation between counters. The remaining six rolls were counted by two

TABLE 6

Summary of ultraviolet imagery obtained in March 1977

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Roll No.</u>	<u>Counted by</u> ¹
9 March	N.W. of Magdalen Is.	478 UV	1, 2, 3
9 March	N.W. of Magdalen Is.	483 UV	1, 2, 3
10 March	N.W. of Magdalen Is.	484 UV	2, 3
11 March	Bird Rocks	486 UV	1, 3
11 March	Bird Rocks	488 UV	1, 3
11 March	Bird Rocks	489 UV part	1, 2
14 March	Front	489 UV part	1, 2
15 March	Front	492 UV	2, 3
15 March	Front	494 UV	1, 2

¹ Numbers refer to each of three photointerpreters

of the three photointerpreters. During this initial count, frames in each roll were analysed separately and in random order by each counter. For rolls 478 and 483, adults and pups were counted on separate occasions without reference to previous counts. On all other rolls, adults and pups were counted simultaneously on each frame, in random order, by each counter involved. This procedure was adopted to test whether counts of pups were more precise when made in reference to adult counts (adults are easier to count) on the same frame.

The results of all counts were tabulated by individuals not involved in counting. Thus all counts by each counter were made independently and without reference to counts by other individuals.

Preliminary assessment of these initial counts involved separating the frames into the following categories:

- 1) frames which all counters reported to be devoid of seals (both adults and pups).
- 2) frames on which at least one counter reported seals (either adult or pups). This category was then, subdivided as follows:
 - a) frames on which all counters reported an identical number of adult seals and pups
 - b) frames on which all counters did not report an identical number of adults and pups

When all the ultraviolet imagery had been counted for the first time, the photointerpreters also began to analyse the 1220 m imagery (see below). During this time replicate counts were made on the ultraviolet imagery. The main objectives of this exercise were to quantify within counter variation, and to verify the previous counts.

Replicate counts were made on every frame in which any seal (adult and/or pup) was reported. In addition a number of frames with no seals, equal to or in excess of the number of frames with seals on which total agreement had been obtained, were selected at random, and included in the replicate counts. These counts were made by frame number (in chronological order) within each roll. Adults and pups were counted simultaneously. This procedure is more straightforward than the previous method and also provided additional data on counting procedures and counter variability. The counters did not have access to their previous counts or the counts of others and these counts were again made independently.

These data were compiled so that the initial counts and replicates by each counter for each frame were compared. Means and standard deviations for adult and pup counts for each frame were then determined. These data were examined and obvious "outliers" (Snedecor and Cochran, 1969) were rejected, i.e. if one out of six of the counts (on rolls 478 and 483) or one out of four (on the remaining rolls) were significantly different from the remaining counts, that count was rejected.

Additional counts were subsequently completed to confirm earlier counts and the final data matrix for the ultraviolet samples was tabulated. This matrix included the frame number (within each roll), the mean (\pm S.D.) number of adult seals and pups counted on each frame, and the area of each frame as measured using a digital planimeter (Numonics Corp., North Wales, PA, U.S.A.).

1220 m Black and white imagery

Initially the black and white transparencies for each flight were mosaiced together. In this way the area covered on the ice by the survey was reconstructed in the lab. At this time areas of overlap were marked

on adjacent frames to prevent duplicate counts. This imagery was obtained to provide a good estimate of the area of the patch, or the area surveyed on a particular day, and to provide a count of adult seals on the ice at the time of the survey (Lavigne et al., 1975a).

In the original plan, counting of adult seals on 1220 m imagery was to be as rigorous as the counting of ultraviolet imagery outlined above. However, after a number of frames had been counted in duplicate, considerable variation was observed both between and within counters. At this point, comparison of the 1977 imagery with similar imagery from previous flights in 1974 and 1975 revealed the resolution problems noted above. As a result, all frames were counted a minimum of two times each and no attempt was made to resolve differences between or within counters. Areas on the ice covered by each frame were again measured using a planimeter.

Maps of each of the aerial survey flights were then constructed from the mosaiced transparencies (Figs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15). It was known that some areas of the whelping patch west of the Magdalen Islands had been covered on both 9 and 10 March. When the imagery from these two surveys was mosaiced between days, it became obvious that little additional coverage had been obtained on 10 March. As a result, it became evident that total coverage of this patch had not been obtained. Discussion of this previously unrecognized problem at a meeting of participants in August, resulted in the decision to place top priority on a detailed analysis of the Front coverage. Thus, only preliminary calculations have been completed for the Gulf of St. Lawrence whelping herds, since any estimate would not include those seals not photographed, and estimates of the area not covered would be highly speculative at best.

Fig. 9. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 9 March 1977 to the northwest of the Magdalen Islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.




Fig. 10. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 10 March 1977 to the northwest of the Magdalen Islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.




Fig. 11. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 11 March 1977 near Bird Rocks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.




Fig. 12. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 14 March 1977 on the Front off Newfoundland.




Fig. 13. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 15 March 1977 on the Front off Newfoundland.




Fig. 14. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 14 March 1977 indicating major "landmarks".





Fig. 15. Mosaic of 1220 m imagery obtained on 15 March 1977 indicating major "landmarks".



ANALYSIS OF DATA

Preliminary estimates of the number of harp seal pups accounted for by the 1977 survey based on a simple random sampling procedure were discussed at a meeting of participants on 17 August. These results, for both the Gulf and the Front, were included in a preliminary interim report submitted to the Committee on Seals and Sealing on 21 and 22 August (Appendix 1).

For these calculations each flight line at 305 m was treated as a sample. Since all flight lines were not of equal length, the samples were effectively weighted in inverse proportion to the area within the herd they represented (Som, 1973).

The results of these calculations (Table 7) were characterized by wide confidence intervals commonly encountered in harp seal census results for various reasons (Lavigne et al., 1975a). Since simple random sampling does not make the most efficient or complete use of all available data, a variety of other estimates were subsequently investigated using data from the Front surveys only.

Post stratification was carried out with respect to the apparent density of adult seals on the 1220 m imagery (Fig. 12 and 13). Four strata were identified: >100 seals km^{-2} , >10 to 100 seals km^{-2} , >0 to 10 seals km^{-2} , and 0 seals km^{-2} . Ultraviolet frames were then matched to the 1220 m imagery and separated into samples. All ultraviolet imagery from one flight line within a single 1220 m frame was considered a sample. The number of pups in the area covered by the survey was then estimated (Table 7) using varying probability, stratified sampling estimators (Som, 1973).

For 14 March, an additional stratum was added to account for an area within the patch not photographed on the 1220 m imagery, yet sampled at 305 m with ultraviolet photography. These ultraviolet frames were separated into samples in units of 10 frames for analysis. The results of this analysis are given in Table 7.

The original experimental design proposed using the ratio of pups to adults counted on the ultraviolet imagery and the total count of adults on the 1220 m imagery to obtain an estimate of the total number of pups in the area surveyed (Lavigne et al., 1975a; Lavigne and Ronald, 1975). In the Gulf of St. Lawrence in March 1975 this relationship was linear with a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.99$ (Lavigne et al., 1975a). However, in 1977, poor quality 1220 m black and white imagery and the resulting variation in counts of adult seals precluded use of this analysis.

As an alternative method, use of a ratio of pup counts on the ultraviolet imagery to the corresponding adult counts on the 1220 m imagery, in combination with the total 9 x 9 count, was examined. This assumes that the relative number of seals in the comparison areas not detected on the 1220 m imagery because of poor quality imagery is similar to the whole area surveyed (i.e. that the comparison areas are random samples of the whole). As a first approximation, the relationship between 305 m pup counts and 1220 m adult counts from corresponding areas on the ice might be considered linear through the origin (Figs. 16 and 17) with variance increasing with mean count (especially Fig. 16). Cochran (1963) indicates that in this situation, with variance proportional to the mean, the ratio estimator should be the best linear unbiased estimator of the total number of pups.

For 14 March, using a mean ultraviolet pup count of 3.6234, a mean




Fig. 16. Relationship between number of pups counted on 305 m ultraviolet imagery and the number of adult harp seals, Pagophilus groenlandicus, counted in the same area on 1220 m black and white imagery on the Front, 14 March 1977. $r = 0.83$; $n = 360$ of which 242 had no seals.




Fig. 17. Relationship between number of pups counted on 305 m ultraviolet imagery and the number of adult harp seals, Pagophilus groenlandicus, counted in the same area on 1220 m black and white imagery on the Front, 15 March 1977. $r = 0.62$; $n = 493$, of which 186 had no seals.

1220 m adult count of 1.5014, and the total adult count of 29,950, the estimate of total pups was 72,281. If the variance of the total adult count is estimated from repeated counting, the coefficient of variation of the estimator is approximately 0.083. This value was obtained by substituting sample estimates of covariances in Cochran (1963, p. 158, eq. 6.7), ignoring the finite population correction factor and adding the relative variances of the ratio and the estimated adult count.

Since the relationship between the pup and adult counts used in this calculation is not precisely linear, the ratio estimator is biased. According to Cochran (1963, eq. 6.14) this bias is approximately 0.82% with the total pup count underestimated.

The above estimate for the region of the Front surveyed on 14 March does not include an area not photographed in the 1220 m mosaic (Table 7) and like the other estimates is not adjusted for pups not detected from the air (Table 8).

Similar calculations were made for the area on the Front surveyed on 15 March. Using a mean ultraviolet pup count of 5.6114, a mean 1220 m adult count of 2.1278, and the total adult count of 11,115, the estimate of total pups was 29,312. The coefficient of variation calculated as described above was 0.061 (Table 7) and the estimation of bias (Cochran, 1963, eq. 6.14) was less than 0.3%.

Regression estimators [$y(\text{pups})$ predicted from $x(\text{adults})$] were also calculated from data for the 14 and 15 March on the Front. These estimates may also be biased due to the nonlinearity of the regression between pups counted on the 305 m ultraviolet imagery and corresponding adults on the 1220 m imagery (Figs. 16 and 17). For 14 March the estimated number of pups was 44,955 with a coefficient of variation of about

0.029. For 15 March, the corresponding estimate was 13,891 with a coefficient of variation of 0.057.

For these data however, the GM regression is probably more appropriate (Ricker, 1973) since variability in pup to adult ratios appears to be a natural consequence of movements of adult seals. Estimates of the number of pups surveyed on 14 and 15 March using the GM regression estimator was 54,170 and 22,408 respectively (Table 7).

DISCUSSION

It would appear that reasonably complete photographic coverage was obtained for the main whelping concentration of harp seals on the Front off Newfoundland in March 1977. Five estimates of the number of pups accounted for by the census ranged from 58,846 to 185,159 (Table 7). Estimates based on simple random sampling and stratified random sampling procedures had relatively large variances. Estimates obtained from ratio estimation and regression analyses were more efficient (i.e. narrower confidence limits) but lower than estimates obtained from simple random and stratified random sampling (Table 7).

Qualitative assessment of the detectability of pups on the Front in March 1977 suggested that about 10 per cent would not be photographed by the sensor (Capstick et al., 1977). Application of this correction factor results in estimates of pup production in the area censused on the Front ranging from 64,731 to 203,675 (Table 8).

The question remains as to which of the five methods of estimation produces the most reliable estimate of the number of pups surveyed on the Front in 1977. The simple random sampling procedure does not utilize all

sources of information; but is based on good photographic imagery. A bias may be incorporated into the area estimates used in this procedure depending on the accuracy and precision of the altimeter in the aircraft, but this is not considered to be a serious problem.

Post-stratification did not increase the efficiency of estimation because of high variability within strata. This is an unavoidable consequence of the distribution of seals on the ice. Regardless, simple random sampling and stratified random sampling produced similar estimates of the total number of pups accounted for by the survey (Table 8).

Estimates obtained using ratio estimation and the two regression estimators utilize more information, incorporating counts from the 1220 m black and white imagery. Normally, estimators obtained by these methods are more efficient and avoid the possible bias in area estimation, and would be favoured over simple and stratified random sampling procedures. However, in 1977, the 9 x 9 imagery was of poor quality and the resulting counts were subject to considerable variability. Comparison of ultraviolet imagery and similar areas on the 1220 m imagery confirmed that adult seals present were not counted because of the poor resolution. Error may also be introduced since resolution deteriorated more towards the edges of each frame; thus the position of each 70 mm frame on the corresponding 1220 m image would influence the results obtained. Most important, however, is the fact that the 1977 survey apparently took place relatively later in the whelping season than the 1975 census in the Gulf (Lavigne et al., 1975a). This is reflected in the more variable relationship between adult and pups (Figs. 16 and 17), i.e. adult females were less likely to be on the ice nursing pups, as they frequently do shortly after parturition. Furthermore, the results of the

two regression estimates (Table 8) are not consistent with the number of pups subsequently killed (108,632) in the seal hunt shortly after the census.

In conclusion, the estimate of pups surveyed on the Front in 1977 based on simple random sampling is the best estimate from the available data. This estimate easily accounts for the number of pups subsequently killed by sealers (Appendix 2). The relatively wide confidence intervals nevertheless place bounds on the attendant uncertainty in the estimates.

The census in the Gulf of St. Lawrence was incomplete and the survey accounted for less than 30,000 seals (Appendix 1). A portion of the whelping patch to the west of the Magdalen Islands was not surveyed. This was recognized only when the imagery was mosaiced and extensive overlap was found between imagery obtained on 10 March with that obtained the previous day. This problem was caused in part by difficulties with the inertial navigation system in the remote sensing aircraft. In addition, it has been suggested that another large whelping patch was located in the Gulf of St. Lawrence on or about 21 March. Unfortunately, this was not reported to us until mid-August and therefore no attempt could be made to estimate its area, or to conduct a survey and obtain an estimate of pup production in this region. Obviously, it is not reasonable to even speculate on the percentage of coverage obtained in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and thus no estimate of pup production was made for harp seals whelping here in 1977.

Nevertheless, it is of some importance to obtain an estimate of pup production in the western Atlantic from aerial census techniques to compare with independent estimates made using other techniques (e.g. Ser-

TABLE 7

Estimates of the number of harp seal pups (\hat{P}) accounted for by the 1977 aerial census on the Front off Newfoundland, 14 and 15 March 1977

<u>Method of Estimation</u> ¹	<u>\hat{P}</u>	<u>95% C.I.</u>
14 March		
Simple Random Sampling	115,818	58,433
Stratified Random Sampling	131,865	59,500
Ratio Estimation ²	72,281	11,785
Regression Estimation ²	44,955	2,546
G.M. Regression ²	54,170	n.c.
15 March		
Simple Random Sampling	69,341	48,394
Stratified Random Sampling	50,412	12,686
Ratio Estimation	29,312	3,510
Regression Estimation	13,891	1,555
G.M. Regression	22,408	n.c.
Total, Front 1977		
Simple Random Sampling	185,159	51,956
Stratified Random Sampling	182,278	60,837
Ratio Estimation	101,593	12,297
Regression Estimation	58,846	2,983
G.M. Regression	76,578	n.c.

¹ estimates from simple random sampling and stratified random sampling are not independent of each other. Similarly, estimates from ratio estimation and regression estimation are not independent. The first two estimators are, however, independent of the latter two estimators.

² As noted in the text, these two estimates do not include a small area within the herd not covered by the 1220 m imagery. The number of pups in this area estimated during the stratified random sampling procedure was $3,805 \pm 1,958$ (1SE). This raises the mean estimates from ratio estimation and regression estimation to 98,812 and 107,291 respectively.

nc = not calculated

geant, 1975; Benjaminsen and Lett, 1976; Capstick et al., 1976). In 1975, pup production in the Gulf was estimated to be $46,300 \pm 5,158$ (Lavigne et al., 1975b; Lavigne, 1976). If it is assumed that two whelping stocks of harp seals are present in the western north Atlantic, an approximation of pup production in recent years can be made. Evidence supporting this assumption includes the difference in whelping dates (Sergeant, 1976), apparent differences in age at maturation (Sergeant, 1966, 1973), and some evidence of fidelity to place of birth by whelping harp seals (Sergeant, 1976). Using the corrected estimates for the Front in 1977 (Table 8) and the estimate from the Gulf of St. Lawrence in 1975 (46,300) suggests that pup production estimated by aerial census techniques in recent years may be in the order of 250,000 animals (Table 8). This assumes no differences in the proportion of western Atlantic harp seals between the Front and Gulf between 1975 and 1977, and if separate stocks, does not account for any changes in stock size in the Gulf since 1975.

None of the above estimates include seals which were not photographed by the 1220 m aerial survey flights. Minor concentrations of seals not surveyed in 1977 have been noted in this report. In addition some seals between the areas photographed on 14 and 15 March 1977 on the Front, have not been accounted for. Further speculation on the completeness of the 1977 survey is, however, futile.

TABLE 8

Summary of estimates of pup production on the Front in March 1977, including a 10% correction factor for seals not detected by the sensor².

<u>Method of Estimation</u> ¹	<u>\hat{P}</u>
Simple random sampling	203,675
Stratified random sampling	200,506
Ratio estimation	115,938
Regression estimation	68,916
GM regression estimation	88,421

¹ corrected for area within the herd not covered by the 1220 imagery (see Table 7).

² An estimate of pup production by harp seals in the western Atlantic based on aerial surveys in 1975 and 1977 may be obtained by adding the 1975 estimate from the Gulf of St. Lawrence (46,300) to the above estimates from the Front in 1977.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report represents the culmination of four years of research involving many individuals and a number of organizations. The 1977 census was undertaken as a cooperative project between participants from the University of Guelph and the Fisheries and Marine Service in conjunction with the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing.

Various individuals contributed to the development of the survey design. These include P.F. Lett, M.C. Mercer, R. Stewart, K. Ronald, and C.K. Capstick.

The field work was accomplished through the cooperation and expertise of the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing, the flight crew from Innotech Aviation Ltd., Ottawa, and sensor operators from Intera Environmental Consultants, Ottawa.

Other individuals provided assistance in the field. These include B. Beck, P. Brodie, T. Curran, S. Dudka and W. King. The imagery was analysed in the lab primarily by D. Leishman, L. Sleeth, S. Smith, with additional assistance from A. Hamilton, M. Hammill and G. Nancekivell.

We thank other participants in the 1977 CAFSAC and ICNAF (STACRES) meetings, in particular P.F. Lett and G. Winters, for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

Financial support for this research project came from the Special Advisory Committee on Seals and Sealing to the Minister of Fisheries and Environment, the Hon. Romeo Le Blanc; the Fisheries and Marine Service Environment Canada; through a grant to the University of Guelph from the Donner Canadian Foundation, and operating grants from the National Research Council of Canada to K. Ronald, and D.M. Lavigne.

REFERENCES

- Benjaminsen, T. and P.F. Lett. 1976. A stochastic model for the management of the northwestern Atlantic harp seal Pagophilus groenlandicus population. Int. Comm. Northwest Atl. Fish. Res. Doc. 76/X/130.
- Capstick, C.K., D.M. Lavigne and K. Ronald. 1976. Population forecasts for northwest Atlantic harp seals, Pagophilus groenlandicus. Int. Comm. Northwest Atl. Fish. Res. Doc. 76/X/132.
- Capstick, C.K., D.M. Lavigne and S. Innes. 1977. Comparison of on-ice counts from 35 mm ultraviolet aerial photography. Can. Atl. Fish. Sci. Ad. Comm. Res. Doc. 77/28 (revised).
- Cochran, W.G. 1963. Sampling techniques, 2nd Ed. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, London.
- Curran, T. 1977. Sealing report, Newfoundland Region. Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, Ottawa.
- Fisher, H.D. 1952. Harp seals of the northwest Atlantic. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. Gen. Ser. Circ. 20.
- Fisher, H.D. 1955. Utilization of Atlantic harp seal populations. Trans. 20th North American Wildlife Conference, pp. 507-518.
- ICNAF. 1976. Report of Scientific Advisors to Panel A (Seals). Int. Comm. Northwest Atl. Fish. Summ. Doc. 76/XII/47.
- Lavigne, D.M. 1976. Counting harp seals with ultraviolet photography. Polar Rec. 18: 269-277.
- Lavigne, D.M., N.A. Øritsland, P. Watts, and K. Ronald. 1974. Harp seal remote sensing. A report prepared for the Special Advisory Committee on Seals and Sealing to the Minister of Environment, Environment Canada, Ottawa.
- Lavigne, D.M. and N.A. Øritsland. 1974a. Ultraviolet photography: A new application for remote sensing of mammals. Can. J. Zool. 52: 939-941.
- Lavigne, D.M. and N.A. Øritsland. 1974b. Black polar bears. Nature 251: 218-219.
- Lavigne, D.M., S. Innes, K. Kalpakis and K. Ronald. 1975b. An aerial census of western Atlantic harp seals (Pagophilus groenlandicus) using ultraviolet photography. FAO Scientific Consultation on Marine Mammals. Bergen, Norway, 31 August - 9 September, 1976. ACMRR/MM/SC/33. (also Int. Comm. Northwest Atl. Fish. Res. Doc. 75/XII/144).
- Lavigne, D.M., S. Innes, K. Kalpakis, and K. Ronald. 1975a. Harp seal aerial censusing. A report prepared for the Special Advisory Committee on Seals and Sealing to the Minister of State for Fisheries Environment Canada, Ottawa.

- Lavigne, D.M. and K. Ronald. 1975. Improved remote sensing techniques for evaluating seal populations. I.C.E.S. C.M. 1975/N:12.
- Ricker, W.E. 1973. Linear regressions in fishery research. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 30: 409-434.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1966. Reproductive rates of harp seals, Pagophilus groenlandicus (Erxleben). J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 23: 757-766.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1973. Environment and reproduction in seals. J. Reprod. Fert., Suppl. 19: 555-561.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1975. Estimating numbers of harp seals. Rapp. P.-v. Reun. Cons. Int. Explor. Mer. 169: 274-280.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1976. History and present status of harp and hooded seals. Biol. Conserv. 10: 95-117.
- Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran. 1969. Statistical Methods, 7th Edition. The Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, Iowa.
- Som, R.K. 1973. A manual of sampling techniques. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London.



Appendix 1

University of Guelph

COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY

September 12, 1977

To whom it may concern:

Preliminary results of the 1977 harp seal census were discussed at a meeting of scientists from the University of Guelph and the Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada on 17 August 1977. A confidential interim report was then presented to the Committee on Seals and Sealing on 21 and 22 August 1977.

These results were not made public because of their preliminary nature. To avoid later confusion and misunderstanding it seemed prudent to release only the final figures when these became available.

Subsequently, the results were released by persons unknown, and this resulted in a number of phone calls and one letter regarding these results. Since the quoted figure is incorrect, and confidentiality has been breached, the interim report to COSS (attached) is being made available to anyone who asks for it. I can only ask you to be more responsible than some (one) of my colleague(s). These results are not final, and they refer ONLY TO THE SEALS COUNTED ON THE IMAGERY, they do not provide an estimate of pup production for the Northwest Atlantic in March 1977.

The final report should be ready by 22-23 September 1977 and tabled at a CAFSAC (Canadian Atlantic Fisheries Scientific Advisory Committee - Marine Mammals) meeting at that time.

Your cooperation in not contributing to further confusion and controversy about the status of the harp seal will be appreciated.

Sincerely,



D.M. Lavigne
Assistant Professor

DML:mf

P.S. The CAFSAC meeting has now been rescheduled for 20, 21 October.

RESTRICTED

The 1977 Census of western Atlantic harp seals

A confidential interim report to
the Committee on Seals and Sealing

21-22 August 1977

by

D.M. Lavigne, S. Innes, and W. Barchard

Department of Zoology

University of Guelph

Guelph, Ontario

In March 1977, an aerial census of harp seal whelping patches off eastern Canada was conducted by the University of Guelph and the Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, in conjunction with the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing, Innotech Aviation Ltd., and Intera Environmental Consultants Ltd.

Three flights were made over whelping patches in the Gulf of St. Lawrence on 9, 10 and 11 March; two flights were carried out on the Front off Newfoundland on 14 and 15 March.

Post-survey evaluations were made by the Guelph-FMS participants in March and April, primarily to outline the apparent extent of the aerial coverage. A meeting was subsequently held in early June to discuss all aspects of the aerial survey. Analysis of the imagery began in April and is still in progress. A second meeting to discuss the initial results, and to plan further analyses was held on 17 August.

Plans are now being made to obtain a duplicate set of imagery for the Marine Fish Division, Fisheries and Marine Service, Environment Canada, Dartmouth, N.S. to completely repeat the analyses of the survey data. Data analysis continues at the University of Guelph with the participation of Dr. W.G. Doubleday, Environment Canada, Ottawa.

At the 17 August meeting preliminary results of the aerial census were discussed, and we have been asked to present these results to COSS. It must be stressed that these results are PRELIMINARY. The estimates given are based on the simplest type of sample survey design - simple random sampling, and refer only to the seals on the ice in the areas covered by the census.

For these calculations, each flight line at 305 m was considered to be a random sample of the herd. Adults and pups counted on the resulting ultraviolet imagery were then extrapolated to the area surveyed at 1220 m and a mean estimate of the number of pups on the ice was obtained. No correction factors have been applied for areas not covered by the survey. Further analyses, incorporating more of the available information are in progress. The clumped or aggregated distribution of both adult seals and pups (typical of harp seals) implies that the best estimates of pup production in the areas surveyed may be somewhat different from the preliminary results tabled below.

The extent of the aerial coverage over all whelping patches is the subject of considerable debate at this time. Coverage of the principal whelping patches on the Front appears in our opinion, to be reasonably complete. Coverage of all known whelping patches in the Gulf of St. Lawrence was not obtained.

A draft report outlining the results of the 1977 aerial census is being prepared and will be forwarded to participating groups for evaluation and comment as soon as possible. A final report will be issued in time for the various stock assessment meetings later in 1977.

TABLE 1

Aerial survey coverage of harp seal
whelping patches in March 1977

	Area Surveyed km ²	Area Sampled km ² (%)
9 March ^a	453.5	24.4 (5.4)
10 March ^b	188.8	9.3 (4.9)
11 March ^c	252.0	14.8 (5.9)
14 March	571.7	11.7 (2.0)
15 March	261.1	16.3 (6.2)

^a Lines 1-5 (209.0 km²) not included in area sampled because of absence of seals, i.e. total area flown - 662.5 km².

^b Much of the imagery from 10 March overlaps with imagery from 9 March.

^c Line 5 (3.29 km²) was not included in area sampled as it was not randomly selected, and overlapped to some extent with sample line 3.

TABLE 2

Preliminary estimates of the number of harp seal pups in whelping patches surveyed during March 1977^a

	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>S.E.</u>
Gulf of St. Lawrence		
9 March	19,421	7,709
11 March (Bird Rocks)	6,909	2,769
Front		
14 March ^b	115,818	4,601
15 March ^b	69,341	18,823
	<hr/>	
	TOTAL	211,489

^a These estimates were made using a simple random sampling procedure. The best estimates of pup production in the areas surveyed may be somewhat different from these preliminary estimates.

^b There is some quantitative evidence that as many as 10% of the pups would not be detected on the Front this year, primarily because of deep snow and overhanging ledges. Using this correction factor the pup estimate for the area sampled on the Front becomes 203,675, and the estimated total number of pups accounted for by the survey becomes 230,005.



University of Guelph

COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY

October 25, 1977

To Whom it May Concern:

A draft report entitled "*The 1977 aerial census of western Atlantic harp seals Pagophilus groenlandicus*" by D.M. Lavigne, S. Innes, W. Barchard and W.G. Doubleday was presented to the Marine Mammal Subcommittee of the Canadian Atlantic Fisheries Scientific Advisory Committee (CAFSAC) at the Arctic Biological Station, Ste Anne de Bellevue, P.Q. on 20-21 October, 1977. Analyses of the census data are still in progress and the final report will be submitted to a meeting of the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF) in Dartmouth, N.S. on 15-18 November, 1977.

Before summarizing the results to date it should be noted that the 1977 aerial census represents only one of a number of techniques used to assess the status of western Atlantic harp seals, and to provide advice on future management options for this stock.

Aerial surveys were conducted over concentrations of whelping harp seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Front off the coast of Newfoundland in March 1977. It would appear that reasonably complete photographic coverage was obtained for the main whelping concentration on the Front. The number of pups accounted for by the census in this region was about 200,000 animals.

The census in the Gulf of St. Lawrence was incomplete and the survey accounted for less than 30,000 seal pups. Speculation on the number of pups produced in areas not covered by the census is a futile exercise.

It is, however, of some importance to attempt an estimate of pup production to compare with independent estimates made using other techniques. In 1975, pup production in the Gulf was estimated by aerial survey to be 46,300. If it is assumed that two whelping stocks of harp seals are present in the western Atlantic, a rough approximation of pup production, estimated by aerial surveys in 1975 and 1977 can be made. Such a calculation, using the 1975 estimate for the Gulf and the 1977 estimate for

the Front, included in the draft report suggested that pup production may be in the order of 250,000 seals. This estimate only includes those seals surveyed in 1975 and 1977 in the Gulf and Front respectively and does not include speculation on the number of pups not surveyed in either year, and does not account for changes in the Gulf stock between 1975 and 1977, or for other differences between the two years.

Preliminary catch statistics for the 1977 seal hunt indicate that about 149,000 harp seals of all ages were landed by sealers. On the Front 108,632 or about 54% of the pups surveyed were killed. A similar calculation for the Gulf of St. Lawrence is not possible. Nevertheless, on the basis of aerial survey data it is unlikely that the total number of pups killed in the western Atlantic in 1977 (124,932) exceeds 50 per cent of the total pup production. There is no indication that 74 per cent of the 1977 pup production was taken by sealers as implied in various press releases this past September.

D.M. Lavigne
Guelph
25 October 1977

