

## **The Conservation Basis for the Regulation of Whale Watching in Canada by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans: A Precautionary Approach.**

Jon Lien  
Memorial University of Newfoundland  
St. John's, Newfoundland

Submitted to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa  
31 March 2000

### **Summary:**

At present, available scientific literature on long-term, negative impacts of whale watching on the conservation of cetacean populations is lacking. Studies that show short-term disturbances of whales and dolphins during whale watching activities which disrupt or prevent animals completing essential life processes are available in a number of species and many locations. In addition, a strong consensus of marine mammal scientists have the expert opinion that whale watching activities can disturb individuals and groups and that such disturbances, if repetitive and persistent over time, can produce harmful conservation impacts. Similarly, arguments based on knowledge of the general biology of cetaceans which make them vulnerable to human presence, and studies which show the affects of human presence on wild terrestrial mammals, provide reason for concern about the conservation impact of such disturbances on cetaceans.

The impacts of short-term disturbances may be exacerbated by the fact that some groups of whales are already endangered, threatened or vulnerable because of past exploitation or present changes in ocean conditions. Because of this vulnerability, and as whale watching concentrates in areas of critical habitat required for specific activities, and because whale watching is competitive and vessel operators seek to make the experience more attractive by getting close to the animals or by pursuing them, whale watching alone, or because of cumulative effects, may entail conservation risks.

Generally what is clear at present is that when there are large numbers of vessels, when some approach too closely, move too quickly, operate too noisily, or pursue animals, performance of life-processes in wild cetaceans may be interrupted. When such activities become repetitive and persist in preventing completion of life processes they clearly become a conservation threat. Because of the growing popularity of whale watching with the Canadian public it is evident that this may be happening. It is therefore necessary to take a precautionary approach to the management of whale watching so that standards of operation do not permit activities that may disturb whales and may become frequent, repetitive and persistent. A precautionary approach requires that whale watching activities do not develop faster than knowledge of their impact on the animals, and that it is done in a cautious manner which proactively avoids harm to individual animals and populations of whales and dolphins.

The objective of establishing regulations for whale watching is to provide a basis for managing human activities that will, or are likely to, affect whale and dolphin populations which occur in Canada's waters so as to ensure their conservation and recovery. The Fisheries Act (Section 7) requires that "No person shall disturb a marine mammal except when fishing for marine mammals under the authority of these regulations". It is the intent of this regulation to protect cetaceans to ensure their long-term conservation.

The goal of this paper is to provide information which shows that whale watching activities may disturb cetaceans in the performance of normal daily activities which are critical to their survival, and that such disturbances, if persistent and repetitive, could cause long-term conservation impacts.

### **Cetacean Vulnerability**

**Previous exploitation/present status:** Canada has a diversity of whale species which have been the focus of interest for whale watchers, including humpbacks, fins, blues, right, minke, gray, killer, long-finned pilot whales, belugas, and incidentally, several smaller species, such as white-sided dolphins, white-beaked dolphins and Dall's porpoise. Some populations of belugas and right whales are endangered due to past exploitation. Current activities or changes in the ocean habitat they require threaten other species such as North Pacific humpbacks and some populations of killer whales and belugas. Other populations, such as the fin whale and long-finned pilot whales, remain reduced in numbers although they have been protected from exploitation for years. Still other populations, such as the gray whale and the Northwest Atlantic humpback, are growing and abundant. Because of the various conditions of groups and species there are significant differences in their vulnerability to additional human impacts such as whale watching. For some species the management objective is to minimize any possible whale watching threats to their recovery. Pending Species at Risk legislation in Canada may affect management of whale watching of some species. For others, the objective is to ensure that their populations are not harmed by the continuing development of whale watching activities.

**Rapid environmental change:** Cetaceans exist in an environment that is rapidly and dramatically changing (Norse 1993). Fisheries have had major impacts on biological processes, food webs and habitat in recent years. Fishing has depleted major finfish stocks and has devoted increasing effort down the food web (Pauley *et al.* 1998). Fisheries in Canada exploit major food sources for cetaceans, Increasing activities at sea, including offshore oil and gas, mineral extraction, transportation and recreation have expropriated or impacted major areas of productive habitat for cetaceans. There has been extensive physical alteration of large portions of Canada's coastal zone and major estuaries Land-based and at sea introductions of a variety of chemicals and nutrients impacts

many ocean species and, through bioaccumulation, seriously impacts some of Canada's whale populations (Lien and Dunn 2000). More important perhaps than the extent of the changes is the very speed with which they have occurred. Canada's marine environment over the past several decades has been changed dramatically and new changes, such as the increase in human presence produced by whale watching activities, may act cumulatively with these changes.

**Specific habitat requirements:** A few cetacean populations, such as some killer whales and all belugas, reside more or less permanently in Canadian waters. Other species, such as gray, humpback, fin, blue and long-finned pilot whales exhibit long migrations and are present in Canadian waters only for specific portions of their life. All species found in Canada occur in concentrated areas of ocean habitat where they must complete specific activities in order to survive (Gaskin 1982). Examples of such concentrated areas are bait rich locations like the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park area in Quebec which is some 15 km wide by 30 km long (N.Menard, pers. comm.) and the Witless Bay Ecological Reserve in Newfoundland which is less than 20 square km in area (L.Daley, pers. comm.). Specific habitat conditions which the animals require may include availability of food, lack of disturbance from predators or weather, currents, depth, temperature, or other factors. The animals are dependent on these areas in the performance of life processes including foraging and feeding, resting, mating, and caring for calves or maintaining social groups.

**Concentration of whale watching:** Because they are dependent on specific habitat areas which become well-known, whale watching activities typically become concentrated in these locations, enhancing the animals vulnerability to repeated disturbance and increasing the likely conservation consequences of any short-term disturbances. It is estimated that 95% of boats engaged in commercial whale watching use the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park area (N.Menard, pers. comm.) and well over half of all commercial whale watching in Newfoundland occurs in the Witless Bay Ecological Reserve. The present record for concentrations of whale watching activities occurred in Haro Strait when 107 vessels were observed following the same small pod of southern resident killer whales (G. Ellis, pers. comm.). As vessel operators are often competitive, and typically attempt to increase the attractiveness of the viewing experience by getting close to the whales or pursuing them (Forestall and Kaufman 1994), frequent repetition of disturbances can become common.

Typical causes for extinction in terrestrial animals has been human presence which excludes animals from prime habitat and forces them into sub-optimal conditions. The concentration of whale watching and the operation of vessels in conducting whale watching may well have the possibility of degrading habitat for cetaceans.

It is the conservation status of whale populations, the numerous and rapid changes in the ocean environment, the animal's dependence on critical habitat

which concentrates them and whale watching activities, that makes these wild animals particularly vulnerable to human presence. Within all species some individuals, or components of a population, are more vulnerable at certain times in their lives, such as while caring for young, resting, nursing or feeding.

### **The Growth of Whale Watching in Canada**

Whale watching is generally regarded as a non-consumptive activity. However, we now know that non-consumptive human presence, such as visits to national parks (Parks Canada 2000), can substantially degrade habitat for wildlife and ecosystem integrity. The public's interest in whale watching has been increasing over the past two decades.

Whale watching in the past two decades has become the fastest growing wildlife-based industry in the world. In 1991 in the United States there were an estimated total of 3,430,225 whale watchers that spent \$46.25 million U.S. dollars on the activity. By 1994 that had climbed to 4,074,195 whale watchers spending over 65.75 million U.S. dollars a year (Hoyt 1995). Numbers in Canada in 1991 were 185,200 whale watchers on commercial tours that paid \$5.75 million U.S. dollars. In 1994 the number had climbed to 462,000 spending \$14.20 million U.S. dollars (Hoyt 1995). Osborne *et al.* (1999) estimate direct revenues in Haro Strait, B.C. alone at 12 million dollars in 1999.

Table I presents the number of commercial whale watch companies by province and the species of cetacean which they target. Vessels used range from fast inflatables to 200 passenger ships and very fast 150 passenger catamarans. In addition, there are thousands of recreational boaters who spend significant amounts of time engaged in whale watching. All whale watching operators focus their activities in specific habitat areas where whales concentrate.

It is estimated from auto exit polls in 1997 that 44.5% of all visitors to Newfoundland from June through September participate in whale watching on boat tours. Whale watching tours in Newfoundland carry from 120,000 - 150,000 passengers per year and are the key to a growing marine ecotourism business (Lien 1999). In Quebec, over 300,000 visitors per year come to see the other whale species in the Saguenay-Saint Lawrence Marine Park (Gilbert 1999). A single, isolated beluga whale in Nova Scotia was the subject of thousands of visitors per year (Frohoff and Kinsman undated). Recently DFO estimated that over 300,000 commercial whale tours occur each year along the British Columbia coast (Lochbaum and Ellis, pers. comm.).

Table I: Number of commercial whale watching companies by Canadian Province, and the species which they target.

Province	Number of Commercial Whale Watching Companies	Species of Cetacean Targeted
Newfoundland	47	humpback, fin, minke
Nova Scotia	45	humpback, right, fin, long-finned pilot
New Brunswick	25	humpback, right, fin
Quebec	-	fin, beluga, humpback, blue
Manitoba	2	beluga
British Columbia	51	killer, gray, humpback

Commercial whale watching today has an economic value that rivals major fisheries. In 1998 it was estimated that a million people may have been engaged in commercial whale watching in Canada (Lien 1999). Costs of a trip range from \$25.-\$80. Thus, direct revenue from whale watching may approximate \$50,000,000. per year in Canada. As whale watching stimulates additional tourism activities it impacts related industries. Duffus and Dearden (1993) estimated that whale watchers at Johnstone Strait spent \$370-\$400. per whale watching trip. But the total true value of whale watching is not adequately reflected in such figures (IFAW 1999).

Much of the impact of whale watching can be very local. In Churchill, Manitoba, for instance, there are two major tour boat operators that use three large vessels and many small ones for whale watching. It is estimated that approximately 10,000 whale watchers come during two summer months to participate in boat trips. That attraction is able to keep restaurants and hotels filled; the summer business is the basis for the entire years economy (Lien 1999). It is important to protect and encourage an industry like whale watching that makes such an important contribution to coastal economies. And there are additional social/economic benefits as well, including recreational, scientific and educational benefits (IFAW 1997; 1997 b).

Whale watching can be an important experience for people. It's educational (Lien 1999). Whale watching provides the opportunity to become familiar with issues involving endangered and threatened species, to become

aware of the ocean environment and animals that live there, and to learn about the whales (IFAW 1997). People report that they learn about the whale's behaviour and biology. Many report that whale watching is an emotional experience. In an early study 75% of whale watchers reported that "whale watching is one of the most fantastic wildlife experiences that I have ever had". Even more (86%) indicate that seeing whales in the wild greatly increased their support and commitment to the cause of whale conservation (Tilt 1986). In many areas whales become a symbol of a communities heritage, and of a communities relationship to nature (Lien 1999).

Although additional documentation of the educational and psychological benefits of whale watching should be done, it seems clear that exposure to wild whales through whale watching tours can have important benefits to the animals themselves in that people learn more about them, care more about them, and are willing to support programmes that help the animals. Of marine wildlife, whales and dolphins are the group of animals Canadians care about above all others (Lien 1999). It is likely that some of this concern was engendered during commercial whale watching tours and direct exposure to the animals. A caring, informed public that will support conservation management is a clear asset for the animals.

The management goal for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is to ensure the socio-economic and educational benefits of whale watching are sustainable and conducted without disrupting the life processes of the animals.

### **Protecting life processes**

The intent of regulations for whale watching under the Fisheries Act is to insure human activities do not prevent an animal from carrying out life processes. If an animal cannot carry out its life processes its own survival may be at risk. If such disruption to life processes occurs to a particular segment, or to a significant number of individuals within a population, it follows that conservation may be at risk.

To survive a whale must rest, forage, feed, avoid predators, communicate and socialize with its group, mate and care for young. Disturbing animals engaged in such activities prevents the animal from carrying out life processes. Whale watching regulations are designed to limit and minimize activities by whale watching vessels which in the short-term interfere with these behaviours. Any one instance of such disruptions would not likely be too serious. If such disturbances were permissible, however, given concentrations of whales and whale watching and the growing popularity of this activity, they could well become frequent, repetitive and persistent and this could cause serious conservation risks for the animals. The likelihood of frequent and repetitive disturbances has been increasing rapidly over the past several years as

popularity of whale watching grows with the general public and recreational boaters, and as the whale watching industry expands the number of vessels which operate in developed areas and develops in new areas (Lien 1999).

## A Precautionary Approach

The International Whaling Commission (I.W.C.) has recognized “the need for precautionary measures to ensure that the continuing development and expected expansion of whale watching activities does not adversely affect cetacean populations, individual animals, or their environment, or significantly increase the risk to the survival or ecological functioning of such populations” (IWC 1997; 1997 b). The Oceans Act requires Canada to move to an integrated management approach also based on sustainability and the precautionary approach (DFO 1997).

The precautionary approach shifts the burden of proof (FAO 1995). In the past the burden of proof was to show environmental harm before corrective management was implemented. This approach has been shown to have considerable conservation risks (Norse 1993; FAO 1995). The precautionary approach requires that the exploitation of any resource does not proceed faster than knowledge about the impact of exploitation, and that it is done in a cautious manner which proactively avoids environmental harm. Thus research is required to show that a resource is not threatened by an activity if it is to proceed (FAO 1995 b).

The Scientific Committee of the I.W.C. has established principles for whale watching based on informed scientific opinion (Table 2).

Table 2: General principles for whale watching by the International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee (IWC 1997).

- 
- i. Manage the development of whale watching to minimize the risk of adverse impacts:
    - i. implement as appropriate measures to regulate platform numbers and size, activity, frequency and length of exposure in encounters with individuals and groups of whale;
      - management measures may include closed seasons or areas where required to provide additional protection;
      - ideally, undertake an early assessment of the numbers, distribution and other characteristics of the target population/s in an area;
    - ii. monitor the effectiveness of management provisions and modify them as required to accommodate new information;
    - iii. where new whale watching operations are evolving, start cautiously, moderating activity until sufficient information is available on which to base any further development;

- iv. implement scientific research and population monitoring and collection of information on operations, target cetaceans and possible impacts, including those on the acoustic environment, as an early and integral component of management;
  - v. develop training programmes for operators and crew on the biology and behaviour of target species;
  - vi. encourage the provision of accurate and informative material to whale watchers to;
    - develop an informed and supportive public;
    - encourage development of realistic expectations of encounters and avoid disappointment and pressure for increasingly risky behaviour.
- 
2. Design, maintain and operate platforms to minimize the risk of adverse effects on cetaceans, including disturbance from noise;
- i. vessels, engines and other equipment should be designed, maintained, and operated during whale watching to reduce as far as practicable adverse impacts on the target species and their environment;
  - ii. cetacean species may respond differently to low and high frequency sounds, relative sound intensity or rapid change in sound;
    - vessel operators should be aware of the acoustic characteristics of the target species and of their vessel under operating conditions; particularly of the need to reduce as far as possible production of potentially disturbing soundvessel design and operation should minimize the risk of injury to cetaceans should contact occur for.
- 
3. Allow the cetaceans to control the nature and duration of 'interactions':
- i. operators should have a sound understanding of the behaviour of the cetaceans and be aware of behavioural changes which may indicate disturbance;
  - ii. in approaching or accompanying cetaceans, maximum platform speed should be determined relative to that of the cetacean, and should not exceed it once on station;
  - iii. use appropriate angles and distances of approach; species may react differently, and most existing guidelines preclude head-on approaches;
  - iv. friendly whale behaviour should be welcomed, but not cultivated; do not instigate direct contact;
  - v. avoid sudden changes in speed, direction or noise;
  - vi. do not alter platform speed or direction to counteract avoidance behaviour by cetaceans;
  - vii. do not pursue, head-off, or encircle cetaceans or cause groups to separate;
  - viii. approaches to mother/calf pairs and solitary calves and juveniles should be undertaken with special care; there may be an increased risk of disturbance to these animals, or risk of injury if vessels are approached by calves;
  - ix. cetaceans should be able to detect a platform at all times;
    - while quiet operations are desirable, attempts to eliminate all noise may result in cetaceans being startled by a platform which has approached undetected;
    - rough seas may elevate background noise to levels at which vessels are less detectable.
- 

## Evidence on the Effects of Whale Watching

**Scientific Studies:** Whale watching has developed relatively recently in Canada, and throughout the world (Hoyt 1995), and concern about its impact on

the animals recognized even more recently. Existing scientific studies which examine how whale watching affects the animals are not as sufficient as one would wish and typically examine short-term effects. Information in some of these studies indicates that vessel activities disrupt and prevent animals from conducting their normal activities (Findlay 1997). There are some difficulties in interpreting these results as most are observational studies and scale the presence or absence of whale watching, or the amount of vessel activity, but do not control other physiological and environmental variables. Because cetaceans are difficult to study there is much that is not known about their 'normal' behaviour and what constitutes disturbed behaviour

Studies of long-term impacts of whale watching are very sparse and, to date, there are almost no studies and there is no evidence of significant long-term negative impact on cetacean individuals, groups or populations (IFAW 1995). The amount and quality of information will change over time as there are studies underway which will yield information on long-term effects. The I.W.C. is at present systematically gathering available evidence and organizing empirical long-term impact evaluations (IWC 1997; 1997 b).

Whales and dolphins are difficult to observe as most of their behaviour occurs underwater. Behaviour at the waters surface is only a sample of how the animals are reacting to a vessel or human presence. The behavioural disturbances typically reported as a consequence of human presence and activity include the following (GBRMPA 2000):

- changes in swimming speed or direction;
- changes in dive depths or durations;
- changes in breathing rates
- cessation of particular activities such as vocalizing, feeding, resting nursing, socializing;
- leaving an area; and,
- beginning or ceasing aerial behaviours such as lob-tailing, flippering, or breaching.

What appears clear at present is that large numbers of vessels which persistently approach whales too closely, or move too quickly, or operate too noisily, or pursue the animals may interrupt their short-term performance of life processes (GBRMPA 2000). Because many individual whales, groups or populations exhibit fidelity both within and between years to specific areas where whale watching occurs (Clapham *et al.* 1992), the impact of whale watching may be disproportionally on a few individuals or special groups of whales who are therefore more vulnerable to long-term impacts.

**Expert Opinion:** Even with the limited scientific study available at present, marine mammal experts in Canada and throughout the world who study whales from vessels and have had extensive experience approaching and following the

animals during their studies much like whale watchers, have the opinion that short-term disturbances are easily caused by some vessel activities, and if they are persistent can produce harmful conservation impacts (IWC 1997). This consensus has led to precautionary management actions.

As a result *ad hoc* rules and regulations which govern whale watching activities have been made in most places where whale watching occurs (Carlson 1996). Most such rules seek to implement a common-sense, precautionary approach. Regulations generally involve: minimization of vessel speeds, avoidance of abrupt changes in speed, direction or noise; minimization of noise, avoidance of pursuit, no encirclement or splitting of groups, specification of appropriate approach angles; consideration of cumulative impacts on the animals from number of vessels and length of exposure; and, allowing the whales themselves to control the nature and duration of the interaction (IFAW 1995). Carlson (1996) has reviewed regulations around the world and notes that most countries with commercial whale watching have them, and concludes there is a convergence on the activities which they attempt to control.

**Wild Animals and Human Presence:** In the absence of specific scientific studies an approach to reasonably predicting the long-term impacts of human presence on cetaceans has been to look at comparable studies on terrestrial mammals. Wild animals react in various ways to noise and other aspects of human presence (IFAW 1995). Because terrestrial animals are more accessible, easier to study and, in many cases, have been subjects for wildlife viewing for many decades, we know more about the long-term impacts of human presence on this group of wild animals. From such studies of other mammals it is possible to infer some of the likely impacts of human presence on cetaceans.

Some individuals in some species quickly habituate to human presence. Typically, however, wild animals are unlikely to habituate to close approaches, or pursuit or when abrupt or unusual human activities occur. On the other hand, some species do not tolerate human presence and habituate to human activities; they simply move to different locations (IFAW 1997). Not all species are alike.

Another common finding from terrestrial mammal studies indicates that reactions to human presence varies with individual animals. Such variance in individual reactions can be due to reproductive state, age, the animals nutritional status, its previous experiences with human activities or what it is doing at the time. The typical expression of reaction to human presence can also vary between individuals, groups and species. Some animals can become aggressive, others flee or change their activities. Not all individuals are alike, and the same individual is not same all the time.

It is known that human presence disturbances to terrestrial mammals can cause serious long-term harm. Their energy budgets can be seriously impacted by disturbances which require additional movement, foraging for prey can

become ineffective and the increased vigilance required during human presence can produce debilitating stress which inhibits reproduction or fosters medical conditions. Typically it is simply habitat loss due to human activities that causes declines in terrestrial mammal populations. Introduction of structural changes, human presence, and continuing disturbances force animals from prime habitat into sub-optimal areas that are unable to support them adequately.

**Predicting Impacts from General Biology:** Another approach to understanding and predicting the impact of human presence on cetaceans has been to examine general behaviour, biology and ecology of populations and identify particular sensitivities and vulnerabilities (Donovan 1986; IFAW 1996). Cetaceans that exhibit site fidelity, for instance, are much more vulnerable to concentrated disturbances than animals that are dispersed and vary their distribution locations. Humpback and right whales show some site fidelity for feeding areas. Prolonged feeding visits occur to the same areas year after year. Gray whales on Vancouver Island exhibit strong site fidelity (Darling 1984). Some coastal minke whales restrict their activities to exclusive home ranges (Dorsey 1983) and exhibit fidelity to these areas between years (Borggaard *et al* 1999). Some whale species return repeatedly to specific calving areas. Where there are specific site or area dependencies, animals are more vulnerable to human interference.

In some species, such as long-finned pilot whales and killer whales, mothers and calves maintain long-term relationships which are critical for the survival of young. Such groups may depend on coordinated feeding or migration which can be more easily disrupted than if these behaviours are more solitary. Cetaceans generally maintain contacts within their community by means of vocalization. Noisy, intrusive human beings can easily disrupt effective underwater communication.

While scientific data which specifically evaluates anthropogenic impacts is the best guide to responsible management, marine resources can be sustainably managed by careful attention to such general biological information (Johannes 1978; Donovan 1986; IFAW 1996). Much of the general biology of cetacean species, and the characteristics they exhibit, suggests strongly that they may be extremely vulnerable to human activities. In such scenarios unfettered development of activities that could prevent animals from completing critical life processes would recklessly risk conservation impacts.

### **Observed Whale Watching Impacts by Species of Cetacean:**

Cetacean species are diverse in their biology and behaviour. It is therefore likely that reactions to whale watching will vary by species. There is scattered information from a variety of scientific studies which suggests short-term effects of human presence and vessel activity in some species. In this section aspects of

the biology of species targeted by whale watching in Canada which make them more vulnerable to conservation impacts will be discussed, and studies which indicate disturbances of life processes by whale watching will be presented.

**Humpbacks:** Humpbacks are migratory in both Atlantic and Pacific Oceans spending a portion of their annual cycle in warmer southern waters where they breed and calve, and summers in Canadian waters when baits are most abundant. Thus, foraging and feeding are primary activities during which the animals accumulate sufficient blubber reserves so that they survive winter periods when they do very little feeding in less productive waters. Feeding is frequently done in cooperative groups so animals act in unison to herd bait into tight schools, and to the surface. This feeding is frequently concentrated in rich, productive ocean areas. Following heavy feeding humpbacks rest near the surface. Calves, who are often curious and playful, accompany their mothers during summer periods in Canada while they learn to find and capture bait but also are fed by mothers at least in early summer. Humpbacks are the primary target species for most Atlantic whale watching.

Whitehead (1987) in his COSEWIC status report on humpbacks notes the social nature of humpback aggregations. Humpbacks attract other humpbacks. He concludes that human disturbances may cause shifts to other areas. Whitehead and Moore (1982) have noted this in West Indian humpbacks in winter. Herman *et al.* (1980) also found compelling evidence for such shifts due to human interference. In Hervey Bay, Australia as the whale watching has developed changes in habitat use have been observed (Corkeron 1995). Todd (S.Todd, pers. comm.) relates how in 1999 vessels would key in on concentrations of humpbacks at which the whales would leave and move to another location. As boats found them in the new location, the whales left and returned to their original area. Disturbance of humpbacks in feeding areas has been suspected to influence changes in distribution and abundance of animals on Stellwagen Bank (IFAW 1995) and in Southeast Alaska (Vequist and Jensen 1988) where the U.S. National Park Service implemented regulations on number of vessels in the area in an attempt to halt declines in humpback numbers.

There have been short-term behavioural impacts of whale watching (Corkeron 1995 b; Corkeron and Bryden 1998). There are indications that humpbacks react more strongly to whale watching vessels than fishing vessels and this is attributed to their tendency to follow the whales. Whale watching vessel activity can also result in disruption of resting, feeding and diving behaviour, and dispersal of groups including animals exhibiting coordinated feeding (Lien *et al.* 1991). Very close approaches and pursuit by vessels were observed to produce “wheezing” blows, shortened surface times and abrupt changes in direction (Lien *et al.* 1991). Schilling *et al.* (1989) found that humpbacks approached within 30 m or approached aggressively showed a variety of changes in behaviour.

Several studies indicate changes in surface active behaviours with vessel presence (Baker and Herman 1986; Baker 1988; Green and Green 1990; Lien *et al.* 1991). Baker (1988) examined the behaviour of humpbacks to vessels within a 400 m operating zone. Whales responded to the close proximity of vessels by decreasing blow intervals, increasing dive times, and moving away from the vessels path. Changes in whale behaviour were correlated with the speed, size, distance, and numbers of vessels within this zone. It has been observed that noise from vessels can interrupt feeding (McCauley *et al.* 1996). Green and Green (1990) found that surface behaviour decreased and changes in direction of movement increased while a vessel was within 1/2 mile of animals. Effects of vessel presence lasted for 20 minutes after its departure.

Relationships between noise from vessels and the animals activities may also occur as hearing is the dominant sense of cetaceans (Watkins and Wartzok 1985). Short-term reactions to noise by cetaceans have been commonly observed (Richardson *et al.* 1995). Watkins (1986) observes that the primary cause of reactions to vessels were apparently underwater sound. Negative reactions to sounds typically occurred when whales were within 100 m of the source, or when there were sudden increases in sound levels (> 12 dB). It is difficult, however, to demonstrate if reactions are to vessel presence or noise in most cases as they are typically confounded. Todd *et al.* (1996) studied humpbacks reactions to industrial activity producing large amounts of noise. The whales showed no immediate behavioural reaction to dredging, vessels and even explosions. However, entrapments in fishing gear increased apparently due to impaired orientation. In subsequent years, significantly fewer of individual animals that were exposed were resighted in the feeding area (Todd *et al.* 1996). However, habituation to noise has also been commonly shown (Richardson *et al.* 1995).

Humpback mothers and calves are sighted most often in the most productive feeding areas (Lien *et al.* 1991) where typically whale watching activities concentrate. They may be especially sensitive to human presence. Salden (1988) found cow/calf pairs moved away from areas presumed to be favored habitat where human activities were common. In Hawaii, mothers and calves use shallow, protected waters for resting, nursing and possibly avoiding sharks and disturbance by other whales. In recent years they have been moving offshore which may be due to increased human activities in shallower coastal areas (Glockner-Ferrari and Ferrari 1985;1990; Glockner and Venus 1983; Green and Green 1990).

Habituation to the presence of vessels has been shown with repeated exposure (Watkins 1986) and the gradual development of 'vessel friendly' humpbacks is well known. If groups or populations of humpbacks are exposed to well-behaving vessels and that exposure is gradual, they will show an increase in investigative behaviour toward vessels. Watkins (1986) noted that in the early days of whale watching humpbacks reacted strongly to the presence of whale watching vessels, often engaging in agonistic responses. However, "On several

occasions during recent years, when we were listening and observing humpbacks near Stellwagen Bank, the whales suddenly stopped their underwater activities, became silent and began slowly swimming at the surface. At the same time, we began hearing the distant sounds of one of the whale watching vessels on our hydrophones..... Although it was still 8-10 km distant, the three humpbacks remained at the surface and appeared to wait for the boat. When it stopped, they swam closely around and under the boat until engines were restarted. Then, before it was away from the area, the whales had returned to their previous activities, including vocalizations.”

Other studies which have examined responses to human presence have found no consistent responses. It should be remembered that in addition to the presence of a whale watching vessel the animals are also experiencing other influences on their behaviour, including social and physiographic conditions, physiological states and past experiences. Because only observational studies are available, and it is difficult to evaluate cumulative changes, these conditions have not been experimentally controlled.

**Minke Whales:** Minke whales are the smallest baleen whale. Some occur in Canadian waters year-round but there is a migration into Canadian waters from the south which begins in May each year. Males may migrate further northward and females segregate further south. There is a southward migration which occurs in winter but because near shore records during this period are scarce, it is believed to occur further offshore (Stewart and Leatherwood 1985). A similar pattern is recognized in both the Atlantic and Pacific. Their heaviest feeding period is during these summer months. Some minkes are known to establish exclusive, individual home ranges during this period and restrict their activities to specific coastal areas (Dorsey 1983). They feed on a variety of prey species. Because they are a small whale, and spend very brief periods at the surface, and their surfacing pattern is erratic and difficult to predict, this species is typically not a primary target for whale watching but is rather an incidental attraction or a ‘back-up’ species for whale watching.

Watkins (1986) reports that early observations of minke responses to vessels were either positive, in the sense they would approach the vessel, or the animals were uninterested. Only occasionally were their reactions to vessels negative. Minke whales, however, did not allow vessels to approach them. Over time interest in vessels decreased. The I.W.C. Scientific Committee (1982) on the other hand has noted that there is some evidence of vessel avoidance in other populations. Still other studies have shown that minke whales do not react strongly to the presence of vessels. The reaction of whales to vessels or whale watching activities may be a function of the animal's previous experience with human presence. Humans could be perceived as a novelty, boring or a threat. Leaper *et al.* (1999) have shown that commercial whale watching operations can record

valuable data which can be used in scientific assessments of abundance and distribution.

**Fin Whales:** Fin whales occur in both the north Pacific and the Atlantic. Whale watching on this species occurs primarily in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, although they are the incidental focus of vessels in all Newfoundland waters, in Nova Scotia coastal waters and in areas of the Bay of Fundy. There are some reports of this species in coastal waters of British Columbia (Meredith and Campbell 1988). The appearance in British Columbia waters consists of migrating animals moving between winter breeding grounds off southern California and high latitude feeding areas in the Bering and Chukchi Seas. In the Atlantic summer feeding concentrations occur in nearshore waters off all Maritime Provinces. A small population occurs regularly at a confluence off Tadoussac, Quebec. Because of past depletion by whaling this species is listed on Appendix I of CITES (Klinowska 1991) and is classified as 'vulnerable' by COSEWIC.

Individual fin whale exposure to boats varies but some populations receive intense attention from whale watchers. One VHF tagged animal was accompanied by an average of 12 boats during an 8 hour period of observation. The mean number of boats accompanying whales during sightings in the Saguenay River Estuary was 10, but varied from 1 to 12 (Michaud and Giard 2000).

Watkins (1986) reports fins initially were consistently wary of vessels. Initially they appear to react strongly to low-frequency ship sounds and can seldom be approached. On approach they usually move rapidly away, not surfacing again until well away from the vessel. However over time, reactions to vessels appear to habituate somewhat such that in later years vessels could pass as close as within 30 m. When vessels are near finbacks, vocalization is interrupted and animals generally remain quiet (Watkins 1986). Near Tadoussac fin whales are frequently surrounded by boats, boats obstruct their paths and on occasion even collide with them (SSLMP 1997).

Using VHF telemetry to monitor fin whales Michaud and Giard (1997; 1999; 2000) have shown that the whales exposed to boats change their behaviour, reducing deep feeding dives which could easily limit the time spent capturing their prey. Noise and speed of vessels, and especially fast personal water craft, have also been noted as a problem in the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park (Gilbert 1998). Edds and MacFarlane (1987) found that fin whales moved away from vessels at distances of over 1 km. Others have found that fins show reduced surfacing, less blowing and shorter dive durations when whale watch vessels were in the vicinity (Stone *et al.* 1992).

Fin whales are often present along with other baleen whales in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, all of which are targeted by whale watchers. Mitchell and Ghanini (1982) made 232 sightings of baleen whales in the St. Lawrence, 172 as their

vessel passed within 500 m of the animals. In 15% of such sightings whales immediately departed the area. Of those remaining, 40% showed changes in diving duration, blowing sequences and time at the surface (Mitchell and Ghanini 1982). Avoidance of boats is perhaps in some cases based on past experiences. In the Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park area since 1992 there have been 22 reported incidents involving collisions between vessels and whales, or animals with fresh vessel wounds (N. Menard, pers. comm.).

**Blue Whales:** In the North Atlantic records indicate that blue whales winter as far south as the Carolinas and Florida but others winter in the Gulf of St. Lawrence feeding on prey that is abundant at the edge of ice. During the summer they range to Davis Strait and Greenland. The major area for whale watching activities is near Mingan and Anticosti Islands, and along the North Shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The population in this area has been well studied for the past twenty years by a research/whale watching group (Sears *et al.* 1987). It is known that this population of blue whales consists of about 300 individuals. Individually identified animals from this group have been sighted in the Gulf of Maine (Wenzel *et al.* 1988) but little is known of their movements. It is believed that movements of this huge animal occur in relation to plankton fronts (Yochem and Leatherwood 1985). Feeding and foraging migrations are the primary activities of this species during the period (Aug.-Oct.) when whale watching occurs.

In the Pacific blue whales migrate to high latitude feeding grounds in spring and summer after wintering in waters off California and Baja, California. The northward migration begins in April and May along the west coast of North America, and then split into two groups, one moving to the Queen Charlotte Islands and the other heading west towards the Aleution Islands (Yochem and Leatherwood 1985). Several hundred Pacific blue whales have been individually identified (Klinowska 1991).

Populations of blue whales were severely depleted throughout their range by commercial whaling and there is insufficient information to confirm any population increases achieved since they were given total protection (Klinowska 1991). Yochem and Leatherwood (1985) estimate there are between 1,100 –1,500 individuals in the north Atlantic; 1,400-1,900 in the north Pacific.

The only major review of impact of whale watching on blue whales is from Richard Sears (Sears, R., pers. comm.). Movements, feeding, foraging, socializing and rest can be disrupted by close approaches of whale watching vessels, by direct approaches or by pursuit. Even a single disturbance can cause an animal to vacate an area. A number of boats around a whale can cause departures of blue whales from an area, disrupt surface feeding and split groups.

**Gray Whale:** Gray whales occur in the Pacific migrating inside shelf waters between California and Mexican waters where they winter and high latitude areas in the Bering, Chukchi and western Beaufort Seas. A few individuals remain scattered along the west coast of North America (Wolman 1985). A summer population of 50-70 remains along the west coast of Vancouver Island with some individuals returning year after year (Darling 1978; 1984; Reeves and Mitchell 1988). Although viewing migrating gray whales from land is common, these residents are the mainstays of whale watching in British Columbia (Malcolm and Lochbaum 1999).

Duffus *et al.* (1998) have measured only small changes in activities of gray whales in response to whale watching vessels as did Jones (1988). In areas of whale watching individual gray whales begin to exhibit 'friendly' behaviour toward vessels, approaching them and even soliciting touching. With increases in boat traffic it has been reported that gray whales begin to avoid boats however (Donovan 1986). Gray whales react negatively, however, to the noise of vessels. They are known to avoid ensonified areas (Malme *et al.* 1988; Tyack 1988), and to alter communication and surface behaviours in the presence of vessel noises (Dahleim 1988; Jones 1988). Sumich (1983) found that when boats were present gray whales deviated from their course and more often changed speeds.

**Right Whales:** North Atlantic right whales number about 300 individuals and are the most endangered large whale species in Canada. They are classified as 'endangered' by COSEWIC (Hay 1985; Gaskin 1987). Some right whales have been seen off British Columbia but this species is not a target for whale watching there. In the North Atlantic winter distribution is dispersed on the continental shelf and along the coast off Georgia and the Carolinas. Summer distribution is primarily in the Bay of Fundy where the animals focus on zooplankton (Murison and Gaskin 1989) with occasional individuals sighted in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and around Newfoundland (Lien *et al.* 1989). The southern Scotian Shelf functions as a summer and fall feeding and mating area for a high percentage of juveniles and adults. However, only a few cow/calf pairs have been observed there (Brown *et al.* 1995). Both the Grand Manan Basin and Roseway Basin are critical habitat for right whales during summer and fall.

The present population of right whales is seriously threatened by incidental captures in fishing gear and by ship strikes (Kraus 1990). Because of the level of mortality from these sources special marine protected areas in the Bay of Fundy have been designated (Brown *et al.* 1995; A. Potter, pers. com.). Because of the seriousness of the threats to this species, and the inability of these animals to avoid vessels, the U.S. has recently approved a 500 m exclusion zone for vessels around right whales.

Watkins (1986) reports that right whales he observed were less easily disturbed than finbacks and humpbacks. Kraus *et al.* (1988) list whale watching as a potential threat to right whales and mentions that it is difficult to monitor

activities of private boats whose operators may not be aware of the right whales extreme vulnerability. The animals are frequently engaged in multi-directional surface foraging and in social behaviours during which they appear unaware of boats (Mayo and Marx 1990). This very likely makes the risk of vessel strikes higher than for other species. Kraus *et al.* (1988), however, report that there are no data on effects of human presence on right whales. There have been reports of inadvertent and intentional harassment of right whales in New Brunswick (McAlpine *et al.* 1994).

**Killer Whales:** Whale watching that targets killer whales occurs primarily on the West Coast of Canada. Key areas for watching are in Johnstone Strait and urban areas around Sidney, Victoria and the Gulf Islands and the Haro Strait area (Duffus and Dearden 1993; Malcolm and Lochbaum 1999). Up to 190 killer whales use Johnstone Strait each summer, primarily to feed on salmon. Studies have shown that 90% of the killer whales in Johnstone Strait use the Robson Bight area, spending up to 20% of their time in the area to socialize, rest and rub on pebble beaches (BC Parks and DFO 1992). Much of the focus of this whale watching is on the southern resident population which was recently classified as 'threatened' by COSEWIC.

The human presence is intense. Ford (1995) concluded that it did regularly affect the activities of the animals. Baird *et al.* (1998) reports that 80 commercial whale watching boats operate in Haro Straits and an average of about 20 boats (only a quarter of which were commercial boats) were always with pods during passes of pods from one land-based observation site. This represents an increase from an average of 5 boats with each pod during 1990 (Osborne *et al.* 1999). Osborne *et al.* (1999) report 400 incidents in 1998 and 560 in 1999 in which vessels violated the voluntary code of conduct for whale watching in the area.

Baird *et al.* (1998) indicates, however, that during eight years of study of boat/whale interactions no impacts on the whales has been documented. But other studies in B.C. have concluded that there is short-term disturbance of the whales, especially from viewing and photographic activities, and that as the level of these activities increases so will whale disturbances, especially in the absence of effective control (BC Parks and DFO 1992). Osborne (1988) has observed reductions in sleep/rest behaviour during daylight hours. Kruse (1998) in careful studies from a land viewpoint observed whales in Johnstone Strait when vessels were present (within 400 m) and absent. When vessels were present pods swam 1.4 times undisturbed speeds. Swimming speed was correlated with the number of vessels present. Orientation of the swimming was not affected by boat presence, number of boats or their characteristics.

There is some evidence that the southern resident population may be more accustomed to the presence of boats than transient animals. Ford *et al.* (1994) report collisions by power boats and ships with northern resident animals

which have caused serious injuries. Transient killer whales are reported as much less tolerant to close approaches (Felleman *et al.* 1998).

Bowles *et al.* (1988) observed changes in vocalization during and after human contact. Killer whales in wild pods share the same call repertoires with each pod possessing its own dialect (Ford and Fisher 1982) and communication within pods is an essential biological activity.

**Beluga Whales:** There are a number of populations of white whales in Canada which are the target of whale watchers. The Saguenay population in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is classified as 'endangered' by COSEWIC (Lesage and Kingsley 1995) and a recovery plan is being implemented (SLBRC 1998). This population may be showing some signs of recovery (Kingsley 1996). At least one animal in this population has been known to stray from the Saguenay area to Nova Scotia but records of isolated beluga in Newfoundland waters are from Arctic populations. These stray individuals often attract massive amounts of attention from whale watchers (Kinsman, pers. comm.; Frohoff and Kinsman undated). An additional area where beluga watching occurs is in Hudson Bay, near Churchill, Manitoba. This activity focuses on beluga in western and southern Hudson Bay. This population is believed to be stable in size and is not listed by COSEWIC (Richard 1993).

The population in Hudson Bay is hunted by First Nations people and is therefore wary of boats and anthropogenic noise. Sjare and Smith (1986) studied activities in another Canadian population and found alarm reactions which involved rapid mass exodus from estuarine areas were triggered by polar bears, boat noise or human activity on land. Brodie (1989) notes that calves swim in specific positions next to females which is an adaptation to decrease costs of swimming and that positions may not be secure during disruptions.

Caron and Sergeant (1988) studied movements in the mouth of the Saguenay Estuary over 10 years and found a decline of 60% in passages of beluga between 1982-1986 which correlated with an increase in recreational boat traffic. Blane and Jaakson (1994) similarly found vessel effects. Scheifle *et al.* (1997) and Lesage *et al.* (1999) have all studied vocalization changes produced by vessels operating in the Saguenay River Estuary area. Reactions of the animals varied somewhat by type of vessel. However, changes included dramatic decreases in the rates of calling, increases in some specific all types, and shifts in the frequency bands of calls (Lesage *et al.* 1999). Erbe's studies on impacts of vessel noise (Erbe 1997, 1999, 2000) indicate that with the sounds of icebreakers are audible at distances of 60 km and belugas show avoidance behaviour at distances of 40 km. Interference with beluga communication starts as the vessel is within 10 km. Hence, it is not surprising that communication changes occur due to the noise of smaller vessels at very close range.

Frohoff and Kinsman (undated) reported an isolated beluga would frequently approach and follow boats and this resulted in ramming, bumping of the animal. On occasions small boats hit the whale and were over-turned. Propeller injuries to the animal were observed, as was feeding of dead fish which animal would accept but not eat. Feeding could be disrupted by the close approach of vessels or by following the animal. During an extended period of intense whale watching activity that resulted in vessels attending the whale for up to 13 hours/day the animal began to loose weight (Kinsman, K., pers. comm.). Rest periods were also frequently disturbed by vessels and, at these times, the animal often exhibited agitated and even agnostic behavior. Some of these interactions had serious consequences for this individual whale but it is not likely there would be long-term population impacts because the survival of that particular animal was compromised. But such careful observations on this well-known individual are informative and reactions may parallel reactions of groups of belugas.

**Long-finned Pilot Whales:** Long-finned pilot whales are found in North Atlantic waters during summer and autumn months, especially in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence. This species was common off the coast of Newfoundland during periods when the Newfoundland bait squid was abundant but has been infrequently seen for over a decade. "Potheads" are abundant off Cape Breton Island, N.S. where whale watching operations target this species (D.Snow, pers. comm.). Although its numbers were seriously depleted by drive fisheries, and there have been substantial decreases in sightings in some areas, this species is not listed by COSEWIC (Nelson and Lien 1996).

During summer months foraging and feeding are primary activities of this species although feeding occurs year-round. It has been estimated that during summer feeding, when squid is abundant, food intake may be 3-6% of body weight (Sergeant 1962). Breeding and calving are also primary activities during summer months. The breeding season of long-finned pilot whales lasts May-November. Calving is most common in mid-August. Lactation can last for several years and social bonds between calves and cows are enduring. There is some evidence of a matrilineal pod organization.

Pods seen in summer in whale watching areas include mature males and females, juveniles and calves. Actions within the pod are coordinated and feeding occurs in dispersed groups (Nelson and Lien 1996). The strong social bonds in this species may account for strandings where even healthy animals beach themselves as a group (Geraci and St. Aubin 1979). During drive fisheries in Newfoundland during the 1960's "potheads" were herded by boats into shallow water until they beached themselves. Recreational boat activity has also been suggested as a factor in mass strandings of pods (McLeod 1981). When traveling pods exhibit typical structures - older males are usually on the fringes of the pod with females and young in the centres (Weilgart 1984). Both Weilgart (1984) and

McLeod (1982) note that vessel type, noise and activity can change vocalizations of pilot whales.

**Dolphin and Porpoise Species:** Dolphin species are diverse in habitat requirements, pod characteristics and biology. Generally dolphin species are believed to be the most cognitively capable cetaceans (Herman 1980) with superior learning abilities and strong social attachments. Dolphin species are not usually the target species for whale watching in Canada but several species are viewed incidentally including white-sided dolphins, white-beaked dolphins, Dall's porpoise, and even harbour porpoise (C.Malcolm, pers. comm.). Reactions of dolphins to vessels and their activity varies greatly. White-beaked dolphins regularly approach boats and ride bow waves. Even when boats move faster, and emit more noise, this species will sometimes move in close association with vessels, at least for a time. Most information on reactions of dolphins and porpoise to human presence comes from other species.

Bejder *et al.* (1999) found Hector's dolphins were not displaced by either swimmers or boats. The dolphins initially approached boats but after slightly over one hour they were uninterested in the vessel, or actually avoided it. When vessels were present the dolphins bunched together more tightly, perhaps indicating stress at the boats presence. Brown (2000) comparing pre-tourism and tourism impacted dusky dolphins found a shift in habitat and some changes in behavior.

Noise, predators, storms are normal stresses for dolphins. In some cases human presence may fit into a normal range of such stresses. However, activities that are benign as isolated and occasional events become much more problematic when they occur repeatedly and persistently. Dolphins have been shown to avoid ships some 10 km away but the reaction depends on the pods activity mode – resting animals may avoid vessels, foraging animals ignore them and socializing animals approach them. Janik and Thompson (1996) observed significantly fewer surfacings in 70% of observed interactions after whale watching boats approached bottlenose dolphins even though this population had been repeatedly exposed previously. Au and Perryman (1982) observing spotted and spinner dolphins noted that all pods swam away from the projected path of a vessel, some began evading the ship as far as 8 km. away. Hewitt (1985) however found only half of dolphins he observed exhibited avoidance behaviour. Evasive behaviours may consist of deep dives, rapid swimming, pod dispersal and changes in course (Weir 2000). Scarpaci (pers. comm.) found whistling increased as boats conducted approaches prohibited under Australian whale watching regulations and suggests that this was to maintain group cohesion in a stressful situation. Further, Scapaci (C.Scarpaci, pers. comm.) has found that in the presence of tour boats and vessels her dolphins spent significantly less time feeding. But accidents happen. In a population of about 100 bottlenose dolphins 4% were injured by boat collisions over a 13 year period (Wells and Scott 1997). Some populations of bottlenose appear to be habituated to small vessels (Wells

1998). Noise from airplanes can explosively disperse some dolphin schools (Scott and Perryman 1998; Bowman pers. comm.)

## Conclusions

There is some evidence that the presence of, or specific actions of whale watching vessels changes the behaviour of targeted cetaceans. Some of these changes could be viewed as adaptive responses to threats which removes the whale from danger of a ship collision, for instance. But other common short-term changes seem more clearly disruptions of the normal activities of the animals. These disruptions may interrupt or prevent animals from completing life processes. There are data which show interference with communication, residential behaviour, movement, and feeding. There is also evidence of direct harm in some populations because of collisions with whale watching vessels. However, there is also evidence that, in some cases, the animals habituate to human presence, and accommodate to it.

What is clear at present is that when there are large numbers of vessels, when some approach too closely, move too quickly, operate too noisily, or pursue animals, the completion of life processes in wild cetaceans may be disturbed.

The relationship between short-term disturbances and the long-term impact of these disturbances is not clear. But given the intensity of whale watching on a number of populations of cetaceans in Canada it is reasonable to conclude that short-term disturbances occur frequently, are repetitive on the same individuals and within some groups, and that these disturbances persist through periods while the animals must complete specific activities required for their survival. If condoned or permitted these disturbances would be likely to become widespread and even more common. It is precisely through such repetition that short-term disturbances may become long-term conservation impacts. In some of the targeted Canadian populations, both because whale watching disturbances are cumulative on species at risk who live in a rapidly changing environment and have specific biological constraints, vulnerability to disturbance is extremely high.

Where there is a risk, or may be a risk of negative conservation impact, the precautionary approach shifts the burden of proof so that an activity must show itself benign before it proceeds. Regulations which minimize whale watching vessel activities which are most likely to interfere and prevent completion of life processes are necessary.

Many studies of both short-term and long-term impacts of whale watching are currently underway which will clarify much about changes in behaviour which result from these activities. Changes perceived now with suspicion may be

shown to be unimportant, or they may be shown unrelated to long-term conservation impact. However, it is at least equally likely that some changes will be shown to clearly interfere with completion of life processes. Precautionary regulation of whale watching should adaptively respond as this new information becomes available by adjusting rules of conduct.

### **Advice on Managing Whale Watching**

(1) **It is a matter of some urgency that the DFO formulate and initiate plans to manage whale watching activities in Canada.** The rapid development of this industry and its present size have been accompanied by inadequate monitoring or evaluation of its impact on the target animals. It has now grown into a major ecotourism industry and an extremely popular leisure time activity for Canadians. From every indication it will continue to grow. There are clear problems which now occur regularly and are recognized by field personnel in the Department, by scientists and by tour operators. If whale watching is to be sustainable management actions are necessary.

(2) **The life processes of whales must be protected.** The intent of regulations for whale watching is to ensure that human activities do not prevent an animal from carrying out life processes. To survive a whale must rest, forage, feed, avoid predators, communicate and socialize with its group, mate and care for its young. Disturbing animals engaged in such activities prevents the animal from carrying out life processes. If an animal cannot carry out its life processes its own survival may be at risk. If such disruptions to life processes occurs to a particular segment of a population, or to a significant number of individuals within a population, it follows that conservation may be at risk. It is vessel activities that cause disruptions that must be regulated.

(3) **While engaged in whale watching some vessel activities must be regulated.** Vessel activity most reliably related to short-term disruptions of life processes of whales and dolphins include close and rapid approaches, direct approaches which cut-off whale movements, rapid changes in speed and direction when near animal(s), pursuit and excessive noise. Because some animals, such as mothers and calves, are especially vulnerable to human presence there should be given exceptional protection by regulations. Although the conservation impact of any single short-term disruption is impossible to evaluate, vessel activities which cause them are very likely to become standard practice and widespread, making them far more likely to have conservation effects. The objective of establishing regulations for whale watching is to provide a basis for managing human activities that will, or are likely to, affect whale and dolphin populations which occur in Canada's waters so as to ensure their conservation and recovery. Precautionary control of short-term disruptions is necessary to proactively achieve this objective.

**(4) Factors that contribute to frequency, repetitiveness and persistence of short-term disturbances should be controlled.** The number of vessels near whales should be regulated as, sheer numbers and competitive relationships between vessels, means repetitive disturbances. The duration of time any one vessel can spend in close contact with an animal(s) should be controlled. It is when short-term disruptions become frequent, repetitive and persistent that the likelihood of conservation increases.

**(5) Regulation should be adaptive.** While there is inadequate scientific information at present regarding the long-term conservation impact of whale watching, because of initiatives by the I.W.C. and many national jurisdictions, new scientific studies will become available over time. It is important that any regulations and management initiatives be examined and adaptively adjusted in the light of new knowledge of whale watching impacts and experience with the effectiveness of regulations.

**(6) DFO should develop programmes to monitor both short-term and long-term impacts of whale watching.** Each population of cetaceans targeted by whale watchers, and each whale watching area, exhibit unique characteristics. While management should be guided by scientific studies from all species and areas, Canada should initiate on-going programmes to monitor those for which we are specifically responsible. Much of this research can be conducted from commercial whale watching vessels themselves. DFO should encourage partnerships with operators in implementing monitoring research.

**(7) Emphasis should be on compliance rather than enforcement.** The enforcement of regulations on whale watching will be somewhat complicated as most problems occur with recreational boaters rather than commercial operations. Developing evidence sufficient for charges may be difficult for many reasons. Clearly regulations and management of whale watching should be presented within a communications and educational programme which provides the public with an understanding of why such management is necessary. Commercial whale watching operators can be very influential and provide leadership here both by example and by their efforts to inform the public of the rules under which they operate. As whale watching typically concentrates in specific areas, commercial operators may also be helpful in enforcement by reporting offending vessels to DFO. However, a public that loves whales, and understands what their personal impact can be on the animals is, or could be, is the best protection for the animals and cheapest insurance that whale watching is sustainable.

## References

Au, D., Perryman, W. (1982) Movement and speed of dolphin schools responding to an approaching ship. *Fishery Bulletin*, 80, 371-379.

Baird, R.W., Otis, R., Osborne, R.W. (1998) Killer whales and boats in the Haro Strait area: Biology, politics, esthetics and human attitudes. Paper presented at the Whale Watching Research Workshop, Monaco, January 18, 1998. (available <http://office.geog.ubic.ca/dept/whale/abstract.html>). Abstract only.

Baker, S. (1988) Behavioral responses of humpback whales to vessels in Glacier Bay., p.16 in *Proceedings of the Workshop to Review and Evaluate Whale Watching Programs and Management Needs.*, 14-16 Nov. 1988, Monterey, Calif., Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.

Baker, C.S., Herman, L.M. (1989) Behavioural responses of summering humpback whales to vessel traffic: Experimental and opportunistic observations., U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Technical Report NPS-NR-TRS-89-01.

B.C. Parks and Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) 1992) Johnstone Strait Killer Whale Committee Management Recommendations. B.C Parks, Victoria, B.C.

Bejder, L., Dawson, S.M., Harraway, J.A. (1999) Responses by Hector's dolphins to Boats and swimmers in Porpoise Bay, New Zealand., *Marine Mammal Science* 15 (3) 738-750.

Blane, J.M., Jaakson, R. (1994) The impact of ecotourism boats on the St. Lawrence beluga whales., *Environmental Conservation*, 21, 267-269.

Borggaard, D., Lien, J., Stevick, P. (1999) assessing the effects of industrial activity on large cetaceans in Trinity Bay, Newfoundland (1992-1995)., *Aquatic Mammals* 25 (3) 149-161.

Bowles, A.E., Young, W.G., Asper, E.D. (1988) Ontogeny of stereotyped calling of a killer whale calf, *Orcinus orca*, during her first year., Pp 251-275 in Sigurjonsson, J., Leatherwood, S. (eds.) *North Atlantic killer whales*. *Rit Fiskideildar Journal of the Marine Research Institute Reykjavik*, Vol. XI, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Brodie, P.F. (1989) The white whale *Delphinapterus leucas* (Pallas, 1776)., Pp. 119-144 in Ridgeway, S.H., Harrison, R. (eds.) *Handbook of Marine Mammals: Vol. 4: River Dolphins and the Larger Toothed Whales*. Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.

Brown, N (2000) Long-term comparison between the behaviour and ecology of pre-tourism and tourism impacted dusky dolphins in Kaikoura, New Zealand., M.Sc. thesis in progress, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Brown, M.W., Allen, J.M., Kraus, S.D. (1995) The designation of seasonal right whale conservation areas in the waters of Atlantic Canada., pp. 90-98 in Shackell, N.L., Willison, J.H.M. (eds.) Marine protected areas and sustainable fisheries. SAMPAA, Wolfville, N.S.

Carlson, C.A. (1996) A review of whale watching guidelines and regulations around the world., Report submitted to the Scientific Committee of the 48<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, Aberdeen, June, 1996, SC/48/025.

Caron, L., Sergeant, D.E. (1988) Yearly variation in the frequency of passage of beluga whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, at the mouth of the Saguenay River, Quebec, over the past decade., Le Naturaliste Canadien 115, III-II6.

Clapham, P.J., Baraff, L.S., Carlson, C.A., Christian, M.A., Mattila, D.K., Mayo, C.A., Murphy, M.A., Pittman, S. (1992) Seasonal occurrence and return of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in the southern Gulf of Maine., Canadian Journal of Zoology, 71, 440-443.

Corkeron, P. (1995) Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in Hervey Bay, Queensland. Impact of whale watching and the utilization of the bay by whales., Working paper for the Workshop on the Scientific Aspects of Managing Whale Watching, Montecastello Di Vibio. Italy, 30 March – 4 April, 1995.

Corkeron, P. (1995 b) Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in Hervey Bay, Queensland. Behaviour and responses to whale watching vessels., Working paper for the Workshop on the Scientific Aspects of Managing Whale Watching, Montecastello Di Vibio, Italy, 30 March – 4 April, 1995.

Corkeron, P., Bryden, M.M. (1998) Behavioural responses of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, to whale watching vessels – a review., In ANZECC Humpback Whale Research and Conservation Seminar. Brisbane, 1998, Program and Abstracts. Queensland Department of Environment and heritage, Brisbane, Australia. (Abstract only).

Dahlheim, M.E. (1988) Responses of gray whales to increased noise levels in Mexico., P. 14 in Proceedings of the Workshop to Review and Evaluate Whale Watching Programs and Management Needs., 14-16 Nov. 1988, Monterey, Calif., Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.

Darling, J.D. (1978) Summer abundance and distribution of gray whales along the Vancouver Island coast., Unpublished report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, Wash.

Darling, J.D. (1984) Gray whales off Vancouver Island, British Columbia., pp 267-287 in Jones., M.L., Swartz., S., Leatherwood, S. (eds.) The gray whale, *Eschrichtius robustus.*, Academic Press, Orlando, Fla.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) (1997) Toward Canada's oceans strategy., Communications Directorate, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ont.

Donovan, G.P. (1986) Behaviour of whales in relation to management., Reports of the International Whaling Commission, Special Issue 8, International Whaling Commission, Cambridge, U.K.

Dorsey, E.M. (1983) Exclusive adjoining ranges in individually identified minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) in Washington state., Canadian Journal of Zoology, 61, 174-181.

Duffus, D.A., Dearden, P. (1993) Recreational use, valuation, and management of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) on Canada's Pacific Coast., Environmental conservation, 20 (2) 149-156.

Duffus, D.A., Bass, J., Dunham, J.S., Malcolm, C.D. (1998) Ecology and recreational use of gray whales in Clayoquot Sound, Vancouver Island, Canada 1991-1997., Whale watching Research Workshop: Biology, politics, esthetics and human attitudes. Monaco, Jan. 18, 1998, (available <http://office.geog.uvic.ca/dept/abstract.html>), (abstract only).

Edds, P.L., Macfarlane, J.A.F. (1987) Occurrence and general behaviour of balaenopterid cetaceans summering in the St. Lawrence Estuary, Canada., Canadian Journal of Zoology, 65 (6) 1363-1376.

Erbe, C. (1997) The masking of beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) vocalizations by icebreaker noise., Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

Erbe, C. (1999) The effects of anthropogenic noise on Canadian marine mammals., Canadian Acoustics 27 (3) 10-11.

Erbe, C., Farmer, D.M. (2000) Zones of impact around icebreakers affecting beluga whales in the Beaufort Sea., Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, In review.

Felleman, F.L., Heimlich-Boran, J.R., Osborne, R.W. (1998) The feeding ecology of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the Pacific northwest., pp. 113-148 in Pryor, K., Norris, K.S. (eds.) Dolphin societies discoveries and puzzles., University of California Press, Berkely, Calif.

Findlay, K. (1997) A review of the effects of tourism on cetaceans. Ms. submitted to the I.W.C. Scientific Committee 49<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Monaco, SC/49/029.

Food and Agricultural Organization of the U.N. (FAO) (1995) The precautionary approach to fisheries., Pp. 14-16 in Responsible Fisheries, Office for External Relations, FAO, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agricultural Organization of the U.N. (FAO) (1995 b) Precautionary approach to fisheries., FAO Technical Paper 350/I, FAO, Rome, Italy.

Ford, J.K.B., Fisher, H.D. (1982) Killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) dialects as an indicator of stocks in British Columbia., Report of the International Whaling Commission, 32, 671-679.

Ford, J.K.B., Ellis, G.M., Balcomb, K.C. (1994) Killer whales., University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, B.C.

Ford, J.K.B. (1995) A review of studies on the effects of vessels on killer whales in British Columbia., Ms., Vancouver Aquarium, Vancouver, B.C.

Forestell, P.H., Kaufman, G.D. (1994) Resource managers and field researchers: Allies or adversaries?, Pp 17-26 in Postle, D., Simmons, M. (eds.) Encounters with whales '93. Workshop series no. 20, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority: Townsville, Queensland.

Frohoff, T.G., Kinsman, C. (undated) Unusual occurrence and behaviour of a lone, sociable beluga whale in Nova Scotia., unpublished ms., Whale Stewardship Project, P.O. Box 88558, 34 Southport St., Toronto, Ont.

Gaskin, D.E. (1982) The ecology of whales and dolphins., Heinemann, New York, N.Y.

Gaskin, D.E. (1987) Updated status of the right whale, *Eubalaena glacialis*, in Canada., The Canadian Field-Naturalist 101 (2) 2295-309.

Geraci, J.R., St. Aubin, D.J. (1979) Stress and disease in the marine environment: insights through strandings., pp. 223-233 in Geraci, J.R., St. Aubin, D.J. (eds.) Biology of marine mammals: Insights through strandings., U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, No. PB 293890, Washington, D.C.

Gilbert, M-C. Proceedings of the Regional Workshop on Whale Watching Activities at Sea., May 25-26, 1998, Tadoussac, Que., Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park, Tadoussac, Que.

Glockner, D.A., Venus, S.C. 1983) Identification, growth rate and behaviour of humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) cows and calves in the waters off Maui, Hawaii., Pp. 223-258 in Payne, R. (ed.) Communication and behaviour of whales, Westview Press, Boulder, Col.

Glockner-Ferrari, D.A., Ferrari, M.J. (1985) Individual identification, behaviour, reproduction and distribution of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in Hawaii., MMC-83/06, U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, D.C. (NTIS PB85-200772).

Glockner-Ferrari, D.A., Ferrari, M.J. (1990) Reproduction in the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in Hawaiian waters, 1978-1988: The life history, reproductive rates and behaviour of known individuals identified through surface and underwater photography., Reports of the International Whaling Commission, Special Issue 12, 161-169.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) (2000) Supporting document for the whale and dolphin conservation policy., Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville, Qld.

Green, M., Green, R.G. (1990) Short-term impact of vessel traffic on the Hawaiian humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)., Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Animal Behavior Society, June, 1990, SUNY, Buffalo, N.Y.

Hay, K.A. (1985) Status of the right whale, *Eubalaena glacialis*, in Canada., The Canadian Field-Naturalist, 99 (3) 433-437.

Herman, L.M. (1980) Cognitive characteristics of dolphins., pp. 363-429 in Herman, L., Cetacean Behavior

Herman, L.M., Forestell, P.H., Antinaja, R.C. (1980) The 1976/77 migrations of humpback whales into Hawaiian waters: composite description., Final Report to U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, MMC-77/19.

Hewitt, R.P. (1985) Reactions of dolphins to a survey vessel., Fishery Bulletin, 83, 187-193.

Hoyt, E. (1995) The worldwide value and extent of whale watching., Report, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, Bath, U.K.

International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) 1995) Report of the Workshop on the Scientific Aspects of Managing Whale Watching., Montecastello Di Vibio,

Italy, 30 March - 4 April 1995, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Crowborough, East Sussex, England.

International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) (1997) Report of the Workshop on the Socioeconomic Aspects of Whale Watching., Kaikoura, New Zealand 8-12 December 1997, IFAW, Yarmouth Port, Mass.

International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) 1997 b) Report of the Workshop on the Educational Values of Whale Watching., Provincetown, Mass., 8-11 May 1997, IFAW, Yarmouth Port, Mass.

International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) (1996) Report of the International Workshop on the Special Aspects of Watching Sperm Whale., Roseau, Commonwealth of Dominica, East Caribbean, 8-11 January 1996, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Yarmouth Port, Mass.

International Whaling Commission (IWC) (1982) Report of the special meeting on southern Hemisphere minke whales., Cambridge, 22-26 June 1981, Report of the International Whaling Commission 32, 697-745.

International Whaling Commission (IWC) (1997) Report of the Whale watching Working Group., Report of the International Whaling Commission 47, 250-256.

International Whaling Commission (IWC) 1997 b) Report of the Scientific Committee - Whale watching., Report of the International Whaling Commission 47, 104-106.

Janik, V.M., Thompson, P.M. (1996) Changes in surfacing patterns of bottlenose dolphins in response to boat traffic., *Marine Mammal Science* 12 (4) 597-601.

Johannes, R.E. (1978) Traditional marine conservation methods in Oceania and their demise., *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 9, 349-364.

Jones, M.L. (1988) Response of gray whales to whale watching in San Ignacio Lagoon, Mexico., p. 16 in *Proceedings of the Workshop to Review and Evaluate Whale Watching Programs and Management Needs.*, 14-16 Nov. 1988, Monterey, Calif., Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.

Kingsley, M.C.S. (1996) Population Index Estimate for the Belugas of the St. Lawrence in 1995., *Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 2117, Fisheries and Oceans, Maurice Lamontagne Institute, Mont-Joli, Que.

Klinowska, M. (1991) Dolphins, porpoises and whales of the world., *The IUCN Red Data Book*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Kraus, S.D., Crone, M.J., Knowlton, A.R. (1988) The North Atlantic right whale., Pp 684-698 in Chandler, W.J. (ed.) Audubon Wildlife Report 1988. Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.

Kraus, S.D. (1990) Rates and potential causes of mortality in North Atlantic right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*)., *Marine Mammal Science*, 6, 278-291.

Kruse, S. (1998) The interactions between killer whales and boats in Johnstone Strait, B.C., pp. 149-159 in Pryor, K., Norris, K.S. (eds.) Dolphin societies discoveries and puzzles., University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif.

Leaper, R., Fairbairns, R. Gordon, J., Hiby, A., Lovell, P., Papastavrou, V. (1997) Analysis of data collected from a whale watching operation to assess the relative abundance of the minke whale (*Balaenoptera acustrostrata*) around Isle of Mull, Scotland., 47, 505-513.

Lesage, V., Kingsley, M.C.S. (1996) Status of the St. Lawrence River Population of beluga, *Delphinapterus leucas*., Report prepared for the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ont.

Lesage, V., Barrette, C., Kingsley, M.C.S., Sjare, B. (1999) The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behaviour of belugas in the St. Lawrence River Estuary, Canada., *Marine Mammal Science*, 15 (1) 65-84.

Lien, J., Sears, R., Stenson, G.B., Jones, P.W., Ni, I.H. (1989) Right whale, *Eubalaena glacialis*, sightings in waters off Newfoundland and Labrador and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 1978-1987., *The Canadian Field-Naturalist*, 103 (1) 91-93.

Lien, J., Todd, S., Curren, K., Seton, R. (1992) The impact of tour boat activity on humpback whales and seabirds in the Witless Bay Ecological Reserve, Newfoundland, and effects of tour boat experiences on passengers., Report to the Marine Adventures Association and Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, St. John's, Newfoundland.

Lien, J. (1999) An examination of the capture and the captive maintenance of marine mammals in Canada., Report to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, 31 March 1999, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, Ont.

Lien, J., Dunn, M. (2000) Troubled waters: An assessment of the status of Canada's coastal and marine habitat., Report to Wildlife Habitat Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Malcolm, C., Lochbaum, E. (1999) Human/Marine Mammal Interaction Workshop Proceedings., University of Victoria, April 13-15, 1999, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Nanaimo, B.C.

Malme, C.I., Wursig, B., Bird, J.E., Tyack, P. (1988) Observations of feeding gray whales responses to controlled industrial noise exposure., Pp. 55-73 in Sackinger, M., Jeffries, M.O. (eds.) Port and ocean engineering under Arctic conditions. Vol. II, Symposium on noise and marine mammals. The Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Mayo, C.A., Marx, M.K. (1990) Surface foraging behaviour of the North Atlantic right whale, *Eubalaena glacialis*, and associated zooplankton characteristics., Canadian Journal of Zoology, 68, 2214-1110.

McAlpine, D.F., Heward, A.D.B., Murison, L.D. (1994) Right whale in New Brunswick., Natural History Series no. 13, New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.

McCauley, R.D., Cato, D.H., Jefferey, A.F. (1996) A study of the impacts of vessel noise on humpback whales in Hervey Bay., Report prepared for the Queensland Department of Environment and Heritage. Maryborough Branch, Qld.

McLeod, P.J. (1981) Recent mass strandings of the long-finned pilot whale, *Globicephala melaena*, Trail, in Newfoundland., CAFSAC Marine Mammal Subcommittee, 14-16 April 1961, CAFSAC 81/100.

McLeod, P.J. (1982) Vocalizations of the pilot whale (*Globicephala melaena*, Traill)., M.Sc. thesis, Queen Elizabeth II Library, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Nfld.

Meredith, G.N., Campbell, R.R. (1988) Status of the Fin Whale, *Balaenoptera physalus*, in Canada., The Canadian Field-Naturalist 102 (1) 351-368.

Michaud, R., Giard, J. (1997) Les rorquals communs et les activites d'observation en mer dans l'estuaire du Saint-Laurent entre 1994 et 1996: Etude de l'utilisation du territoire et evaluation de l'exposition aux activites d'observation a l'aide de la telemetrie VHG., Rapport final, GREMM, Tadoussac, Que.

Michaud, R., Giard, J. (1998) Les rorquals communs et les activites d'observation en mer dans l'estuaire maritime du Saint-Laurent entre 1994 et 1996: Evaluation de l'impact des activites d'observation en mer sur le comportement des roquals communs., Rapport final, GREMM, Tadoussac, Que.

Michaud, R., Giard, J. (2000) VHF tracking of fin whales provides scientific grounds for the management of whale watching in the St. Lawrence Estuary., Unpublished Ms., Draft of paper was presented at the Monaco Marine Mammal Biennial.

Mitchell, E.D., Ghanime, L. (1982) Whale-vessel interactions in the Gulf of St. Lawrence., In Contract Report to DFO, Andre Marson and Associates, Montreal, Que.

Murison, L.D., Gaskin, D.E. (1989) The distribution of right whales and zooplankton in the Bay of Fundy, Canada., *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 67, 1411-1420.

Nelson, D., Lien, J. (1996) The status of the Long-finned pilot whale, *Globicephala melas*, in Canada., *The Canadian Field-Naturalist* 110 (3) 511-524.

Norse, E.A. (1993) *Global Marine Biological Diversity: A strategy for building conservation into decision making.*, Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Osborne, R.W. (1988) Whale watching and killer whale occurrence in Greater Puget Sound., p. 11 in *Proceedings of the Workshop to Review and Evaluate Whale Watching Programs and Management Needs*. 14-16 Nov. 1988, Monterey, Calif., Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.

Osborne, R.W., Koski, K.L., Tallmon, R.E., Harrington, S. (1999) Soundwatch 1999 interim report. Unpublished Ms.

Parks Canada (2000) Report on the Ecological Integrity of Canada's National Parks., Available at <http://www.parkscanada.gc.ca>.

Pauley, D., Christensen, V., Dalsgaard, J., Froese, R. Torres, F. (1998) Fishing down marine food webs., *Science*, 279, 880-863.

Reeves, R.R., Mitchell, E. (1988) Current status of the gray whale, *Eschrichtius robustus*., *The Canadian Field-Naturalist* 102 (1) 369-390.

Richard, P.R. (1993) Status of beluga, *Delphinapterus leucas*, in western and southern Hudson Bay., *The Canadian Field-Naturalist* 107 (4) 534-532.

Richardson, W.J., Greene, C.R., Malme, C.I., Thomson, D.H. (1995) *Marine mammals and noise.*, Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.

Salden, D.R. (1988) Humpback whale encounter rates offshore of Maui, Hawaii., *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 52 (2) 301-304.

Scheifle, P.M., Michaud, R., Beland, P., Babb, I.G. (1997) Evaluation des niveaux de bruit ambiants et de source anthropogénique dans l'habitat du beluga du Saint-Laurent et leur impacts potentiels., Parks Canada, Tadoussac, Que.

Schilling, M.R., Wienrich, M.T., Ledder, J. (1989) Reaction of humpback whales to vessel approaches in New England waters., *Abstracts of the 8<sup>th</sup> Biennial*

Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, Pacific Grove, Calif., 60, (abstract only).

Scott, M.D., Perryman, W.L. (1998) Using aerial photogrammetry to study dolphin school structure., pp 227-244 in Pryor, K., Norris, K.S. (eds.), Dolphin societies discoveries and puzzles. University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif.

Sears, R., Wenzel, F.W., Williamson, J.M. (1987) The blue whale: a catalogue of individuals from the western North Atlantic (Gulf of St. Lawrence)., Mingan Islands Cetacean Study, St. Lambert, Que.

Sergeant, D.E. (1962) The biology of the pilot or pothead whale *Globicephala melaena* (Trail) in Newfoundland waters., Bulletin of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, 132, 1-84.

Sjare, B.L, Smith, T.G. (1986) The relationship between behavioural activity and underwater vocalizations of the white whale, *Delphinapterus leucas*., Canadian Journal of Zoology, 64 (12) 2824-2831.

Stone, G.S., Katona, S.K., Mainwaring, A., Allen, J.M., Corbett, H.D. (1992) Respiration rates and surfacing rates of fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*) observed from a lighthouse tower., Reports of the International Whaling Commission, 42, 739-745.

St. Lawrence Beluga Recovery Committee (SLBRC) (1998) Implementation of the St. Lawrence Beluga Recovery Plan: 1996-1997., Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Maruice Lamontagne Institute, Mont-Joli, Que.

Stewart, B.S., Leatherwood, S (1985) Minke whale – *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*., pp 91-136 in Ridgway, S.H., Harrison, R. (eds.) Handbook of Marine Mammals vol. 3 The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, San Diego.

Tilt, W.C. (1986) Whale watching in California: An industry profile., M.Sc. thesis, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Todd, S., Stevick, P., Lien, J., Marques, F., Ketten, D. (1996) Behavioural effects of exposure to underwater explosions in humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)., Canadian Journal of Zoology 74, 1661 – 1672.

Tyack, P. (1988) Avoidance characteristics of bowhead whales and migrating gray whales., p.14 in Proceedings of the Workshop to Review and Evaluate Whale Watching Programs and Management Needs., 14-16 Nov. 1988, Monterey, Calif., Center for Marine Conservation, Washington, D.C.

Watkins, W.A., Wartzok, D. (1985) Sensory biophysics of marine mammals., *Marine Mammal Science* 1, 219 – 260.

Watkins, W.A. (1986) Whale reactions to human activities in Cape Cod waters., *Marine Mammal Science* 2, 251 - 262.

Weilgart, L. (1984) Vocalizations of the North Atlantic pilot whale (*Globicephalas melaena*) as related to behavioral and environmental contexts., M.Sc. thesis, Queen Elizabeth II Library, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Nfld.

Weir, J. (2000) The management of dolphin ecotourism in Victoria., Dolphin Research Institute, Frankston, Vic., Australia.

Wells, R.S., Scott, M.D. (1997) Seasonal incidence of boat strikes on bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida., *Marine Mammal Science* 13 (3) 475-480.

Wells, R.S. (1998) The role of long-term study in understanding the social structure of a bottlenose dolphin community., pp. 199-226 in Pryor, K, Norris, K.S. (eds.) *Dolphin societies discoveries and puzzles.*, University of California Press, Berkely, Calif.

Wenzel, R., Mattila, D.K., Clapham, P.J. (1988) *Balaenoptera musculus* in the Gulf of Maine., *Marine Mammal Science* 4 (2) 172-175.

Whitehead, H., Moore, M.J. (1982) Distribution and movements of West Indian humpback whales in winter., *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 60 (9) 2203-2211.

Whitehead, H. (1987) Updated status of the Humpback Whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in Canada., *The Canadian Field-Naturalist* 101 (2) 284-294.

Wolman, A.A. (1985) Gray whale *Eschrichtius robustus* (Lilljeborg, 1861)., Pp 67-90 in Ridgway, S.H., Harrison, R., *Handbook of Marine Mammals. Vol. 3: The Sirenians and Baleen whales.* Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.

Yochem, P.K., Leatherwood, S. (1985) Blue whale *Balaenoptera musculus* (Linnaeus, 1758)., Pp 193-240 in Ridgway, S.H., Harrison, R. (eds.) *Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 3: The Sirenians and Baleen Whales,* Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.

### **Personal Communications:**

Christine Erbe, Institute of Ocean Sciences, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Sidney, B.C., Canada.

Carol Scarpaci, 41 Saratoga Crescent, Keilor Downs, Victoria, Australia.

Wendy Szaniszlo, Dept. of Geography, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

Ed. Lochbaum, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Nainaimo, British Columbia, Canada.

Chris Malcolm, Dept. of Geography, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

Roxanne Candelaria-Ley, Marine Acoustics laboratory, Texas A&M University, Galveston, Texas, U.S.A.

Dave Duffus, Dept. of Geography, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

David Mattila, Centre for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, Mass., U.S.A.

Erika Schaub, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

Lars Bejder, Biology Department, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S., Canada

Catherine Hood, Biopsychology Programme, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

Claudio Corbelli, Dept. of Biology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

Bob Bowman, Centre for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, Mass., U.S.A.

Cheri Recchi, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville, Qld., Australia.

Nichollete Brown, School of Biological Sciences, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Naomi Rose, The Humane Society of the United States, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Myriam Bourgeois, Ministere des Peches et des Oceans, Institut Maruice-Lamontagne, Mont-Joli, Que., Canada.

Janet Russell, Biopsychology Programme, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

Jeremy Geels, Au Sable Institute, Whidbey Island, Wash., U.S.A.

Bob Bowman, Centre for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, Mass., U.S.A.

Jooke Robbins, Centre for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, Mass., U.S.A.

Sean Todd, Allied Whale, College of the Atlantic, Bar Harbour, Maine, U.S.A.

Dave Snow, Wildlands Tours, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

Wil Burns, Journal of International Wildlife Law and Policy, Burlingame, Calif., U.S.A.

Jeff Weir, Dolphin Research Institute, Frankston, Victoria, Australia

Nadia Menard, Saguenay-St. Lawrence Marine Park, Parks Canada, Tadoussac, Que., Canada

Christoph Richter, Marine Studies Centre, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Bill Rossiter, Cetacean Society International, Georgetown, Conn., U.S.A.

Cathy Kinsman, The Whale Stewardship Project, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Richard Sears, Mingan Island Cetacean Study (MICS), St. Lambert, Que., Canada.

Moira Brown, Centre for Coastal Studies, Provincetown, Mass., U.S.A.

Graeme Ellis, Pacific Biological Station, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Nanaimo, B.C., Canada.

Paul Forestell, Social Sciences Division, Southampton College, Southampton, N.Y., U.S.A.

A.T. Potter, Oceans Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Dartmouth, N.S., Canada.

Diane Borggaard, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Miami, Florida, U.S.A.

Louise Daly, Natural Areas Division, Dept. of Tourism, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

Pat Hall, Freshwater Institute, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

Gerry Conway, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Halifax, Nova Scotia,  
Canada.