University of Reading

Population change of Common Buzzards Buteo buteo in central southern England between 2011 and 2016

Article

Accepted Version

Stevens, M., Murn, C. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4064-6060 and Hennessey, R. (2019) Population change of Common Buzzards Buteo buteo in central southern England between 2011 and 2016. Bird Study, 66 (3). pp. 378-389. ISSN 1944-6705 doi: 10.1080/00063657.2019.1693960 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/87715/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.
Published version at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2019.1693960
To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2019.1693960

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

University of Reading

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Population change of Common Buzzards Buteo buteo in central southern England between 2011 and 2016

Journal:	*Bird Study/Ringing & Migration*
Manuscript ID	BS-2019-014.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Stevens, Matt; Hawk Conservancy Trust, Conservation & Research Murn, Campbell; Hawk Conservancy Trust, Conservation & Research Hennessey, Richard; Hawk Conservancy Trust, Conservation & Research
Keywords:	multiple covariates distance sampling, raptor, Population

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Population change of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo* in central southern England between 2011 and 2016

Matthew Stevens*, Campbell Murn and Richard Hennessey

Conservation and Research Department, Hawk Conservancy Trust, Andover, Hampshire, UK.

Population change of Buzzards

Keywords: multiple covariates distance sampling, raptor, population

*Corresponding author: matt@hawkconservancy.org

For Peer Review

Abstract

Capsule: Distance sampling identified an increase in estimated population size of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo* in central southern England between 2011-16 of more than 50% . The rate of population growth slowed in later years.

Aims: To assess the utility of a targeted distance sampling protocol to derive seasonal and annual population estimates for Common Buzzards across an area of southern England.

Methods: We used a line transect survey methodology and multiple covariate distance sampling to assess population density and abundance of Common Buzzards in spring and autumn between 2011and 2016 across a 2600km^2 area of central southern England.

Results: Estimated population size increased by more than 50%, from ca. 2900 to 4500 individuals, across the period in a trend similar to that shown by Breeding Bird Survey (BBS) data.

Discussion: A slowing of the growth in population size of Common Buzzards in central southern England suggests that the species may be approaching carrying capacity in this area. These results also suggest that currently employed broad scale survey methodologies adequately reflect the general population trends for this species. Our data provide the first published estimates of the Common Buzzard population in central southern England derived from direct empirical assessment.

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Introduction

Identifying the population size of a species is a key step in developing and implementing an effective conservation strategy (Soulé 1987, Frankham 1995). Unfortunately, determining population size can be difficult and expensive. Difficulties can arise due to particular behaviours of the study species (e.g. mobility, shyness, crypsis, nocturnality), scarcity or its occupancy of habitats where access or movement is difficult etc. (Anderson *et al.* 2015). Also, the spatial scale required to produce meaningful estimates influences survey effort, the level of sampling and cost. To improve efficiency in data collection many broad-scale studies use multi-species surveys or monitoring programmes utilising volunteer fieldworkers (see e.g. Riseley *et al* 2008, Jiguet 2009). There are consequences to these approaches, however, and analyses must consider the effects of surveying for more than one species at a time (e.g. reduced effort per species, heterogeneity in species detectability (Johnston *et al*. 2014) and potential difficulties generating sufficient observations of rarer species (but see Sanderlin *et al*.2014)) and the variation in skills and intrinsic differences between volunteer observers (e.g. in hearing, visual acuity, level of concentration, stamina, image-processing, tiredness; e.g. Link *et al.* 1994, Peterjohn *et al.* 1995, Jiguet 2009, Eglington *et al.* 2010).

Species abundance and density estimates are now often generated using a distance sampling methodology. This technique uses the recorded distances of objects of interest to randomly-placed survey routes or points to estimate animal density or abundance (Buckland *et al.* 2001). A key assumption of this method is that all objects at zero distance ($g(0)$) are detected and that probability of detection decreases with increasing distance from the route or point. Accurate measurement of these distances is also assumed, however, it is often necessary to simplify survey methodologies (e.g. by using a small number of distance bands rather than accurate measurement) to encourage participation and adherence to protocols (Newson *et al.* 2008, Quesada *et al.* 2010). There is a trade-off between the quality of the estimate and simplicity of the method (Rabe *et al.* 2002) and simplification will result in detection functions that are less robust (Johnston *et al.* 2014), reduces

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

61 estimated detectability (Stanbury & Gregory 2009) and decreases the precision of derived estimates
62 (Stanbury & Gregory 2009, Ekblom 2010).
63
64 Estimates of population size for bird species in the UK tend to focus on breeding populations. These
65 estimates are usually derived from indices of relative abundance generated as part of the Breeding
66 Bird Survey (BBS) (e.g. Newson *et al.* 2008, Riseley *et al.* 2008, Musgrove *et al.* 2013). Although
67 useful for many species, the use of the breeding pair as the unit of interest is less appropriate for
68 certain species and will underestimate population size (Newson *et al.* 2008). This is particularly true
69 for many raptor species where individuals do not breed until into their third year (Davis & Davis
70 1992) and where a significant proportion of the adult population is not breeding in any one year
71 (Newton 1979, Hunt 1998, Kenward *et al.* 1999, 2001), as is the case with the Common Buzzard
72 (*Buteo buteo*, hereafter 'Buzzard'). Accurate estimation of population size is therefore necessary if
73 the aim of monitoring is to provide an objective assessment of population trends – particularly
74 where species may be increasing or decreasing. Using methodologies suitable for certain species
75 groups to produce population estimates may then provide a means of periodically validating or
76 calibrating indices that are applied more widely.
77
78 The Buzzard was lost from many parts of its range in Britain due to the combined effects of
79 widespread persecution in the 19th century, a crash in preferred prey populations (Rabbit,
80 *Oryctolagus cuniculus*) in the 1950s and the effects of organochlorine pesticides in the 1960s and
81 1970s (Sim *et al*. 2000). Until the 1980s Buzzards in Britain were confined to Scotland, Wales and
82 Western England. Since then, the enactment of improved wildlife conservation legislation (e.g.
83 banning of organochlorine pesticides and comprehensive legal protection) and increasing public
84 awareness have led to a significant increase in the species' population size and range. Most recent
85 assessments indicate that the species has now recolonised many of the areas of the UK from which it
86 had been lost (Clements 2002, Musgrove *et al.* 2013).

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

The primary objective of this study was to use a distance sampling methodology to produce local and regional population estimates of Buzzards in central Southern England. We also draw comparisons with population estimates derived using other methodologies and discuss the utility of our approach for determining population sizes of Buzzards and other conspicuous diurnal raptor species on a larger scale.

Methods

Study area and fieldwork

The study was conducted between September 2011 and June 2016 across two areas (designated 'East' and 'West') covering ca. 2600km^2 of central southern England in Hampshire, Wiltshire, Surrey and West Sussex (centred on 1^o 18'W and 51^o 13'N – see Fig. 1). Land use within the study area is primarily mixed farming (arable and grassland) with scattered small woodlands; although the extent of woodland is higher in the East (26687ha) than West (17634ha). The study area contains ten urban areas of which five have human populations exceeding 40000 (Nomis 2016).

We used a line transect combined with distance sampling methodology (Buckland *et al.* 2001, 2004) to determine the population size and density of Buzzards. Each transect was a circuit based on a square with each side measuring 3km. Even coverage of the study area was achieved by dividing the East and West sections into 24 smaller blocks and using a random number generator to identify a grid reference and start point for transects within each of these blocks. An idealised transect route (ITR) at this location was then identified using a 3km x 3km square overlay. Negotiating access across such a large area of private land was impractical and so transects made use of public rights of way and open access land, the ITR serving as a point of spatial reference to facilitate the identification of a circuit of appropriate length through the selected area. Transects followed the ITR

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

as closely as possible. Where deviations were necessary, alternative routes prioritised open access land and other rights of way types before roads in an effort to reduce bias associated with following obvious linear landscape features (surfaced roads, field edges, fences and hedgerows; Ortega & Capen 2002, Marques *at* al. 2009). Edge effects were minimised by including all randomised start locations even when these resulted in the transect breaching the study area boundary. In these cases, only the lengths of transect within the study area were included in analyses.

Surveys were performed in ten transect periods, two each year, between Sep-Dec ('autumn') 2011 and Feb-May ('spring') 2016. Two seasonal transect periods were used to enable assessment of expected fluctuations in density associated with post-breeding abundance and overwinter mortality. Transects started between 08.30 and 10.00 from a randomised start point and took 3-7 hours to complete. The direction (anti- or clockwise) of travel was also randomised. Each transect was performed by one of two fieldworkers (MS or RH). Transects were walked only on days with no rain, good visibility and when wind strength was no greater than Beaufort force four.

All birds observed during the walked transects were recorded. When groups of birds were encountered, the number of individuals was noted. For each observation, observer location was recorded using Garmin 60 Csx GPS units and horizontal distance and bearing to each bird (or to the centre point of groups; Buckland *et al.* 2001) from the observer using Swarovski Laser Guide 8x30 or Nikon Forester 550 laser rangefinders and Silva compasses. Where a bird in flight had obviously been disturbed from a perch by the fieldworker just prior to detection, measurement of distance was taken from the fieldworker location to the original perch. Bird behaviour, situation (i.e. flying, perched or on the ground), habitat, time of observation and weather conditions were also recorded for each observation. To minimise double-counting, fieldworkers noted, where possible, the plumage morph of all birds (following Glutz von Blotzheim *et al.* (1971)), specific aspects of plumage (e.g. bright tail, prominent breast patches etc.) and location of obvious moult (in remiges or

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

rectrices). Where there was still uncertainty regarding the status of an individual, the observer noted their confidence in the observation being new on a percentage scale where '0' indicated a certainty that the individual had already been recorded, and '100' where it had not. Bird movement and relative timings and location of previous observations were used to inform this assessment. This enabled later exclusion of observations from analyses, based on confidence. We adopted a conservative approach to inclusion of data, retaining only those where confidence exceeded 70%.

Where the ability of a fieldworker to detect birds was compromised by visibility from the transect route (e.g. obstruction by surrounding vegetation), the observer moved a short distance away from the transect to obtain a clearer view before returning and continuing along the route. Although the fieldworker followed a map of the transect route it is unlikely that they will have been standing exactly on the transect line (i.e. at $g(0)$ – zero distance from the line) at the time of making any observation. The perpendicular distance of the fieldworker from the transect route at the time of each observation was determined using the GPS locations viewed in GIS. These 'offsets' were then used to correct the calculated distances of the observations to the transect line through either addition or subtraction of the offset (depending on the relative positions of the observer and bird to the transect route). All GPS locations obtained using WGS-84 were transformed to British National Grid using the Ordnance Survey 'OSTN02' transformation in ArcGIS (ESRI 2011).

The restriction of transect routes to public rights of way and open access areas may have resulted in the violation of the distance sampling assumption that all areas have equal probability of being sampled. We determined the extent of entire study area unavailable for surveying using the 'Buffer' function in ArcGIS (ESRI 2011). In this we produced a survey strip corresponding to the maximum operational distance of the rangefinder (700m) on each side of all rights of way and open access areas and deducted the extent of study area not covered by these strips (5.8km^2) from the total size of the study area in all subsequent distance analyses.

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

To investigate the possible role of roads and roadside areas in attracting birds, we also compared the distribution of distances of 5000 randomly-generated points with that of our observations. Points were generated using the random number generator *runif()* function in R (R Core Team 2016) to produce pairs of latitude and longitude. These points were then plotted and their distances from the nearest road determined using the *Near* function in ArcGIS. The distributions of these 'distance-to-roads' measurements were compared using two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests.

Density estimation

Population size and density estimates were derived using both the Conventional Distance Sampling (CDS) and Multiple Covariates Distance Sampling (MCDS) engines within program Distance 7.0 (Thomas *et al.* 2010). Distance analysis here follows the guidelines provided for that software and in the associated literature by Buckland *et al.* (2001, 2004).

Five covariates (Table 1) were included in the MCDS modelling process on the basis that each was assumed *a priori* to influence the ability to detect birds through a biological or methodological effect (Burnham 1981, Thompson 2002, Diefenbach *et al.* 2003). A two-level factor covariate (OBS) was included to account for the likely variation in ability of fieldworkers to detect birds. Area of woodland at the point of observation (WDS) is also likely to impact detection distance due to an inverse relationship with range of view (i.e. the maximum range of vision). Values for this covariate were determined from the CEH Land Cover Map 2007 (Morton *et al.* 2014) by measuring the area of woodland within a 250m radius of the point of observation using ArcGIS 10.2 (ESRI 2011). STRATA was included as a covariate in order to account for potential differences in topography or habitat quality between the two sections of the study area, since this may result in differential detection distances. Bird activity and behaviour, and thus detectability, will vary throughout the day (e.g.

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

191 Kendall 2014, Öberg *et al.* 2015). Here, TIME was defined as the number of minutes after sunrise for
192 each observation. Lastly, the situation of the bird, i.e. whether on the ground, perched or in flight,
193 was included as a factorial covariate, LOC. The inclusion of flying birds in distance sampling can
194 present a number of problems, primarily due to violation of the assumption of uniform distances
195 through responsive movement, and double-counting (see Fewster *et al.* 2008, Anderson *et al.* 2015).
196 Where this occurs, estimates will tend to be overestimated (Buckland *et al.* 2001). Although
197 exclusion of flying birds from analyses is possible, this approach is best used for species in which only
198 a small proportion of the population will be in flight at any one time (Buckland *et* al. 2008). This is
199 clearly not the case for many soaring raptor species and exclusion of such data was not appropriate.
200 Instead, we adopted a 'look-ahead' approach to improve the likelihood of birds being recorded
201 before they responded to the presence of the fieldworker (Burnham *et al.* 1980, Anderson *et al.*
202 2015).
203
204 Relationships between covariates and the ability to detect birds were explored prior to modelling,
205 although failure to detect any effect here did not prevent inclusion in model assessments. Factor
206 covariates were tested against perpendicular distance using either Welch's t-tests or ANOVA.
207 Exploration of the potential relationship between continuous, non-factor covariates and distance
208 was performed using Pearson's *r* and regression.
209
210 Models with uniform, half-normal and hazard-rate key functions were fitted to the data. Automatic
211 addition of adjustment terms was enabled for analyses using CDS. For the MCDS engine, however,
212 this was restricted to a maximum of two cosine, simple polynomial or hermite polynomial
213 adjustment terms. Model fit was assessed with reference to cosine-weighted Cramér-von Mises and
214 Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. Data were truncated at 550m to remove a lengthy tail and all models
215 incorporating adjustment terms were scaled by the truncation distance.
216

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Overloading of the MCDS engine with covariates is more likely to result in failure of the algorithm to converge (Thomas *et al.* 2010). To counter this, we follow the guidelines of Thomas *et al.* (2010) who advocate the forward stepwise addition of individual covariates, retaining those which contribute to reducing Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC). AIC was used to select between models (Burnham & Anderson 2002).

All statistical analyses, other than distance sampling, were performed using R version 3.3.1.

Results

4490km of surveys were completed during the 10 transect periods (Table 2). Coverage was higher in the eastern section of the study area with 2295km of surveys walked on 151 transects compared with 2194km on 145 transects in the western section. The average duration of each transect was 371 minutes (365 in Spring vs 377 in Autumn).

4274 observations of 5174 individuals were made during the study. Birds were seen in groups of up to 32 individuals, however, 85% of observations were of single birds (mean group size = 1.2 ± 0.75). 63% of observations were of birds in flight (cf. 37% perched or on the ground). Of these, 62% were birds which were soaring, hovering or interacting with other species, rather than in obvious directional transit movements.

There was no difference between the distributions of number of observations and the number of transects walked (and therefore, transect length) for each season (autumn X^2 (4) = 3.08, p = 0.55; spring (X^2 (4) = 1.75, p = 0.78) indicating that more observations were made when more transects were walked. Significantly more individuals were seen during spring surveys than in autumn (X^2 (3) = 160.25, p <0.001) despite the total length of surveys undertaken being similar.

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

Histograms of the distribution of perpendicular distances indicated detection on and close to the transect line remained at or near 100% in all survey periods. Median detection distance across all data was 178m. Truncation of data above 550m resulted in the loss of 2.8% of observations (99 observations of 143 individuals) but left more than 330 observations per period; comfortably above the threshold of 60-70 generally recommended for modelling using Distance (Buckland *et al.* 2001). Sufficient data were available to enable the modelling of separate detection functions, and the inclusion of different covariates, for each period.

55% of the total length of transects was walked along roads. 28% of all observations involved Buzzards within 100m of any road and only 11% were of birds within 100m of the same road as that from which the observation was made. There was no indication of a bias in observation of birds near to roads when comparing the distribution of distances with that of 5000 random locations (two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov, *D*- <0.001, $p = 0.99$; Buzzard median – 264m, Random median – 158m). 36% of the random locations were within 100m of a road compared with 21% of Buzzard locations

Exploratory analyses of covariates

The distance at which birds were detected reduced as the extent of woodland at the point of observation increased. This effect was negative across the entire dataset ($r = -0.166$, $t_{4157} = -10.8$, $p < 0.001$) and in all survey periods ($p < 0.002$) except spring 2013 ($r = -0.079$, $t_{363} = -1.51$, $p = 0.13$).

None of the remaining covariates showed any consistent relationship with detection distance. Mean detection distances were similar between both sections of the study area and varied significantly only in 2012 (spring, $t_{474.13} = -3.5$, $p <0.001$, mean East – 178.9m, West – 207.7m; autumn, $t_{255.2} = -$

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

2.06, p = 0.04, mean East – 179.2m, West – 214.2m). The situation of birds (i.e. whether on the ground, perched or in flight) had no significant influence on detection distance (ANOVA $F_{2,4156}$ = 2.42, p =0.09, Tukey test, p > 0.15). Observer effects on detection distances were identified in one of the four survey periods where data were collected by more than one fieldworker (spring 2013, t_{139} = 3.67, p <0.001, mean MS – 208m, RH – 148m). Although timing of an observation had a bearing on detection distance in two periods (autumn 2012, $F_{1,402}$ = 4.91, p = 0.027; and spring 2015, $F_{1,307}$ = 5.99, p = 0.015), there was no significant effect during the other eight periods.

Model fitting

MCDS models having reasonable fit (i.e. with Cramér von Mises and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests p > 0.3) were developed for all periods (Table 3) except periods 5-7. Although statistics assessing model fit for these periods produced p> 0.1, their detection functions and quantile-quantile plots indicated that more birds than expected were observed close to the transect route. As model fit was reasonable in these periods, we still present the outputs from these but emphasise their being on the margins of acceptability. CDS models were preferred in period 7 (p >0.5), however, the model with lowest AIC (Half-normal + three cosine adjustments) showed signs of over-fitting and issues in maintaining monotonicity. A model using CDS with a Uniform key function is preferred for this period. Among the MCDS models, TIME, WDS/WDD and STRATA had the greatest effect on AIC, and appeared in the majority of preferred models for each survey period.

Population estimates

Population size and density estimates increased throughout the course of study and were 0.6 birds km^{-2} higher by 2016 than at the start of the study. Our analyses suggest an increase in estimated population size of 56%, from 2883 individuals in 2011 to 4485 in 2016 (Table 4). The average annual

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

rate of increase across the four-and-a-half years of the study was 12.5% but this slowed in successive years (from 15% to 1% in autumn and 43% to -1% in spring; Figure 2).

More birds were seen in spring surveys (1.31km^{-1}) than preceding autumn periods (1.0 bird km^{-1}) even though total lengths of transects walked were shorter in spring for all periods except autumn 2012-spring 2013. Estimated density was also consistently higher for surveys performed during the spring (Table 4; means: spring – 1.59 autumn – 1.44).

Discussion

Population density estimates

We used a distance sampling-based methodology to estimate the population density of a conspicuous diurnal raptor species within an area of central southern England. These estimates indicate that the Buzzard population increased by more than 50% over the course of the study (Figure 2). In contrast, Buzzard populations in the adjacent SW region have shown a comparatively modest rate of increase since 1995 (+13% - Harris *et al*. 2017). Differences in the rate of population change between these two regions may be a function of there being a higher number of available potential territories in regions neighbouring the SW population and the consequent dispersal of individuals from higher to lower density areas (Walls & Kenward 1998).

The reduced rate of population growth during the last three survey periods mirrors estimates derived from BBS data for the SE region (www.bto.org/bbs) which, although showing an overall increase of 1104% since 1995, indicate a slowing of population growth to a point of a slight decline (-2%) between 2016-17. The reasons for this are unclear, especially since rates of breeding success for Buzzards have increased across the UK during these years (Woodward *et al.* 2018) – although

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

regional differences will be masked in these national estimates. Nevertheless, a number of factors may be operating to limit population growth, including: the ongoing impacts of viral haemorrhagic disease (VHD) on UK rabbit populations (Harris *et al.* 2019), the abundance of which has been shown to influence breeding productivity and population increase in Buzzards in the UK (Graham *et al.*1995; Swann & Etheridge 1995); the continued impacts of secondary poisoning by rodenticides (e.g. Christensen *et al*. 2012) and ingestion of lead in spent ammunition (Pain *et al.* 2009); and a potential increase in persecution in response to the perceived predation pressures on game bird populations from increasing Buzzard abundance.

Despite the observed declines between 2016-17 in this study and BBS, continued population growth in areas of the SE region which lie to the north and east of the study area still appears likely since they will have been recolonised later and will be further from reaching carrying capacity; a situation highlighted by Harris *et al.* (2014). In addition, now that the scale of human-induced population constraints appears to have substantially reduced, carrying capacities are likely to have increased and be governed mostly by the availability and suitability of food and breeding habitat. In southern England, there is likely to be a proportionally greater extent of suitable breeding habitat in the SE region compared to the historical strongholds in the SW since the landscape is more heavily wooded (Forestry Commission 2016). As a result, continued population growth in this region is likely for the foreseeable future.

Atlas data (Balmer *et al.* 2013) show the Buzzard to be uniformly distributed across all 10x10km squares of SE England and from more than 85% of all 2km x 2km tetrads covered by atlas fieldwork (2007-2012) in the SE region. Assuming that habitat quality and availability within our study area is representative of that throughout the remainder of the SE region, then our density estimates indicate a population size of 27500-32500 individuals in SE England. Translation of this figure into an estimate of the breeding population is difficult, since a significant proportion of Buzzards will not

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

make a nesting attempt each year, either due to immaturity, lack of status and inability to find a mate or hold a territory (Davis & Davis 1992, Kenward *et al*. 2000). Using the estimate suggested by Kenward *et al.* (2000) of only one in four individuals breeding each year, results in an estimate of between 3440-4125 pairs in SE England. This represents a breeding density of 18-22 pairs per 100km^2, similar to that found by Sim *et al.* (2001) in one of their West Midlands study areas. This is still lower than the 41 pairs 100km^{-2} recorded by Newton *et al.* (1982) across a large area in mid-Wales, and substantially lower than the densities (78 pairs 100km^{-2}) recorded in ideal wooded habitat in central Europe (Melde 1956, Thiollay 1967). Since the coarse regional population estimate presented here is an extrapolation from our derived estimates, any variation in the quality of those landscape characteristics representing suitability for Buzzards (e.g. food and prey density, disturbance, persecution, habitat structure and mosaic etc.) will influence its validity.

Alongside the estimates of overall abundance within the study area, our study provides an interesting comparison of the apparent abundance of Buzzards between autumn and spring periods. Several studies have determined that juvenile Buzzards tend to remain within their natal territory for the first few months after fledging (Davis & Davis 1992, Walls *et al.* 1999) and that most do not disperse more than 50km from the natal site in their first year (Walls & Kenward 1998). This is particularly the case in landscapes with a significant arable component (Walls *et al.* 1999) where Buzzards often exploit the easy foraging for invertebrates provided by ploughed fields (Dare 1957). As a result, there is unlikely to have been any significant loss of first year birds from the study area in the autumn, and in fact we expected higher densities for surveys in this period. The potential impacts of overwinter and courtship mortality (Tubbs 1974, Simpson 1993) would theoretically compound this expected difference in seasonal abundance. That this is not the case may reflect more on seasonal variation in bird behaviour, and its influence on detectability, than demographics. Increased time spent soaring and in display behaviours in spring resulted in improved detectability during spring surveys. The supplementation of the autumn population by juveniles will also have

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

372 been offset by dispersal (Walls & Kenward 1995) and high rates of mortality for Buzzards in the four
373 months after fledging (Kenward *et al.* 2001).
374
375 ***Methodological assessment***
376 We encountered few obvious methodological issues with the study. Poor model fit using the MCDS
377 engine for the autumn 2014 was most likely the result of higher than expected numbers of birds
378 recorded between 275-325m in this survey period. This problem was not identified in other periods
379 suggesting that it is unlikely to represent any significant issue with survey design. Similarly, the issue
380 of poor precision was limited to one survey period and stems from reduced coverage; the level of
381 effort being lowest in this period (Table 2).
382
383 The covariates most frequently included within preferred models (WDS, STRATA and TIME) indicate
384 that woodland cover was the most important factor affecting Buzzard detectability. Increasing
385 density of woodland reduces the view of surrounding habitats leading to birds generally being
386 detected at shorter distances than in more open habitats. This effect is also likely to account for the
387 inclusion of STRATA in many preferred models since a greater proportion of the landscape area was
388 woodland (and, therefore, a higher proportion of surveys performed through woodlands) in the
389 eastern section of the study area. Lastly, the inclusion of TIME is likely to relate to the behaviour of
390 birds at differing times of the day e.g. birds perched during cooler periods (during morning) and
391 soaring in warmer periods (from late morning onwards). The level and type of activity of birds will
392 have an obvious impact on detection distance. Daily variation in temperature and weather
393 conditions will make this a complicated relationship which is unlikely to be detected by these
394 analyses.
395
396 Transects running through dense woodland may result in undetected responsive movements of
397 birds which may, in turn, lead to incorrect distance measurement or incomplete detection at $g(0)$. In

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

such habitats Buzzards were almost always heard to call prior to, or immediately after, taking flight when disturbed by a fieldworker. Use of such cues to identify original locations for measurement should have reduced the number of undetected responsive movements along transects performed in these habitats.

The use of public rights of way and roads for this study will have resulted in some sections of transect necessarily following linear landscape features such as hedgerows, fences and runs of power lines and poles. These features can influence the distribution of raptors such as Buzzards through their impact on the abundance of preferred prey items (e.g. Adams & Geiss 1983, Meunier *et al.* 2000) or carrion (Lambertucci *et al.* 2009, Lees *et al.* 2013), the ways in which they can improve hunting efficiency (e.g. Beckmann & Shine 2011) or how they permit the adoption of less energy-demanding hunting strategies (Meunier *et al.* 2000). Failure to place transects randomly across a study area (e.g. by following linear landscape features) can lead to biases arising from the association and preferences for certain habitats or landscape features. This will effectively remove the validity of extrapolating sample statistics to the population of interest (Buckland *et al.* 2001). Despite this, and the potential effects listed above, we found no evidence for the attraction of Buzzards to roads in our data. Whether the inclusion of roadside transect data has a significant influence on the derived density estimates is open to question.

Although we adopted a number of strategies to reduce double counting, the duration of each transect (mean - 371 minutes) means that there was ample opportunity for birds to move across the study area. This is likely to have resulted in the double-counting of a small number of individuals and possible positive bias to our estimates. Similarly, the inclusion of flying birds may also have affected our results. Buckland *et al.* (2001) suggest that independent movement of birds can be accommodated they must, 'on average', be moving at less than half the speed of the observer if they are not to introduce a positive bias to the results. 24% of the observations here were of birds

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

For Peer Review

424 engaged in purposeful, directional flight. Since neither the destination of flying birds nor their
425 duration of flight was recorded here, it is not possible to determine whether the average speed of
426 these individuals was less than half that of the observer. Whether the inclusion of these
427 observations has resulted in a significant positive bias to estimates is open to question.
428 Nevertheless, inclusion of some assessment of the nature and distances of flight behaviour in future
429 surveys would enable greater discrimination of data and exploration of impacts on derived
430 estimates.
431
432 The population trends derived here closely follow those obtained for the same period by BBS. This
433 suggests that the potential issues often associated with broad-scale, multi-species, volunteer surveys
434 (e.g. the dilution of effort between target species and differential abilities of volunteers) have little
435 effect on results. This may not be the case for density estimates though, since the use of a small
436 number of distance bands (in BBS), rather than accurate distance measurement, has been shown to
437 over-estimate density (Quesada *et al*. 2010). The extent of any difference cannot be assessed here
438 since there are no published BBS-derived population estimates for this species in this region for the
439 period covered by our study.
440
441 The methods employed here provide a reasonably straightforward means of assessing the absolute
442 population size of an abundant, conspicuous, raptor species across the UK landscape. However, this
443 methodology is unlikely to be suitable for more secretive (e.g. Sparrowhawk, A*ccipiter nisus*) or
444 scarcer species. The methods used here are applicable across most landscape types and could
445 provide a useful means of population monitoring stratified by habitat and area. The broader
446 application of such methods is perhaps limited by the cost of equipment (laser rangefinder and gps);
447 however, rapid technological advances and falling costs are likely to remove such obstacles in the
448 near future. Individual variation in skill levels, abilities to detect birds in the landscape and the need

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

449 to train individuals in survey methodology may also pose certain problems; however, these are
450 challenges faced by all survey protocols.
451
452 The recovery of raptor populations is often accompanied by concerns relating to potential impacts
453 on conservation (e.g. of prey species or competitors; e.g. Moleón *et al.* 2011), sociology (e.g. Burke
454 *et al.* 2015) or economy (e.g. of game populations; e.g. Parrot 2015). Indeed, the recovery of
455 Buzzard populations has been followed by increasing pressure for population control measures to
456 protect game stocks (Lees *et al.* 2012). Although Buzzards are protected under UK law (Wildlife &
457 Countryside Act 1981), provision exists to issue licences to kill individuals to prevent agricultural
458 damage (including 'damage to livestock'). Licences are issued only after careful consideration of a
459 number of factors, including local abundance. Without accurate population data, such assessments
460 will be affected by subjective perceptions of abundance. Producing estimates of actual population
461 size for this species is therefore timely, and will prove useful in assisting decision-makers in assessing
462 the potential impacts of any licensed action.
463
464
465 ***Conclusion***
466 Our results show how the population size of a previously persecuted species of raptor in central
467 southern England has increased by more than 50% over a five year period, and how the previously
468 high rate of population growth appears to be stalling. The next phase of this study will focus on
469 producing density estimates using this methodology across a larger area. This approach will enable
470 comparison of the predicted population estimates for the SE region produced here with those
471 utilising fieldwork undertaken across all parts of the region and a direct comparison with BBS
472 estimates. Further assessment of the utility of this method and the viability of using volunteers to
473 derive estimates across a broader geographical scale will also be possible.
474

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the visitors and supporters of the Hawk Conservancy Trust. The John Spedan Lewis Foundation assisted with funding for the purchase of essential equipment. Two anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

For Peer Review

References

Adams. L.W. & Geiss, A.D. 1983. Effects of roads on small mammals. *J Appl. Ecol.* 20: 403-415.

Anderson, A.S., Marques, T.A., Shoo, L.P. & Williams, S.E. 2015. Detectability in audio-visual surveys of tropical rainforest birds: the influence of species, weather and habitat characteristics. *PLoS ONE* 10(6): e0128464. Doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128464.

Balmer, D.E., Gillings, S., Caffrey, B.J., Swann, R.L., Downie, I.S. & Fuller, R.J. (eds) 2013. *Bird Atlas 2007-11: the breeding and wintering birds of Britain and Ireland*. BTO Books, Thetford.

Beckmann, C., & Shine, R. 2011. Toad's tongue for breakfast: exploitation of a novel prey type, the invasive cane toad, by scavenging raptors in tropical Australia. *Biol. Invasions* 13(6): 1447-1455.

BTO. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://www.bto.org/volunteer-surveys/bbs/latest-results/population-trends

Buckland, S.T., Anderson, D.R., Burnham, K.P., Laake, J.L., Borchers, D.L. & Thomas, L. 2001. *Introduction to distance sampling.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buckland, S.T., Marsden, S.J. & Green, R.E. 2008. Estimating bird abundance: making methods work. *Bird Conserv. Int.*18:S91-S108.

Burke, B.J., Finna, A., Flanagan, D.T., Fogarty, D.M., Foran, M., O'Sullivan, J.D., Smith, S.A., Linnell, J.D. and McMahon, B.J., 2015. Reintroduction of White-tailed Eagles to the Republic of Ireland: A case study of media coverage. *Irish Geography*, *47*(1):95-115.

For Peer Review

Burnham, K., Anderson, D., & Laake, J. 1980. Estimation of density from line transect sampling of biological populations. *Wildlife Monogr.* 72:7-202.

Burnham, K.P. 1981. Summarizing remarks: Environmental influences. *Studies Avian Biol-Ser.* 6:324-325

Christensen, T.K., Lassen, P. & Elmeros, M. 2012. High exposure rates of anticoagulant rodenticides in predatory bird species in intensively managed landscapes in Denmark. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 63:437-444.

Clements, R. 2002. The Common Buzzard in Britain: a new population estimate. *Brit. Birds* 95:377-383.

Dare, P.J. 1957. The post-myxomatosis diet of the buzzard. *Devon Birds* 10:2-6.

Davis, P.E. & Davis, J.E. 1992. Dispersal and age of first breeding of buzzards in central Wales. *Brit. Birds* 85: 578-597.

Dean, W.R.J. & Milton, S.J. 2003. The importance of roads and road verges for raptors and crows in the succulent and Nama-Karoo, South Africa. *Ostrich* 74(3-4):181-186.

Diefenbach, D.R., Brauning, D.W. & Mattice, J.A. 2003. Variability in grassland bird counts related to observer differences and species detection rates. *Auk* 120(4):1168-1179.

For Peer Review

531 Eglington, S.M., Davis, S.E., Joys, A.C., Chamberlain, D.E. & Noble, D.G. 2010. The effect of observer
532 experience on English breeding bird survey population trends. *Bird Study* 57:129-141
533
534 Ekblom, R. 2010. Evaluation of the analysis of distance sampling data: a simulation study. *Ornis*
535 *Svecica* 20:45-53
536
537 ESRI 2011. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.
538
539 Faanes, C.A. & Bystrak, D. 1981. The role of observer bias in the North American breeding bird
540 survey. *Studies Avian Biol-Ser.* 6:353-359.
541
542 Fewster, R.J.M, Southwell, C., Borchers, D.L., Buckland, S.T. & Pople, A.R. 2008. The influence of
543 animal mobility on the assumption of uniform distances in aerial line-transect surveys. *Wildlife. Res.*
544 35: 275-288
545
546 Forestry Commission. 2016. *National Forest Inventory Woodland England 2015*.
547
548 Forman, R.T.T. & Alexander, L.E. 1998. Roads and their major ecological effects. *Annu. Rev. Ecol.*
549 *Syst.* 29:207-231.
550
551 Frankham, R. 1995. Effective population size/adult population size ratios in wildlife: a review. *Genet.*
552 *Res. 66*(2), 95-107.
553
554 Glutz von Blotzheim, U., Bauer, K. & Bezzel, E. 1971. *Handbuch der Vögel Mitteleuropas*, Vol. 4. Aula
555 Verlag, Wiesbaden.
556

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Harris, S.J., Risely, K., Massimino, D., Newson, S.E., Eaton, M.A., Musgrove, A.J., Noble, D.G., Procter, D. & Baillie, S.R. 2014. *The Breeding Bird Survey 2013*. BTO Research Report 658. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.

Harris, S.J., Massimino, D., Gillings, S., Eaton, M.A., Noble, D.G., Balmer, D.E., Procter, D. & Pearce-Higgins, J.W. 2017. *The Breeding Bird Survey 2016*. BTO Research Report 700. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.

Harris, S.J., Massimino, D., Eaton, M.A., Gillings, S., Noble, D.G., Balmer, D.E., Pearce-Higgins, J.W. & Woodcock, P. 2019. *The Breeding Bird Survey 2018.* BTO Research Report 717. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.

Hunt, W.G. 1998. Raptor floaters at Moffat's equilibrium. *Oikos* 82: 191-197.

Jiguet, F. 2009. Method learning caused a first-time observer effect in a newly started breeding bird survey. *Bird Study* 56: 253-258.

Johnston, A., Newson, S.E., Risely, K. Musgrove, A.J., Massimino, D., Baillie, S.R. & Pearce-Higgings, J.W. 2014. Species traits explain variation in detectability of UK birds. *Bird Study* 61: 340-350.

Kendall, C.J. 2014. The early bird gets the carcass: Temporal segregation and its effects on foraging success in avian scavengers. *The Auk: Ornithological Advances* 131:12-19.

Kenward, R.E., Marcström, V. & Karlbom, M. 1999. Demographic estimates from radio-tagging: models of age-specific survival and breeding in the goshawk. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 68: 1020-1033.

For Peer Review

583 Kenward, R.E., Walls, S.S., Hodder, K.H., Pakhala, M., Freeman, S.N. & Simpson, V.R. 2000. The
584 prevalence of non-breeders in raptor populations: evidence from rings, radio-tags and transect
585 surveys. *Oikos* 91:271-279.
586
587 Kenward, R.E., Walls, S.S. & Hodder, K.H. 2001. Life path analysis: scaling indicates priming effects of
588 social and habitat factors on dispersal distances. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 70:1-13.
589
590 Knight, R.L. & Kawashima, J.Y. 1993. Responses of Raven and Red-tailed Hawk populations to linear
591 right-of-ways. *J. Wildlife Manage.* 57(2):266-271.
592
593 Lambertucci, S.A., Speziale, K.L., Rogers, T.E. & Morales, J.M. 2009. How do roads affect the habitat
594 use of an assemblage of scavenging raptors? *Biodivers. Conserv.* 18(8):2063-2074.
595
596 Lees, A.C., Newton, I. & Balmford, A. 2012. Pheasants, buzzards, and trophic cascades. *Conserv. Lett.*
597 00: 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00301.x
598
599 Link, W.A., Barker, R.J. & Sauer, J.R. 1994. Within-site variability in surveys of wildlife populations.
600 *Ecology* 75: 1097-1108.
601
602 Marques, T.A., Buckland, S.T., Borchers, D.L., Tosh, D. & McDonald, R.A. 2010. Point transect
603 sampling along linear features. *Biometrics* 66:1247-1255.
604
605 Melde, M. 1956. *Die Mausebussard.* Neue Brehm Bucherei, Leipzig.
606
607 Meunier, F.D., Verheyden,C., & Jouventin, P. 2000. Use of roadsides by diurnal raptors in agricultural
608 landscapes. *Biol. Conserv.* 92:291-298.

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

609

610 Moleón, M., Sánchez-Zapata, J.A., Gil-Sánchez, J.M., Barea-Azcón, J.M., Ballesteros-Duperón, E. and
611 Virgós, E., 2011. Laying the foundations for a human-predator conflict solution: assessing the impact
612 of Bonelli's eagle on rabbits and partridges. *PLoS One*, *6*(7), p.e22851.

613

614 Morelli, F. Beim, M., Jerzak, L., Jones, D. & Tryjanowski, P. 2014. Can roads, railways and related
615 structures have positive effects on birds? – A review. *Transport. Res. D-Tr. E* 30:21-31

616

617 Morton, R.D., Rowland, C.S., Wood, C.M., Meek, L., Marston, C.G. & Smith, G.M. 2014. Land Cover
618 Map 2007 (vector, GB) v1.2. NERC Environmental Information Data Centre.

619

620 Musgrove, A., Aebischer, N., Eaton, M., Hearn, R., Newson, S., Noble, D., Parsons, M., Risely, K. &
621 Stroud, D. 2013. Population estimates of birds in Great Britain and the United Kingdom. *Brit. Birds*
622 106, 64-100.

623

624 Newson, S.E., Evans, K.L., Noble, D.G., Greenwood, J.J.D. & Gaston, K.J. Use of distance sampling to
625 improve estimates of national population sizes for common and widespread breeding birds in the
626 UK. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 45:1330-1338.

627

628 Newton, I. Davis, P.E., & Davis, J.E. 1982. Ravens and buzzards in relation to sheep farming and
629 forestry in Wales. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 19: 681-706.

630

631 Nomis – Official Labour Market Statistics. 2016. *KS101EW (Usual resident population)*. Available
632 from: http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/ks101ew [Accessed August 2018].

633

For Peer Review

634 Öberg, M., Arlt, D., Pärt, Laugen, A.T., Eggers, S & Low, M. 2015. Rainfall during parental care
635 reduces reproductive survival components of fitness in a passerine bird. *Ecol. Evol.* 5:345-356.
636
637 Ortega, Y.K. & Capen, D.E. 2002. Roads as edges: Effects on birds in forested landscapes. *Forest Sci.*
638 48:381-390.
639 Pain, D.J., Fisher, I.J. & Thomas, V.G. 2009. A global update of Lead poisoning in terrestrial birds from
640 ammunition sources, In Watson, R.T., Fuller, M., Pokras, M. & Hunt, W.G. (eds) *Ingestion of Lead*
641 *from Spent Ammunition: Implications for Wildlife and Humans.* The Peregrine Fund, Boise, Idaho,
642 USA.
643
644 Parrott, D., 2015. Impacts and management of common buzzards Buteo buteo at pheasant
645 *Phasianus colchicus* release pens in the UK: a review. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 61:181-
646 197.
647
648 Peterjohn, B.G., Sauer, J.R., & Robbins, C.S. 1995 Population trends from the North American
649 breeding bird survey. In Martin, T.E. & Finch, D.M. (eds) *Ecology and Management of Neotropical*
650 *Migratory Birds*: 3-39. Oxford University Press, New York.
651
652 Pollock, K.H., Nichols, J.D., Simons, T.R., Farnsworth, G.L., Bailey, L.L, & Sauer, J.R. 2002. Large scale
653 wildlife monitoring studies: statistical methods for design and analysis. *Environmetrics* 13:105-119.
654
655 Quesada, J. Guallar, S., Pérez-Ruiz, N.J., Estrada, J. & Herrando, S. 2010. Observer error associated
656 with band allocation is negligible in large scale bird monitoring schemes, but how precise is the use
657 of bands at all? *Ardeola* 57:23-32.
658

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

R Core Team. 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www/R-project.org/.

Rabe, M. J., Devos, S. S. & Rosenstock Jr, J.C. 2002. Review of big-game survey methods used by wildlife agencies of the western United States. *Wildlife Soc. B*. 30:46–53.

Ralph, C.J. & Scott, J.M. Eds. 1981. Estimating numbers of terrestrial birds. *Studies Avian Biol.-Ser* 6.

Ramsey, F.L. & Scott, J.M. 1981. Tests of hearing ability. *Studies Avian Biol.-Ser* 6:342-345.

Riseley, K., Noble, D.G., & Baillie, S.R. 2008. *The breeding bird survey 2007.* BTO Research Report 508, Thetford, UK.

Robbins, C.S., Bystrak, D. & Geissler, P.H. 1986. *The Breeding Bird Survey: Its first fifteen years, 1965-1979.* U.S. Fish. Wildl. Serv., Resour. Publ. 157.

Sanderlin, J.S., Block, W.M. & Ganey, J.L. 2014. Optimizing study design for multi-species avian monitoring programmes. *J.Appl. Ecol* 51:860-870.

Sauer, J.S., Peterjohn, B.G. & Link, W.A. 1994. Observer differences in the North American Breeding Bird Survey. *Auk* 111:50-62.

Sim, I.M.W., Campbell, L., Pain, D.J. & Wilson, J.D. 2000. Correlates of the population increase of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo* in the West Midlands between 1983 and 1996. *Bird Study* 47:154-164.

For Peer Review

685 Sim, I.M.W., Cross, A.V., Lamacraft, D.L. & Pain, D.J. 2001. Correlates of Common Buzzard Buteo
686 buteo density and breeding success in the West Midlands. *Bird Study* 48:317-329.
687
688 Simpson, V.R. 1993. Causes of mortality and pathological conditions observed in Common Buzzards
689 (*Buteo buteo*) in Cornwall, England. – In: Dorrestein, G. and van den Bergh (eds), *Proc. 1993 Eur.*
690 *Conf. Avian Med. Surgery.* Association of Avian Veterinarians, Utrecht, pp. 423-440.
691
692 Soulé, M. E. (Ed.). 1987. *Viable populations for conservation*. Cambridge university press.
693
694 Stanbury, A. & Gregory, R. (2009) Exploring the effects of truncated, pooled and sexed data in
695 distance sampling estimation of breeding bird abundance. *Bird Study* 56:298-309
696
697 Stephens, P.A., Pettorelli, N., Barlow, J., Whittingham, M.J, & Cadotte, M.W. 2015. Management by
698 proxy? The use of indices in applied ecology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 52:1-6
699
700 Thiollay, J.M. 1967. Ecologie d'une population de rapaces diurnes en Lorraine. *Terre Vie* 114: 116-
701 183.
702
703 Thomas, L., Buckland, S.T., Rexstad, E.A., Laake, J.L., Strindberg, S., Hedley, S.L., Bishop, R.B.,
704 Marques, T.A. & Burnham, K.P. 2010. Distance software: design and analysis of distance sampling
705 surveys for estimating population size. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 47: 5-14.
706
707 Thompson, W.L. 2002. Towards reliable bird surveys: Accounting for individuals present but not
708 detected. *Auk* 119:18-25.
709
710 Tubbs, C.R. 1971. *The Buzzard.* David and Charles.

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Walls, S.S. & Kenward, R.E. 1998. Movements of radio-tagged Buzzards *Buteo buteo* in early life. *Ibis* 140:561-568.

Walls, S.S., Mañosa, S., Fuller, R.M., Hodder, K.H. & Kenward, R.E. 1999. Is early dispersal enterprise or exile? Evidence from radio tagged buzzards. *J. Avian Biol.* 30:407-415.

Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, Ch 69, *s*.1 & *s*.16

Woodward, I.D., Massimino, D., Hammond, M.J., Harris, S.J., Leech, D.I., Noble, D.G., Walker, R.H., Barimore, C., Dadam, D., Eglington, S.M., Marchant, J.H., Sullivan, M.J.P., Baillie, S.R. & Robinson, R.A. (2018) *BirdTrends 2018: trends in numbers, breeding success and survival for UK breeding birds.* Research Report 708. BTO, Thetford. www.bto.org/birdtrends

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

724 # Tables

725 Table 1. Covariates used in modelling distance sampling estimates of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo*

726 in central southern England.

Covariate	Description	Levels
OBS	Fieldworker	Factor - MS or RH
LOC	Situation of the bird	Factor - Ground, Perched, Flying
STRATA	Section of study area	Factor - East or West
TIME	Minutes after sunrise	Continuous
WDS	Area (m^2) of woodland within 250m radius of observer location	Continuous

727

728

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

729 Table 2. Survey effort and numbers of observations made during surveys of Common Buzzards

730 *Buteo buteo* in central southern England.

Transect Period	Season Year	Number of transects	Σ Transect lengths (km)	Mean transect duration (min)	Observations	Observations after Truncation (550m)
1	Autumn 2011	40	594.7	320	489	475
2	Spring 2012	35	531.2	343	611	599
3	Autumn 2012	26	379.2	345	359	336
4	Spring 2013	25	382.2	339	471	445
5	Autumn 2013	39	570.3	388	590	565
6	Spring 2014	35	523.7	404	830	814
7	Autumn 2014	25	373.4	363	409	396
8	Spring 2015	22	361.6	414	437	431
9	Autumn 2015	25	393.3	411	469	467
10	Spring 2016	24	379.9	384	509	502
TOTAL		299	4489.5	3711	5174	5030

731

732

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

Table 3. Details of model selection statistics for distance sampling estimates of the Common Buzzard *Buteo buteo* population in central southern England. Preferred models are indicated by bold type. (Period – survey period number, season and year; Engine – analysis engine; Key – key function, U-Uniform, HN – Half normal, HZ – Hazard rate; Adjustment Term – series expansion type (number of terms), Cos – Cosine, HP – Hermite polynomial, SP – Simple polynomial; Covariates – included in the model; Parameters – total number of parameters in the model; ΔAIC – difference in Akaike Information Criterion between model with best fit and the current model; CvM(p) - cosine-weighted Cramér-von Mises Goodness of fit test value and (P value))

Period	Engine	Key	Adjustment Term	Covariates	Parameters	ΔAIC	CvM (*p*)
(1)AUT 2011	CDS	HN	Cos(1)	-	2	11.52	-
		HZ	HP(3)	-	5	11.72	-
	MCDS	**HN**	**0**	**STRATA TIME WDS**	**4**	**0.00**	**0.277 (0.1)**
		HN	SP(1)	TIME WDS	6	1.74	0.139 (0.3)
		HN	Cos(1)	TIME WDS	4	1.81	0.121 (0.4)
		HN	Cos(1)	WDS	3	3.11	0.123 (0.3)
(2)SPR2012	CDS	HN	0	-	1	1538.46	0.011 (1.0)
		HZ	SP(1)	-	3	1541.85	0.012 (1.0)
	MCDS	**HN**	**0**	**STRATA TIME WDS**	**4**	**0.00**	**0.038 (0.9)**
		HN	Cos(1)	STRATA TIME WDS	5	1.75	0.021 (1.0)
		HN	0	TIME WDS	3	8.99	0.036 (0.9)
		HN	0	TIME	2	26.07	0.015 (1.0)
(3)AUT2012	CDS	HN	0	-	1	13.27	0.117 (0.4)
		HZ	0	-	2	17.45	0.124 (0.3)
	MCDS	HN	0	STRATA TIME WDS	6	0.00	0.109 (0.4)
		HN	**0**	**WDS**	**4**	**0.77**	**0.115 (0.4)**
		HN	0	TIME	2	13.88	0.114 (0.4)
		HN	0	LOC	3	15.95	0.114(0.4)
(4)SPR2013	CDS	HN	Cos(1)	-	2	18.38	0.039 (0.9)
		HZ	Cos(1)	-	3	19.24	0.038 (0.9)
	MCDS	**HN**	**Cos(1)**	**OBS TIME**	**4**	**0.00**	**0.032 (0.9)**
		HN	SP(1)	OBS TIME	4	0.11	0.070 (0.6)
		HN	Cos(1)	OBS TIME WDS	5	1.82	0.031 (0.9)
		HN	Cos(1)	TIME	3	8.10	0.030 (0.9)
(5)AUT2013	CDS	HN	0	-	1	46.97	0.286 (0.1)
		U	HP(1)	-	1	49.05	0.647(0.01)
	MCDS	HN	0	OBS STRATA TIME WDS	5	0.00	0.252(0.1)
		HN	**0**	**OBS TIME WDS**	**4**	**0.59**	**0.235(0.15)**

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

		HN	0	TIME WDS	3	1.20	0.233(0.15)
(6)SPR2014	CDS	HN	0	-	1	12.45	0.106 (0.4)
		HZ	Cos(1)	-	3	14.42	0.076 (0.6)
	MCDS	**HN**	**SP(1)**	**STRATA WDS**	**4**	**0.00**	**0.300 (0.1)**
		HN	SP(1)	STRATA TIME WDS	5	1.87	0.270 (0.1)
		HN	SP(1)	WDS	3	3.42	0.191(0.15)
		HN	0	WDS	2	3.94	0.084 (0.5)
(7)AUT2014	CDS	HN	Cos(3)	-	4	0.00	0.094 (0.5)
		U	**Cos(5)**	**-**	**5**	**0.94**	**0.074 (0.6)**
		HN	Cos(2)	-	3	11.91	0.199(0.15)
	MCDS	HN	Cos(1)	WDS	3	9.02	0.34 (0.05)
		HN	Cos(1)	WDD	5	10.99	0.314 (0.1)
(8)SPR2015	CDS	HN	Cos(2)	-	3	110.17	0.022 (1.0)
		HZ	SP(2)	-	4	111.16	0.020 (1.0)
	MCDS	**HZ**	**0**	**LOC TIME WDS**	**7**	**0.00**	**0.069 (0.6)**
		HN	Cos(2)	TIME WDS	5	1.21	0.022 (1.0)
		HZ	SP(1)	WDS	6	6.94	0.032 (0.9)
		HZ	SP(1)	TIME	4	9.63	0.054 (0.7)
(9)AUT2015	CDS	HN	SP(1)	-	2	10.71	0.113 (0.4)
		HZ	HP(1)	-	3	12.92	0.101 (0.4)
	MCDS	**HN**	**SP(1)**	**WDS**	**3**	**0.00**	**0.093 (0.4)**
		HN	SP(1)	STRATA WDS	4	0.82	0.091 (0.5)
		HN	SP(1)	TIME WDS	4	1.56	0.094 (0.5)
		HN	0	WDS	2	1.59	0.093 (0.5)
(10)SPR2016	CDS	HN	SP(1)	-	2	5.02	0.151 (0.3)
		HZ	SP(1)	-	3	5.26	0.063 (0.6)
	MCDS	**HN**	**0**	**WDS**	**4**	**0.00**	**0.087 (0.5)**
		HN	0	TIME WDS	5	1.37	0.079 (0.5)
		HN	0	STRAT WDS	5	1.78	0.088 (0.5)
		HN	0	LOC TIME WDS	7	3.97	0.077 (0.6)

741

742

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

743 Table 4. Estimates of density and population size of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo* with Lower (LCL)

744 and Upper (UCL) 95% confidence intervals. %CV - coefficient of variation, df - degrees of freedom.

745

Year	Period	LCL – Density – UCL (Individuals km^{-2})	LCL – No. individuals - UCL	% CV	df
2011	Autumn	0.936 - 1.111 - 1.319	2428 - 2883 - 3423	8.62	65.4
2012	Spring	0.836 - 1.126 - 1.517	2169 - 2922 - 3936	14.81	39.2
	Autumn	0.990 - 1.274 - 1.639	2568 - 3305 - 4254	12.48	35.31
2013	Spring	1.327 - 1.614 - 1.963	3444 - 4187 - 5093	9.66	34.58
	Autumn	1.172 - 1.393 - 1.654	3043 - 3613 - 4292	8.58	50.10
2014	Spring	1.458 - 1.734 - 2.064	3782 - 4500 - 5354	8.66	47.94
	Autumn	1.333 - 1.695 - 2.156	3458 - 4399 - 5595	11.86	32.84
2015	Spring	1.176 - 1.746 - 2.593	3051 - 4531 - 6729	19.70	36.58
	Autumn	1.342 - 1.705 - 2.164	3483 - 4423 - 5616	11.77	32.45
2016	Spring	1.445 - 1.728 - 2.068	3749 - 4485 - 5365	8.82	32.15

746

747

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901

748 ## Legends to Figures

749

750 Figure 1. Study area in central southern England showing randomised locations of the Idealised
751 Transect Routes (ITRs) for the first survey of Common Buzzards *Buteo buteo* in autumn 2011.
752 Shading represents urban areas.

753

754

755 Figure 2. Estimates of Common Buzzard *Buteo buteo* population size within the study area in central
756 south England for each survey period between autumn 2011 and spring 2016 (± 95% confidence
757 intervals).

758

759

760

761

For Peer Review

ScholarOne, 375 Greenbrier Drive, Charlottesville, VA, 22901



Figure 1. Study area in central southern England showing randomised locations of the Idealised Transect Routes (ITRs) for the first survey of Common Buzzards Buteo buteo in autumn 2011. Shading represents urban areas.

164x83mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Figure 2. Estimates of Common Buzzard Buteo buteo population size within the study area in central south England for each survey period between autumn 2011 and spring 2016 (± 95% confidence intervals).

81x185mm (96 x 96 DPI)