

Recovering the Eurasian Curlew in the UK and Ireland

In their paper in June's *British Birds*, 'Recovering the Eurasian Curlew [*Numenius arquata*] in the UK and Ireland: progress since 2015 and looking ahead' (Douglas *et al*, 2021), the authors (members of the UK and Ireland Curlew Action Group) referred to the 'immediate and overriding challenges facing Curlews' and cited, quite rightly, 'intense predation pressure' as one of the threats to the species. The paper concluded with 12 recommended 'priority actions', only one of which referenced this threat, effectively kicking the issue into the long grass by only calling for 'research into how to reduce mesopredator densities in the countryside'. Sufficient research has already been completed to know the origins of high densities of predators in the countryside, and the need for action now is urgent.

The Curlew population in Shropshire has declined by an estimated 77% between 1990 and 2010, to about 160 pairs (Smith 2019), with further monitoring since then showing it has since declined to about 120 pairs. At the current rate, the population will have halved in 12 years, and virtually disappeared within 25. In reality, the decline is likely to be quicker, because, as a result of poor productivity in recent years, the population has become skewed towards older birds, and because declines often accelerate just prior to extinction due to fragmentation of the population.

Curlew monitoring and conservation work is well developed in Shropshire, and I have been involved since its start, in 2004. In 2015–16, before nest-fencing and radio-tracking were undertaken, the local Landscape Partnership Scheme Ground-nesting Birds Recovery Project found and monitored 33 Curlew nests using cameras: 27 of these nests were lost during the incubation stage, with Red Foxes *Vulpes vulpes* responsible in 15 cases. The remainder were predated by European Badgers *Meles meles* (4), deserted (2), destroyed by sheep (1), predated by corvids (1), and cause unknown (4). From the six nests where chicks hatched, none fledged. One chick was lost to agricultural activities, with all others being predated.

This research led to setting up the Shropshire Ornithological Society 'Save our Curlews Campaign' in 2018, which adopted the practice of protecting nests with electric fencing. In total, in 2018–19 and 2021, 22 nests were found and fenced. Even then, only 14 (64%) of nests passed the incubation stage. In those three years, a total of 44 chicks were tagged and tracked, but only 7 or 8 of them (~17%) survived to fledging; the 2021 results are summarised in *Brit. Birds* 114: 568–569. For all of those where the body or tag was recovered, evidence showed the chick had been predated. None of the tagged chicks were killed due to agricultural operations

The radio-tags have proved reliable, and a loss of signal usually indicates that the bird (and/or the tag) has been taken underground (mainly by Foxes), or, less likely, carried out of range by an avian predator. One tag, still transmitting, was found embedded in Fox scat outside a Fox den, a month after the chick was lost.

In 2021, 21 chicks were tagged. Of these, 19 were predated at less than eight days old, one was predated at 14 days, and one survived to fledging at c.35 days. Discounting the single fledged bird, the average survival of the chicks was less than 5.5 days. While electric fences around nests improve hatching rates, they are expensive and time consuming to put in place, and they do not protect chicks when they move away from the immediate vicinity of the nest. Even with electric fencing, fledging rates still fall far short of what is needed, and more radical measures are needed.

There is thus strong evidence that the principal cause of mortality in Curlew chicks in Shropshire is predation and not, for example, agricultural activity. While addressing land-use policies is undoubtedly important – and five of the 12 recommended priority actions given by Douglas *et al*. relate to this and AES – if immediate and effective action to stop predation is

not taken, Curlews will be largely extinct across southern England well before the results of better land-use policy can provide any respite for them. In the immediate future, there is a need for the Curlew Action Group to focus primarily on action to reduce predation.

We have shown that the main predator of Curlew chicks in Shropshire is the Fox, and Harris (2021) produces clear evidence that the release of Common Pheasants *Phasianus colchicus* and other non-native gamebirds sustains the Fox population at much higher levels than it would otherwise be naturally. A minimum of 726,000 Pheasants were released for shooting in Shropshire in 2018 (Shrubshole 2019), though that is likely to be a substantial underestimate (Madden 2021). The breeding population in the county is estimated at over 40,000 pairs (Smith 2019), all descended from releases for shooting. Numbers increased by 59% between 1994 and 2019 (BTO/JNCC/RSPB Breeding Bird Survey results), fuelled by an increasing number of birds released each year over the same period. Pheasant now breeds across the entire county, although areas where birds are released for shooting occupy only a small part of it.

Our own research has been put into a national context by e.g. Roos *et al* (2018), Pringle *et al* (2019) and Mason *et al* (2020), which show that Pheasants released for shooting increase the number of predators, particularly Foxes.

Mason *et al*, of the RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, provided the scientific basis that informed the RSPB Review of Shooting Policy, announced at the AGM in October 2020. This new important policy includes calling for a reduction in the number of large-scale gamebird releases (www.rspb.org.uk/gamebirdreview).

Harris, a retired Professor from Bristol University, has published an extensive list of papers about Fox numbers and their impact. His 2021 paper included evidence to show that ‘the number of Foxes supported by predating and/or scavenging non-native gamebirds has increased 10-fold since the turn of the century’ and ‘the gamebird-shooting industry provides enough supplementary food to support between 80,000 (based solely on predation rates) and 200,000 Foxes (assuming that all the gamebird carrion was also eaten by Foxes).’

Discussion is now taking place within the recently established Curlew Recovery Partnership (CRP, <https://www.curlewrecovery.org/>) on predator control to help Curlews. However, Mason *et al*. and Harris both point out that control of Foxes by Pheasant shoots occurs most frequently when Pheasants are in their release pens, and shortly after release. Control occurs least frequently after the shooting season ends in February. If this Fox control is to help Curlews, it needs to have its maximum impact in the few weeks prior to nesting, in March and April. Fox control on estates has little long-term impact, because it is usually followed by an influx of replacements from outside.

More importantly, this control only addresses the symptoms, not the cause of the problem. The Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust (www.gwct.org.uk) website refers to the number of Foxes killed as part of predator control activities and reported through the National Gamebag Census (NGC). It states: ‘There has been a continuous increase in the bag index since 1961, leading to it being more than three times higher in 2009 than in 1961.’ Pheasant release, it should be noted, increased 10-fold over the same period. With considerable understatement, the website article concludes: ‘The widespread rearing and releasing of gamebirds has probably improved Fox food supply in autumn and winter.’

According to the NGC, an estimated 89,000 Foxes were killed in 2016; but that number did little or nothing to reduce predation of Curlews. This raises the question, how many Foxes need to be killed to have an impact on the Fox population in April? And do conservationists want to be associated with such a high level of killing? The only way forward is to make large-scale reductions in supplementary food for Foxes and other predators – i.e. the Pheasant population, in particular the number released each year – at a landscape scale.

The absence of any mention of the need to control Pheasant release in the paper by Douglas *et al.*, let alone any proposed action in support of the unequivocal conclusion of the RSPB policy review, is surprising. Several of the authors are RSPB staff, and I expected that the organisation's policy review would feature strongly in the paper. Why, I wonder, was this omitted?

The interaction of factors that influence predation of Curlews is undoubtedly complex, but it is perverse to ignore taking immediate action to tackle the clear and obvious main driver of the decline while researching less important influences.

If Curlew is the 'UK's most pressing avian conservation priority' (Brown *et al*, 2015), an Action Plan is needed that addresses the main, current driver of its decline. We need to set suitably ambitious targets, taking into account the limited time we have left, such as reducing the number of Pheasants released annually to the number currently shot each year, within five years.

Every month that passes without action eats into the very limited time that we have left to save this iconic species from local extinction, so an Action Plan is urgent. It is also important that the Action Group takes a strong lead on this issue. A lot of hope has been invested in the CRP, but several of its members are rooted in the shooting industry, and the other CRP members will need considerable support if we are to have any chance of getting a large-enough reduction in Pheasant release to help Curlews.

References

- Aebischer, N. J., Davey, P. D., & Kingdon, N. G. 2011. *National Gamebag Census: Mammal Trends to 2009*. Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust, Fordingbridge.
- Brown, D., *et al.* 2015. The Eurasian Curlew – the most pressing bird conservation priority in the UK? *Brit. Birds* 108: 660–668.
- Douglas, D. J. T. *et al.* 2021. Recovering the Eurasian Curlew in the UK and Ireland: progress since 2015 and looking ahead. *Brit. Birds* 114: 341–350.
- Harris, S. 2021. *A review of the animal welfare, public health, and environmental, ecological and conservation implications of rearing, releasing and shooting non-native gamebirds in Britain*. Report to the Labour Animal Welfare Society.
- Madden, J. R. 2021. How many gamebirds are released in the UK each year? *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 67: 72
- Mason, L. R., Bicknell, J. E., Smart, J., & Peach, W. J. 2020. *The impacts of non-native gamebird release in the UK: an updated evidence review*. RSPB Research Report No. 66. RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, Sandy.
- Pringle, H., Wilson, M., Calladine, J., & Siriwardena, G. 2019. Associations between gamebird releases and generalist predators. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 56: 2102–2113.
- Roos, S., Smart, J., Gibbons, D. W., & Wilson, J. D. 2018. A review of predation as a limiting factor for bird populations in mesopredator-rich landscapes: a case study in the UK. *Biol. Rev.* 93: 1915–1937.
- Shrubsole, G. 2019 *Who Owns England? How we lost our green and pleasant land and how to take it back*. William Collins, London. <https://bit.ly/2XJM194>
- Smith, L. 2019a. *The Birds of Shropshire*. Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

— 2019b. Community Wildlife Group surveys. In: Thomas, G. (ed.), *Shropshire County Bird Report 2019*. Shropshire Ornithological Society, Shrewsbury.

Wall, T. 2019. Pheasant species account. In: Thomas, G. (ed.), *Shropshire County Bird Report 2019*. Shropshire Ornithological Society, Shrewsbury.

Leo Smith, 'Save our Curlews' Campaign Co-ordinator, Shropshire Ornithological Society; e-mail leo@leosmith.org.uk