IDENTIFYING MIGRANT WATERFOWL AND WATERBIRD STOPOVERS TO INFORM WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT SITING WITHIN SAGINAW BAY

PROJECT NUMBER 11-309-05

Prepared By:
Michael J. Monfils and Joelle L. Gehring
Michigan Natural Features Inventory
Michigan State University Extension
P.O. Box 30444
Lansing, MI 48909-7944

Suggested Citation:
Monfils, M. J., and J. L. Gehring. 2012. Identifying migrant waterfowl and waterbird stopovers to inform wind energy development siting within Saginaw Bay. Michigan Natural Features Inventory, Report Number 2012-19, Lansing, MI.

Cover photographs by Michael Monfils (Saginaw Bay) and Joelle Gehring (Partenavia P68C aircraft).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

There are many issues affecting migratory bird species, including habitat alterations to breeding, migration, and wintering sites. Little is known about the potential impacts of nearshore and offshore wind energy development on migrating waterfowl and waterbirds using the Saginaw Bay of Lake Huron in Michigan. Potential impacts could be direct, such as collisions with turbines, or indirect, such as displacement from critical migration stopover sites used for feeding and loafing. Tax credits, renewable energy mandates, and a strong desire for non-polluting energy sources have increased the use and development of wind energy world-wide. According to the Michigan Department of Energy, Labor, and Economic Growth, the Great Lakes and their coasts are specifically targeted for increases in wind farm development due to their propensity for high, steady winds (http://www.michigan.gov/cis/0,1607,7-154-25676_25774-101765--,00.html). In September 2009, the Great Lakes Offshore Wind Council (GLOW Council) delineated almost the entire Saginaw Bay as areas of "Most Favorable" or "Conditional" offshore wind development, with few areas of "Categorical Exclusion". With water depths of $\leq$ 30 m, Saginaw Bay also provides for feasible and economical turbine construction (Mikinetics Consulting and Private Sector Consultants 2009). This information was provided to Governor Jennifer Granholm in part to help focus development efforts. Saginaw Bay has a combination of high winds, proximity to load centers (e.g., large urban areas) for interconnection, and water depths needed to construct turbine foundations tolerant of ice cover.

The shallow-water depths of Saginaw Bay also provide excellent food sources and habitat for migrating waterfowl and waterbirds. Approximately three million swans, geese, and ducks travel along migration corridors that cross the Great Lakes region (Great Lakes Basin Commission 1975, Bellrose 1980). Lake Huron's Saginaw Bay contains a substantial concentration of Michigan's coastal marshes (about 2,500 ha; Bookhout et al. 1989), which occurs as a nearly continuous strip along the perimeter of the bay (Prince et al. 1992). Saginaw Bay was recognized as an Important Bird Area of global significance for several waterbird species (American Bird Conservancy 2003). Emergent wetlands and shallow open water zones of Saginaw Bay have been identified as priority areas for waterfowl and waterbird conservation in the Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture (hereafter Joint Venture) (Soulliere et al. 2007a,b, UMRGLR Joint Venture 2007). Several Species of Greatest

Conservation Need identified in Michigan's Wildlife Action Plan (Eagle et al. 2005), such as American Black Duck (*Anas rubripes*) and Great Blue Heron (*Ardea herodias*), use Saginaw Bay coastal wetlands during migration. It is important that we better understand the potential impacts that wind turbine construction could have on migratory birds using Saginaw Bay and other parts of the Great Lakes.

Before the potential impacts of wind energy development in Saginaw Bay can be assessed or avoided, we need to better delineate those areas utilized by migratory birds. The numbers of avian fatalities are directly related to the placement of wind farms on the landscape (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2003). Carefully planned siting of wind farms is thought to be one of the most important variables when attempting to minimize ecological impacts. Resource managers currently have few data available to them on the location of waterfowl and waterbird concentration areas on Saginaw Bay. In 2009, the Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) proposed a project to improve our understanding of bird use of Saginaw Bay so that informed decisions can be made about future wind development. With approved funding from the Michigan Coastal Program, we began work in 2009 toward the following objectives: (1) evaluate existing data sources and make them more available to resource managers and agencies; (2) identify knowledge gaps in our understanding of waterfowl and waterbird use of Saginaw Bay and the Great Lakes; (3) conduct aerial surveys to fill knowledge gaps about bird use of Saginaw Bay; (4) incorporate our survey data into larger mapping efforts; and (5) provide map products to resource managers, agencies, and industry. The rapid increase in the discussion of offshore wind farms heightens the value and urgency of this research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generalized Findings of Complementary Surveys

Compared to our surveys, most efforts surveyed only nearshore waters and not offshore waters. The Mid-winter Inventory (MWI) surveys are 0.5 km off shorelines in most areas of the lower Great Lakes except on the Canadian side of Lake Ontario where additional transects are added 2, 4, 10, and 20 km offshore. "Results suggest that 83% to 100% of scaup (primarily Greater Scaup [*Aythya marila*]) species, Bufflehead (*Bucephala albeola*), Common Goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*), Common Merganser (*Mergus merganser*), and Red-breasted Merganser (*Mergus*

serrator) were counted on the shoreline transect, but all individuals of these species were accounted for by addition of the 2-km offshore transect. The shoreline transect contained 57% of the Long-tailed Ducks (*Clangula hyemalis*) and 48% of scoter species. About an additional 30% of both Long-tailed Duck (cumulative = 87%) and scoter species (cumulative = 76%) were counted on the 2-km transect, and more than 98% of individuals of each species observed were accounted for after inclusion of the 4-km transect" (Sea Duck Joint Venture 2007). "…An average of 50,214 Long-tailed Ducks were counted each January during the Lower Great Lakes January Waterfowl Survey, and > 90% of those birds were located on the Canadian side of Lake Ontario. Based on these survey results, the northern portions of Lake Ontario have been identified as the most important wintering area for Long-tailed Duck on the Lower Great Lakes. Possibly 100,000 to 200,000 Long-tailed Ducks (perhaps 10-20% of continental population) winter on the Great Lakes." This is believed to be correlated with the increase in zebra (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and quagga mussel (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*) availability (Sea Duck Joint Venture 2007).

Starting in 1974, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) has conducted annual November Canvasback (*Aythya valisineria*) surveys to track population trends and spatial distribution within the Great Lakes (Soulliere et al. 2000). This survey is conducted in coordination with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Canadian Wildlife Service, and several other state wildlife agencies (Soulliere et al. 2000). The most important areas for these ducks in Michigan include: Lake St. Clair (a mean of 88% of all Canvasbacks detected in Michigan) and the lower Detroit River / Lake Erie complex. Ninety-five percent of all Canvasbacks detected between 1974 and 1999 were in these 2 areas combined. Saginaw Bay was also highlighted as an important staging area in 1984 and 1985, with 18-20% of all Canvasbacks detected (Soulliere et al. 2000). Additional details on this survey follow in the Results section of this report.

Recently, Mueller et al. (2011) produced a report on their aerial waterfowl surveys of western Lake Michigan. Long-tailed Ducks were the most frequently detected species, followed by Red-breasted Mergansers, and Common Goldeneyes. Long-tailed Ducks were detected in high numbers (32,714 total), but were present predominantly in the fall; whereas the Red-breasted

Mergansers were detected throughout their fall and spring survey periods. The authors planned to conduct additional analysis on Lake bathymetry in an effort to understand the relationship between water depth and waterfowl concentrations.

Similarly, Lott et al. (2011) conducted aerial bird surveys over Lake Erie. They suggested gulls were widespread and detected miles from the shoreline, but dabbling ducks were only detected along shoreline areas and only after inland areas had become frozen. Diving ducks were found in deeper water than the dabbling ducks and tended to concentrate at the mouth of the Maumee River and near islands. Long-tailed Ducks also congregated along Long Point. The authors suggested that geese and swans concentrated their activities along the shoreline especially during inclement weather. Loons and Grebes were typically detected more than 1 mile from the shoreline. Mergansers were detected less than 5 miles from the shorelines and appeared sensitive to the presence of the aircraft, suggesting that they may also be sensitive to the activity related to turbine construction and maintenance. Overall, Lott et al. (2011) states that no area of the Lake was devoid of ducks, but there were fewer ducks as the distance to the shoreline grew larger. This conclusion was also reached by (Peterson 2011) who found almost no birds beyond 60,000 m from the North Carolina shoreline.

Ewert et al (2005) accumulated and summarized a significant amount of information regarding the qualities and characteristics of migratory bird stopover areas in the Western Lake Erie area. They state that the lower Great Lakes are considered by the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP 2004) to be areas of continental significance. According to Prince et al. (1992), approximately 3 million birds of more than 30 species of waterfowl use Great Lakes coastal waters and wetlands at some time during the year (Great Lakes Basin Commission 1975). Some of the largest migratory waterfowl concentrations have occurred in the central basin and southwestern Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River (Dennis and Chandler 1974, Prince et al. 1992). The main species detected in the lower Great Lakes region include: Canvasback, Lesser Scaup (*A. affinis*), Redhead (*A. americana*), Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), Green-winged Teal (*A. crecca*), Blue-winged Teal (*A. discors*), American Wigeon (*A. americana*), Wood Duck (*Aix sponsa*), Bufflehead, mergansers, and Tundra Swans (*Cygnus columbianus*). Ewert et al (2005) provides a temporal framework for the timing of waterfowl

species migration through the Great Lakes. However, they state that the "spring waterfowl inventories of coastal areas in the region have not been systematic so assessments of spring stopover sites remain inadequate."

Ewert et al (2005) summarized some of the habitat preferences for waterfowl in the lower Great Lakes. They state that, "most diving ducks require deeper water sites for feeding and loafing. Although Redheads may feed in <10 cm (<4 inches) of water and Lesser Scaups commonly use sites with water depths of 3-6 m (10-25 ft) (Bellrose 1980), most feeding sites used by diving ducks are in 2-5 m (6-15 ft) of water. Diving ducks using Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair have varied diets, with scaups and Common Goldeneyes consuming mollusks (80-99%) and Redheads and Canvasbacks eating primarily plants (50-99%) during fall and spring (Custer and Custer 1996). Zebra mussels have been a primary mollusk food source on Lakes Erie and St. Clair since their invasion, accounting for a majority of the mussels eaten by diving ducks (Hamilton and Ankney 1994, Custer and Custer 1996)."

Garthe et al. (2009) studied the relationship between seabird use of their south North Sea study area and season, hydrographic variables, and meteorological variables. Between 1990 and 2007 they counted seabirds on 407 days and compared the results to archived data for two hydrographic and five meteorological parameters. The birds had different seasonal behaviors with some occurring year-round and others present only seasonally. Despite the seasonal changes, the five meteorological and two hydrographic parameters significantly influenced the abundance of birds present. Wind field, sea surface temperature anomaly, sea surface salinity anomaly, and air pressure change were most closely correlated with bird presence and absence. These data could be used to suggest the times with the most risk of avian collisions in offshore wind farms.

Dennis and Chandler (1974) suggested that in addition to quality habitat, waterfowl needed areas with low human disturbance (e.g., low boat traffic). This may be more important during migration when feeding needs and energetic risks are greater. Knapton et al. (2000) found that diving ducks appeared more tolerant of boat traffic and often returned to feeding sites post disturbance. This response was more common in the spring than in the fall. Knapton et al.

(2000) suggested that a 300 m (990 ft) buffer be placed around important feeding areas in order to reduce disturbance to migrating birds.

Saginaw Bay has been listed as an Important Bird Area for its importance to several waterbird species, including Great Blue Heron, Great Egret (*Ardea alba*), Black-crowned Night-Heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), Least Bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*), American Bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*), Virginia Rail (*Rallus limicola*), Sora (*Porzana carolina*), Common Gallinule (*Gallinula galeata*), Forster's Tern (*Sterna forsteri*), Black Tern (*Chlidonias niger*), Common Tern (*Sterna hirundo*), and Caspian Tern (*Hydroprogne caspia*). Similar to their assessment of waterfowl stopovers, Ewert et al. (2005) summarized information on waterbirds in the same focal area of Lake Erie. According to Wires and Cuthbert (2001) islands in the western Lake Erie basin and Saginaw Bay are important to nesting egrets in the Great Lakes region. Campbell (1968) stated that migrant Soras used dry grassy fields and wetlands of all sizes, whereas migrant Black Terns used open water >3 ha and sandbars/beaches lacking human disturbance for roosting (Knutson et al. 2001). Gulls, terns, and cormorants have been found to use areas with concentrations of small (<15 cm) fish in wetlands, river mouths, or nearshore waters. Bonaparte's Gulls (*Chroicocephalus philadelphia*), for example, have been found to feed on gizzard shad (*Dorosoma cepedianum*; Anderson et al. 2002) and emerald shiners (*Notropis atherinoides*) during fall migration (Campbell 1968). Stepanian and Waite (2003) found that Ring-billed Gulls (*Larus delawarensis*) and Bonaparte's Gulls spent equivalent amounts of time in four aquatic habitats: immediately offshore of refuges, developed shorelines, open water >10 m deep, and reefs and shoals of 3-6 m water depth. When compared to Double-crested Cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), which were found less frequently over open water compared to other habitats, Herring Gulls (*Larus argentatus*) frequently used areas 0.5-0.8 km offshore of refuges. When studying waterbirds in the Mid-Atlantic island archipelago of Azores, Amorim et al. (2009) found Common Terns to be closer to islands and in more shallow waters. Due to a potential sensitivity to disturbance, Rodgers and Schwikert (2000) suggested the following buffers: approximately 250 m for airboat activity near cormorants and 100 m for other waterbirds (Rodgers and Smith 1997). They also suggested a 140-m buffer for gulls and terns when using personal watercraft and outboard motors (Rodgers and Schwikert 2000).

Wind Energy, Waterfowl, and Waterbirds

Exo et al. (2003) expressed the following concerns regarding how offshore wind turbines could effect birds: collision risk, short-term habitat loss and disturbance during construction of the wind farm, more long-term habitat loss due to the presence of turbines and the related boating activities, migration and movement barriers, and fragmentation of use areas (e.g., roosting and feeding). They suggested that these issues be considered in an integrated manner, but noted a lack of useful data to make this possible (Exo et al. 2003). We currently have more information regarding onshore than offshore wind farms, but as previously mentioned, onshore wind energy impacts cannot always be directly compared to offshore wind energy impacts. However, some similarities are present. With both onshore and offshore turbines, studies have determined that bird fatalities are most related to the location of the turbine in relation to landscape features and the frequency of use of that area by birds (Barrios and Rodriguez 2004). Smallwood and Karas (2008) found that some bird (and bat) fatalities increased after older turbines were replaced with more contemporary turbines. For waterbirds detected (Pied-billed Grebe [*Podilymbus podiceps*], gulls, and Mallard) these changes in fatalities were not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). In a larger analysis, Barclay et al. (2007) found that although bat fatalities increased with taller turbines and larger rotor swept areas, bird fatalities did not. This supports that location may be a more important variable in determining the level of impact to bird populations.

With waterfowl, most researchers suggest that displacement from habitats and movement barriers is more of a concern than collisions with turbines (Fox and Nilsson 2005). Eriksson and Peterson (2005) concluded that the fatality risk to seabirds passing through or near to offshore wind farms was only one in 100,000. Desholm et al. (2006) studied offshore wind farms in Denmark. Using thermal imaging and modeling he estimated a collision rate of 1.4 Common Eiders (*Somateria mollissima*) per turbine per year. These birds also demonstrated a high ability to avoid turbines, especially in clear weather. Of 235,136 migrating sea ducks, only 47 individuals were predicted to collide with turbine rotor-blades, an overall mean collision risk of approximately 0.02%. Sea ducks avoided wind farms in many ways, including avoiding the farm completely, flying between turbines, flying above turbines, and cutting through the edges of the wind farms, thereby minimizing time spent at risk of collision. He stated that this fatality rate is relatively low compared to the approximate 70,000 Common Eiders shot and killed by

Danish hunters every year. Desholm et al. (2006) used avoidance behavior rates and built a stochastic model framework to estimate duck fatality rates. He suggested that this be incorporated into standard management procedures for estimating risk to birds and bats at both onshore and offshore wind farms.

Identifying those species most vulnerable to wind farm collisions is a challenge as it includes many biological variables, such as local migration densities, population size, flight altitude, avoidance behavior, and demographic vulnerability to wind farm related mortality. Desholm et al. (2006) developed a general framework to categorize species according to their relative vulnerability to wind farm-related mortality. This categorization will help resource managers prioritize management and mitigation efforts. Specifically, Desholm et al. (2006) developed an Environmental Vulnerability Index (EVI). The EVI includes an abundance and demographic vulnerability indicator. These two indicators are thought to capture the vulnerability of migrating birds to wind farm related mortality. Desholm et al. (2006) used the Nysted offshore wind farm as a case-study. In general, large-bodied and long-lived species tended to be the most vulnerable.

Similarly, Chamberlain et al. (2006) conducted sensitivity analyses on the variables affecting overall fatality rates. They examined many variables, including but not limited to, size and speed of the turbine, and size, speed, and flight behavior of the bird, and found that the birds' avoidance rates were the most important variables. Small changes in avoidance rates can lead to large increases in the percent of birds suffering fatalities at wind farms. Avoidance rates should be generated in a diversity of conditions (i.e., weather, season, temporal, and spatial). Currently avoidance rates are rarely incorporated into estimates of fatality rates at proposed wind farms. The authors suggest that this needs to change for more accurate estimates and subsequent management decisions (Chamberlain et al. 2006). Collision rates would likely be more of an issue for long-lived species with low reproductive rates, as wind farm related deaths would more likely be additive instead of compensatory.

The subject of avoidance and displacement has been the focus of several studies. Winkleman (1990) found that birds were more hesitant to approach turbines in the dark and estimated that 1

of 76 birds passing through the turbines at night suffers a collision. Winkleman (1992) suggested that because turbines on the edges of wind farms are more likely to cause collisions, turbines should be clustered to minimize the edge effect. This is also consistent with the Winklemen (1994) finding of a 95% reduction in bird numbers within 250-500 m of the nearest turbine. Similarly, he found that 13% of migrating flocks of birds showed a turbine-related change in flight behavior (Winkleman 1985). Stewart et al. (2007) evaluated existing data for bird abundance declines in relation to the construction of onshore wind farms. They found that, although populations in different locations varied, the family Anseriformes (ducks and geese) had the greatest declines and Charadriiformes (gulls, shorebirds, waterbirds) the second greatest declines. This could be linked to displacement of birds away from wind farms. Abundance declines increased over time since wind farm construction, but the turbine number and turbine size (correlated with the author's use of the word "power") had little to no effect on the declines (Stewart et al. 2007). The fact that declines continued and increased over time suggests that Anseriformes and Charadriiformes do not adapt or habituate to the presence of turbines. Similarly, Benitez-Lopez et al. (2010) used meta-analysis to examine the relationship between bird abundance and mammal abundance and road infrastructure. They found that bird populations were affected for approximately 1 km from the infrastructure and mammals were affected for approximately 5 km. Smallwood et al. (2009) determined that the majority of Mallards and gulls flew >50 m away from onshore turbines in the Altamont and were not documented flying through the rotor swept zone of turbines. However, Great Blue Herons fly <50 m from turbines with some flight through the rotor swept zone.

Desholm and Kahlert (2005) found that Common Eiders changed their flight trajectory upon observation of the turbines at an average of 3 km away from the structures. This avoidance behavior was enough to prevent all but 1% of the ducks and geese to fly close enough to the turbines to be at risk (Figure 1). Similarly, Larsen and Guiilemette (2007) used sea duck decoys to study the response of Common Eiders to wind turbines that were moving and turbines that were stationary. They found that eiders avoided turbines and changed their flight paths regardless of whether the turbines were turning or stationary.

Figure 1. Radar registrations from the Nysted offshore wind farm applied on a GIS-platform. Red dots indicate individual wind turbines, green area the land, green dot the siting of the radar, and black lines migrating waterbird flocks determined visually at the Nysted offshore wind farm (from Kahlert *et al.* 2004 in Desholm and Kahlert 2005).

Masden et al. (2010) considered the energetics of waterfowl and waterbirds avoiding a wind farm and suggested that these types of estimates need to be addressed a species level. For example, those species with high wing loading were more energetically challenged by avoiding wind farms than were low wing loading species. In addition, the frequent flights of terns made them a high risk species for negative energetic impacts due to avoidance of wind turbines. The specific biology of each species needs to be considered when estimating the impact of a wind farm.

Most studies have found low fatality rates for waterfowl in general, but relatively high avoidance rates of wind turbines (Winkelman 1995, Erickson et al. 2002). Jain (2005) studied the response of Canada Geese (*Branta canadensis*) to the presence of wind turbines in their onshore foraging habitats. Although he found no collision fatalities of geese, he also found minimal avoidance of the feeding fields with turbines. Geese were observed flying above and between the turbines,

typically avoiding them by 40-50 m. Jain (2005) suggested that avoidance may have been detected if the study had been continued for longer than 2 seasons. Jain (2005) suggested that turbines placed closer together formed more of a barrier to waterfowl than turbines placed farther apart from one another. He also suggested that habituation to the turbines could be taking place. Larsen and Madsen (2000) detected significant avoidance by Pink-footed Geese (*Anser brachyrhynchus*) of onshore foraging areas near turbines by at least 100 m. Upon revisiting this research, Madsen and Boertmann (2008) determined that geese were habituating to the presence of the wind farm and were often 2 times as close to the structures than they had been almost a decade earlier.

Some birds may actually be drawn into the turbines for foraging or perching. Petersen et al. (2004) documented an increase in Herring Gull and tern use in offshore wind farm areas and cormorants (*Phalacrocorax carbo*) used the maintenance platforms for loafing (Kahlert et al. 2004). These piscivorous species could also be responding to an increase in fish populations related to the novel artificial reef structures of the turbines and related infrastructure.

Modeling has been used at times to estimate impacts and prioritize conservation efforts. For example, Carrete et al. (2009) used modeling to demonstrate that wind turbine related fatalities were negatively impacting populations of the endangered Egyptian vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*). Another landscape planning and modeling effort was undertaken by Garthe and Hupop (2004). The authors developed Wind Farm Sensitivity Indices (WSIs) that were based on accumulations of Species Sensitivity Indices (SSIs). The SSIs were determined for the seabirds expected to be found in the area of potential offshore wind energy development. They were based on 9 factors: flight maneuverability, flight altitude, percentage of time flying, nocturnal flight behavior, sensitivity to ship and helicopter traffic, habitat plasticity, biogeographic population size, adult survival rate, and European threat and conservation status. Once the SSIs were applied to the landscape via the WSIs, the authors determined that nearshore areas were more vulnerable than offshore areas. They suggest that this be applied at a large scale to help guide resource managers and decision makers in the early stages of wind farm planning.

More land-use focused, Eichhorn and Drechsler (2010) proposed using Pareto-optimal land use scenarios (the so-called efficiency frontier; e.g., Polasky et al. 2008) to determine prime locations for turbines that minimized negative impacts on humans and wildlife. These variables are considered to be at opposite ends of the spectrum as humans want turbines located away from their settlements and these more remote areas are often important to wildlife. Many important variables were left out of the model, which significantly reduces its value. However, the framework may be valuable in the future.

Minimization of wildlife-turbine collisions and mitigation are summarized in Drewitt and Langston (2008). They state that siting the location of the wind farm away from high use areas or away from sensitive species is the most important variable. Once a wind farm is constructed, they list blade feathering and turbine shut-downs as possible short-term methods of reducing collisions. These techniques can be automated to occur when radar detects large numbers of birds or bats flying through the area, during sensitive times of the year (migration), sensitive times of the day (nights), or during high-risk weather conditions (fog/low visibility). These options include potentially significant impacts to the energy production of the wind farm and hence to the financial profit. Therefore, these techniques may not be readily adopted nor supported by the wind energy industry. Appropriate micro-siting can also be helpful in reducing wildlife fatalities.

Placing turbines as close to one another as possible may encourage wildlife to go around the wind farm instead of through it (Winkleman 1992). Incorporating travel corridors through the wind farms may funnel wildlife through safe pathways. Although wind speed is often greater at the edge of outcroppings and cliffs, birds often use these strong winds for migration and hunting. Therefore, it may decrease collisions if turbines are set back from the edges of cliffs and outcroppings (Johnson et al. 2000, 2007). Decreasing the attraction to turbines via minimization of lighting (Gehring et al. 2009) and small mammal (i.e., prey) densities (Smallwood and Thelander 2004) is important and some have suggested increasing the visibility of the turbine blades using UV paint (Johnson et al. 2007).

Huppop et al. (2006) examined bird movement offshore of Germany. They used radar and thermal imaging to track the migration and movement paths of birds. They determined that the several million birds that cross these seas twice per year can be at risk of wind farm collisions as they are flying in what would be the rotor swept area if the wind farm is constructed. They recommended several things to help mitigate losses and reduce the risk to birds. First, refrain from building wind farms in areas with dense migration levels. Second, micro-siting of the wind farm should include plans to align the turbines in rows parallel to the migration directions. Third, ensure travel corridors several km wide between the separate wind farms. Forth, avoid placing wind farms between bird feeding and roosting sites to minimize collision risk. Fifth, monitor weather conditions and maintain the ability to feather the blades if the level of risk to birds is dramatically higher than normal. Sixth, minimize external lighting or light with only blinking lights. Seventh, make turbine blades more visible to birds but do not light and cause attraction to the site.

Research Needs

"Although areas where birds migrate through or concentrate seasonal activities are generally known, the specific timing, routes, and altitudes of movement within and between resting and foraging areas and altitudes that migrants use are poorly known, and such information is needed to conduct assessments of the potential risk to birds from offshore wind developments" (Arnett et al. 2007). Similarly, the Sea Duck Joint Venture (2007) suggested that sea ducks are under monitored and similar data need to be collected. Camphuysen et al. (2004) suggested that the following variables be sought when collecting and analyzing seabird data in an effort to reduce fatalities from wind turbines: seabird abundance, migratory pathways, foraging areas, factors explaining seabird distribution and abundance, variability in spatial and temporal patterns (seasonal, diurnal, and spatial), and the evaluation of collision risks.

Desholm et al. (2006) reviewed the different types of remote sensing data (radar, thermal imaging, etc.) that may be useful when studying the collision and avoidance rates of birds at offshore wind farms. Desholm (2009) suggested that most current methods of estimating fatality rates would be more accurate and useful if the variable of avoidance was included. Although

estimating an individual's ability to avoid turbines requires intense research at the species level, Desholm (2009) still emphasized its necessity.

In addition to collecting data via surveys and observations, Camphuysen (2004) suggested that "using spatial and temporal modeling techniques to estimate bird density over certain areas of open sea offers the best method for statistically detecting differences in the distribution and abundance of these birds before, during, and post-construction of offshore wind farms." Future research also needs to consider quantification of the effects of stopover habitat loss and movement barriers at a species level. In addition, we need to understand how the frequent motorized traffic to and from offshore wind sites might affect waterbirds. It may be possible to develop and use individual-based models to determine the effects of these issues (West and Caldow 2006).

When developing a site specific Environmental Impact Statement or when estimating the potential impacts of a specific wind farm (offshore or onshore), Fox et al. (2006) suggested several important variables to address relative to local wildlife populations. Specifically, the background information search should address the species present and how are they are distributed in the area temporally and spatially. It is also important to understand the behavior (including fight height) and overall abundance of wildlife populations. Specifically, avoidance and displacement behaviors, as these can affect the energy budgets, life cycles, nest productivity and success, and habitat available to individuals and populations (Fox et al. 2006).

Maclean et al. (2007) evaluated the possibility of conducting population viability indices on the waterfowl using areas near offshore wind farms in Denmark. They found that in most cases enough information was available to conduct the analysis that would be helpful to determine potential impacts of offshore wind farms on their populations. Similar background work should be done for the species likely to be impacted by offshore wind energy development in the Great Lakes region.

In Europe, offshore wind farms expected to impact birds are required to complete a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and an Environmental Impact Assessment. The SEA involves

mapping waterbird densities to determine important breeding and feeding areas that may be sensitive to wind development. Much of this can be done using radar ornithology, but more direct observation needs to be used for species identification and documentation of avoidance behavior (Fox et al. 2006). These data, combined with collision risk data and habitat loss, can be incorporated into models that estimate the cumulative impacts and energetic costs of offshore wind farms. Currently, we lack enough data to effectively build these models and emphasis should be placed on collecting those data (Fox et al. 2006). The authors suggested a before/after control/impact comparative study design for studies for more accurate interpretations. Our study includes some of the initial steps to building these models. Additionally, Fox et al. (2006) suggested that research use standardized methods for better comparisons among studies, share experience and data as much as possible for both pre-construction and post-construction studies, and test predictions using post-construction collision and displacement data. The steering group Collaborative Offshore Wind Research into the Environment (COWRIE) has initiatives to address most of these issues.

METHODS

Existing Waterfowl and Waterbird Data

We examined data from existing sources to inform potential future wind development on Saginaw Bay. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) conducts several surveys on an annual basis: (1) fall weekly waterfowl surveys at wildlife areas managed for waterfowl; (2) Coordinated November Canvasback Inventory; and (3) Midwinter Waterfowl Survey. Fall weekly surveys are conducted at wildlife areas managed intensively for waterfowl, with Fish Point and Nayanquing Point being the only areas surveyed on Saginaw Bay. The Coordinated November Canvasback Inventory is a cooperative North American survey conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Canadian Wildlife Service, and state agencies since 1974 (Cordts 2010). Surveys in Michigan are done using fixed-wing aircraft. Although detailed locations of the Saginaw Bay survey route are not available, surveys tend to be focused near the shoreline. The Midwinter Waterfowl Survey is an annual survey conducted by state agencies and the FWS since 1935. Surveys are conducted during the first week of January and the methods used vary across the County, but Michigan typically uses ground surveys.

In addition to surveys completed by the MDNR, we summarized data from aerial surveys conducted by the MNFI in 2006-2007 for a study of diked and undiked coastal wetlands (Figure 1; Monfils 2009). We compiled data from the MNFI surveys into the following taxonomic groups, due to similarities in habitat usage, food resources, and foraging strategies: (1) swans (genus *Cygnus*); (2) geese (genera *Anser*, *Chen*, and *Branta*); (3) dabbling ducks (genus *Anas* and Wood Duck); (3) diving ducks (genus *Aythya* and Ruddy Duck [*Oxyura jamaicensis*]); (4) sea ducks (eiders, scoters, mergansers, goldeneyes, and Long-tailed Duck); and (5) waterbirds (Great Blue Heron, Great Egret, Double-crested cormorant, and American Coot [*Fulica americana*]). Although Ruddy Duck is a member of the stiff-tail duck subfamily Oxyurinae, we combined it with the diving duck group because it often uses similar habitats.

Figure 2. Transects used during aerial waterfowl and waterbird surveys conducted by the Michigan Natural Features Inventory on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron in 2006 and 2007. Abbreviations indicate the general location (FPT = Fish Point; NPT = Nayanquing Point; PIN = Pinconning; TOB = Tobico Marsh; WIG = Wigwam Bay; and WIL = Wildfowl Bay) and transect number.

Aerial Surveys

We conducted low-level aerial waterfowl surveys in fall 2010, spring 2011, fall 2011, and spring 2012 along a system of parallel transects placed systematically across Saginaw Bay with a random starting point. We alternated between two sets of 12 transects each (transects A-L and M-X; Figure 2) during surveys to maximize coverage of Saginaw Bay and minimize the chance of double-counting birds. For example, during the first survey we used transects A-L, then transects M-X during survey two, back to transects A-L for the third survey, and so on. Transects within a given set were 5 km apart, thus 2.5 km separated the full set of 24 transects (Figure 2). Camphuysen et al. (2004) recommended transects for seabird surveys be separated by at least 2 km to avoid double counting. Because there is substantial variation in migrant waterfowl and waterbird numbers across a given season, our goal was to conduct at least three

surveys during the fall (mid October – mid November) and spring (early March – late April) migration periods.


Figure 3. Study design used during aerial waterfowl and waterbird surveys conducted by the Michigan Natural Features Inventory on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during 2010-2012. Identifiers indicate transect (letter) and segment number. One set of transects (A – L or M – X) was covered during a given survey and we rotated between sets each survey.

We conducted surveys in the morning using a Partenavia P68C twin-engine fixed-wing aircraft. Surveys were flown at approximately 91 m (300 ft) at speeds of 130-200 km/hr (80-125 mph). We used four distance bands to estimate perpendicular distances of bird groups from the transects: two 100-m bands, a 200-m band, and an open-ended outer band (Figure 3). These distances were used to approximate bird group locations and create GIS data layers and could be used to estimate bird densities that incorporate imperfect detection (Buckland et al. 2001). We marked the boundaries of the distance bands on the aircraft windows using a clinometer and appropriate angles for our elevation. For each flock or individual bird, we recorded the species, number observed, latitude and longitude (using GPS equipment), and the distance band in which it occurred. We also recorded the locations of hunting parties and fishing vessels (both sport and commercial) for future analyses, because human activities are likely to influence the locations of birds. Geospatial data were recorded using a TDS Nomad handheld computer and Garmin 10 GPS receiver or a Columbus V-900 GPS data logger. Voice data were collected with Nomad units, digital voice recorders, or Columbus data loggers.

Figure 4. Distance bands used to estimate perpendicular distances of bird groups from transects during 2010-2012 aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron.

We summarized data from our 2010-2012 aerial surveys using the same groups used for the 2006-2007 MNFI surveys, except that we combined geese and swans due to similar habitat usage. We also counted all waterbirds observed, including herons, egrets, American Coot, gulls, and terns. We estimated raw densities (birds per ha) within each segment assuming a maximum survey distance of 1,250 m on either side of the transect. We hope to refine these density estimates at a later date using distance sampling (Buckland et al. 2001) to account for decreasing probability of detection as distance increases. We approximated geographic locations of bird observations using latitude and longitude coordinates recorded with GPS units in the aircraft that

were adjusted using the midpoints of the recorded distance bands. We used 860 m on either side of the aircraft as the approximate midpoint of the unlimited distance band D (Figure 3), which was calculated by using the midpoint between adjacent transects (i.e., 1,250 m perpendicular from either side of the transect line) as the outer edge of the band.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Existing Waterfowl and Waterbird Data

We compiled data from previous surveys conducted by the MDNR and MNFI. The MDNR conducts weekly waterfowl surveys at state wildlife areas intensively managed for waterfowl. Data are available for two areas on Saginaw Bay: Fish Point State Wildlife Area and Nayanquing Point State Wildlife Area. We summarized data gathered at these sites during the 2006-2011 seasons. These data provide useful information on waterfowl use of these areas and migration timing (Figure 4). Data are collected for all waterfowl species on a weekly basis throughout the hunting season and are available online (http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-153-10363_10859-151581--,00.html). Ducks made up 88% of the waterfowl observed at Fish Point and 98% of the birds recorded at Nayanquing Point. On average, duck numbers peaked at about 17,000 birds at Fish Point and just over 5,000 birds at Nayanquing Point in late October (Figure 4).

The Coordinated November Canvasback Inventory is an aerial survey conducted annually by the MDNR in early November as part of the cooperative North American program. This survey provides one-day counts of Canvasbacks and other waterfowl species observed at or near traditional stopover sites. Surveys on Saginaw Bay are typically focused near Wildfowl Bay, Fish Point, Tobico Marsh, and Wigwam Bay. We summarized data from the five most recent years for which data were available (2006-2010; Table 1). The total number of waterfowl observed per survey ranged from 39,300 in 2009 to 69,282 in 2010 (mean of 51,212). On average over the five-year period, Mallards represented 37.1% of the total, Redheads 18.3%, Canada Geese 13.0%, and scaup (Lesser and Greater Scaup combined) 9.9%. All other species observed made up less than 4% of the total average number observed.

Fish Point

Nayanquing Point

Figure 5. Average number of ducks, geese, and swans observed during weekly surveys conducted by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources at Fish Point and Nayanquing Point State Wildlife Areas during 2006-2011.

Table 1. Average number of birds observed by species and survey location during aerial November Canvasback surveys conducted by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources on Saginaw Bay, 2006-2010.

SPECIES	Wildfowl Bay	Lookout Pt. - Nayanquing Pt.	Wigwam Bay Diked	NayanquingPt. Refuge	Nayanquing Pt. - Fish Pt.	Tobico Marsh	Fish Pt. Refuge	Total
American Black Duck	127	184	8	221	237	40	1,080	1,897
American Coot	58	0	0	0	50	0	0	108
American Wigeon	0	2	0	0	0	160	0	162
Bufflehead	4	12	0	0	32	0	0	48
Canada Goose	136	1,030	0	0	2,874	990	2,620	7,650
Canvasback	106	22	0	0	870	0	10	1,008
Common Goldeneye	7	40	0	0	192	0	0	239
Gadwall	3	5	0	0	0	130	140	279
Green-winged Teal	37	26	2	50	0	330	820	1,265
Long-tailed Duck	0	140	0	0	0	0	0	140
Mallard	784	720	47	2,254	1,114	2,100	12,000	19,019
Mergansers	42	114	0	0	1,458	40	0	1,654
Mute Swan	9	188	0	0	26	58	0	281
Northern Pintail	34	10	0	5	25	60	46	180
Redhead	7,793	1,934	0	0	1,186	0	0	10,913
Ring-necked Duck	302	2	0	0	20	102	0	426
Scaup	389	721	6	0	3,419	500	0	5,035
Snow Goose	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Tundra Swan	23	104	0	0	357	0	0	484
Unknown Duck	52	29	1	540	44	600	1,600	2,866
Wood Duck	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

We examined data from the Midwinter Waterfowl Survey for 2010 and 2011, but little data were available for Saginaw Bay. The Midwinter Survey is typically conducted in January and February. For Saginaw Bay, surveys were conducted on the ground and were limited to sites with open water, such as ponds at D.E. Karn/J.C. Weadock Power Generating Plant located at the mouth of the Saginaw River on portions of Saginaw Bay. A total of 605 birds were observed in 2011, consisting of 425 Mallards, 50 American Black Duck (*Anas rubripes*), 50 Canada geese, 50 Common Mergansers, and 30 Common Goldeneyes. In 2010, 4,925 birds were recorded at the power plant and in open water near the Middle Grounds (Wildfowl Bay). The total consisted of 3,075 unidentified ducks, 1,000 Common Goldeneyes, 650 Mallards, 75 Canada Geese, 55 Mute Swans (*Cygnus olor*), 30 Common Mergansers, 25 American Black Ducks, and 15 Red-breasted Mergansers. Although this survey provides information on waterfowl wintering use of the Bay, the data are probably of limited value to offshore wind development planning.

Aerial surveys conducted by the MNFI in 2006-2007 provide additional information on waterfowl and waterbird use of the Saginaw Bay shoreline during spring, late summer, and early fall (Table 2). Transects covered several undiked marshes along the shoreline and adjacent diked wetlands located primarily within state wildlife areas (Figure 1; see Monfils 2009 for detailed descriptions of study areas). Dabbling ducks were the most abundant bird group observed during surveys across all survey periods (Table 2; Monfils 2009). Canada goose was the next most common taxa observed during spring and early fall surveys, whereas waterbirds was the second most common bird group detected during late summer surveys. Fall surveys ended before numbers of diving and sea ducks typically peak. Along with fall surveys conducted by the MDNR, the MNFI data provide information on nearshore waterfowl and waterbird use on Saginaw Bay and highlight the lack of data on offshore bird use.

Table 2. Summary results of aerial surveys conducted by the Michigan Natural Features Inventory on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron, in 2006 and 2007 by transect and survey period.

Bird Variable	Transect[1]	Spring (n = 5)			Late Summer (n = 5)			Early Fall (n = 3)		
		Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density
Total Waterfowl	FPT1	74	347	2.19	52	537	2.33	83	580	5.45
	FPT2	687	2416	4.54	86	340	0.64	42	230	0.38
	FPT3	30	196	2.23	3	152	1.31	2	49	0.49
	NPT1	60	266	3.35	1	21	0.21	10	164	1.71
	NPT2	88	322	1.58	3	44	0.18	0	19	0.09
	PIN1	236	705	1.69	8	196	0.35	282	562	1.59
	QUA1	393	1906	2.33	37	388	0.31	695	1834	2.46
	TOB1	140	568	1.96	67	130	0.55	424	688	3.44
	WIG1	101	643	3.24	5	124	0.59	37	88	0.44
	WIG2	41	190	1.14	1	9	0.03	5	44	0.20
	WIL1	573	2029	5.51	10	1008	1.84	411	1015	3.25
	WIL2	136	1931	2.10	23	194	0.43	59	148	0.35
Swans	FPT1	0	6	0.03	0	3	0.01	0	5	0.03
	FPT2	0	17	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	FPT3	0	4	0.05	0	2	0.01	0	0	0.00
	NPT1	3	10	0.16	0	12	0.09	0	6	0.06
	NPT2	1	26	0.12	0	15	0.06	0	10	0.05
	PIN1	0	30	0.04	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	QUA1	0	35	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	TOB1	13	154	0.32	32	68	0.31	53	74	0.39
	WIG1	0	2	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	6	0.02
	WIG2	0	8	0.03	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIL1	66	732	1.05	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIL2	0	250	0.20	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00

Table 2. Continued.

Bird Variable	Transect[1]	Spring (n = 5)			Late Summer (n = 5)			Early Fall (n = 3)		
		Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density
Canada Goose	FPT1	7	17	0.18	0	3	0.01	0	297	2.79
	FPT2	603	1591	3.40	0	85	0.12	0	32	0.03
	FPT3	14	24	0.43	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	NPT1	9	43	0.62	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	NPT2	8	79	0.34	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	PIN1	0	176	0.32	0	0	0.00	140	400	1.04
	QUA1	110	1252	1.09	0	278	0.13	186	378	0.56
	TOB1	2	209	0.39	0	15	0.03	0	71	0.15
	WIG1	21	450	1.93	0	31	0.05	0	2	0.01
	WIG2	5	62	0.35	0	0	0.00	0	15	0.07
	WIL1	81	1000	2.25	0	0	0.00	0	10	0.01
	WIL2	11	1362	1.15	0	0	0.00	0	30	0.03
Dabbling Ducks	FPT1	7	320	1.39	34	525	2.15	75	280	2.53
	FPT2	53	806	1.12	2	324	0.52	42	198	0.35
	FPT3	4	174	1.51	2	150	1.21	0	49	0.38
	NPT1	4	57	0.69	0	17	0.10	0	149	1.51
	NPT2	39	104	0.67	0	37	0.10	0	9	0.04
	PIN1	77	200	0.58	8	193	0.32	111	142	0.51
	QUA1	152	1063	1.19	37	187	0.18	509	1456	1.90
	TOB1	4	108	0.21	9	54	0.17	280	608	2.79
	WIG1	20	386	1.10	5	116	0.52	28	85	0.39
	WIG2	4	106	0.31	0	6	0.02	3	26	0.12
	WIL1	169	544	1.46	7	1003	1.83	399	1014	3.23
	WIL2	87	449	0.62	23	191	0.43	29	146	0.31

Table 2. Continued.

Bird Variable	Transect[1]	Spring (n = 5)			Late Summer (n = 5)			Early Fall (n = 3)		
		Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density
Diving Ducks	FPT1	2	109	0.45	0	0	0.00	0	15	0.07
	FPT2	0	2	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	FPT3	0	35	0.23	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	NPT1	6	125	1.40	0	0	0.00	0	13	0.10
	NPT2	0	220	0.44	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	PIN1	48	447	0.61	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	QUA1	0	28	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	TOB1	42	214	0.73	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIG1	0	36	0.12	0	0	0.00	0	8	0.02
	WIG2	10	55	0.35	0	0	0.00	0	3	0.01
	WIL1	11	552	0.66	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIL2	0	92	0.08	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
Sea Ducks	FPT1	0	18	0.10	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	FPT2	0	10	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	FPT3	0	4	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	NPT1	0	31	0.40	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	NPT2	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	PIN1	9	55	0.11	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	QUA1	0	17	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	TOB1	37	62	0.31	0	0	0.00	0	15	0.03
	WIG1	2	11	0.05	0	1	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIG2	1	10	0.08	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIL1	0	30	0.06	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	WIL2	0	16	0.02	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00

Table 2. Continued.

Bird Variable	Transect[1]	Spring (n = 5)			Late Summer (n = 5)			Early Fall (n = 3)		
		Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density	Min. Count	Max. Count	Mean Density
Total Waterbirds	FPT1	0	20	0.07	9	43	0.37	22	42	0.47
	FPT2	0	3	0.00	4	56	0.06	18	145	0.24
	FPT3	0	3	0.02	0	43	0.28	13	29	0.44
	NPT1	0	75	0.75	4	34	0.37	0	27	0.23
	NPT2	0	14	0.03	1	22	0.08	1	24	0.12
	PIN1	0	0	0.00	3	77	0.09	3	39	0.09
	QUA1	0	6	0.00	53	617	0.43	110	145	0.28
	TOB1	0	30	0.06	3	7	0.04	7	10	0.06
	WIG1	0	2	0.00	16	62	0.32	3	21	0.11
	WIG2	0	1	0.00	0	2	0.01	0	4	0.02
	WIL1	0	100	0.12	8	25	0.06	35	44	0.17
	WIL2	0	20	0.01	3	17	0.03	3	23	0.03

[1]Abbreviations indicate the general location (FPT = Fish Point; NPT = Nayanquing Point; PIN = Pinconning; TOB = Tobico Marsh; WIG = Wigwam Bay; and WIL = Wildfowl Bay) and transect number (see Figure 1).

Aerial Surveys

We conducted 12 aerial surveys over Saginaw Bay, of which six occurred during fall (n = 4 in 2010, n = 2 in 2011) and six during spring (n = 2 in 2011, n = 4 in 2012). Fall surveys occurred between late October and early December and spring surveys were done between late March and late April. We recorded a total of 169,283 waterfowl and waterbirds during the 12 surveys (mean 14,107 birds per survey; Table 3). Our greatest single survey total was 27,476 birds on March 19, 2012. Because we attempted to record all waterfowl observed, 18.6% of the total could not be identified to species and were categorized as unknown dabbling duck, unknown diving duck, unknown sea duck, or unknown duck. Diving ducks made up the greatest percentage (43.3%) of the total birds observed, with scaup (Lesser and Greater combined) accounting for the greatest proportion (39.3%) of the diving ducks recorded. Redhead and Ring-necked Duck (*Aythya collaris*) were the second and third most common diving ducks, representing 15.6% and 7.2% of the total, respectively. Sea ducks accounted for 23.8% of the total waterfowl observed. Long-tailed Duck made up the greatest proportion of the sea ducks seen (64.8%), followed by Bufflehead (13.8%) and Common Goldeneye (10.3%). Similarly, Long-tailed Ducks were the most common sea duck recorded during aerial surveys of western Lake Michigan (Mueller et al. 2011). Canada Goose accounted for 10.2% of the total birds recorded during surveys. Dabbling ducks constituted 6.9% of the total birds recorded. Mallard was the most common dabbling duck species, making up 79.4% of the total observed, followed by American Black Duck (5.8%) and Wood Duck (1.8%). Because most of the survey time was spent away from the shoreline, it was not surprising that dabbling ducks made up a small proportion of the total waterfowl observed. We also timed surveys during the period when numbers of diving and sea ducks on Saginaw Bay were likely to peak, which precluded us from surveying species that tend to migrate earlier in the fall (e.g., Blue-winged Teal [*Anas discors*]). Dabbling ducks were the most common taxa observed along the shoreline of Saginaw Bay during 2006-2007 aerial surveys conducted in spring, late summer and early fall by MNFI (Table 2; Monfils 2009). Swans represented only 3.1% of the total birds observed.

Table 3. Total number of birds observed by taxon during aerial surveys conducted during 2010-2012 over Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron.

Bird Taxon	Year 1 (fall 2010 & spring 2011)	Year 2 (fall 2011 & spring 2012)	Total
Geese	7,832	9,481	17,313
Swans	2,001	3,234	5,235
Dabbling Ducks	5,788	5,975	11,763
Diving Ducks	40,283	33,072	73,355
Sea Ducks	12,988	27,348	40,336
Unknown Ducks	1,365	2,870	4,235
Waterbirds	6,036	11,010	17,046
Total	76,293	92,990	169,283

Waterbirds made up only 10.1% of the total birds recorded during aerial surveys. Gulls were the most commonly observed waterbirds, making up 90.0% of the total waterbirds counted. Although we did not attempt to identify gulls to species, Ring-billed Gull and Herring Gull were the most common species observed. Double-crested Cormorant was the next most common species seen (5.1%) followed by Great Egret (1.1%). Low numbers of waterbirds were expected given most of our survey time was spent offshore and surveys were timed outside of periods when many waterbirds migrate (e.g., most herons and terns migrate in early fall or late spring). Previous surveys conducted by MNFI in 2006-2007 indicate that waterbirds, such as Great Blue Heron and Great Egret, are common near the shoreline of Saginaw Bay (Table 1; Monfils 2009).

We estimated geospatial locations for 52.6% of the birds detected (40,122 birds) during year one (fall 2010 and spring 2011) and all birds detected (92,990 birds) during year two (fall 2011 and spring 2012). When data for all waterfowl taxonomic groups are combined, locations were scattered throughout Saginaw Bay, but the number of observations and total raw densities tended to be greater on transect segments closer to shore in shallower water (Figure 6). Swans, geese, and dabbling ducks tended to occur closer to shore (Figures 7 and 8) compared to other waterfowl taxa. Densities of swans, geese, and dabbling ducks also tended to be greater near the shoreline; however, densities for these taxa were low throughout the Bay. Diving duck observations appeared to be more concentrated near the shoreline (Figure 9) compared to sea duck locations (Figure 10). Diving ducks were often recorded further from shore compared to dabbling ducks, swans, and geese; however, they were observed more frequently overall. We regularly observed sea ducks throughout Saginaw Bay (Figure 10) and recorded them more frequently on transects located further from shore than other waterfowl taxa. Lott et al. (2011) similarly observed geese, swans, and dabbling ducks concentrated near the shoreline and diving ducks in deeper water during aerial surveys of Lake Erie.

We recorded waterbirds in small numbers at many locations scattered across the Bay (Figure 11). Gulls made up the majority of our observations and were regularly observed over deep water far from shore, whereas other waterbirds (e.g., cormorants, egrets) were usually seen closer to shore. Lott et al. (2011) similarly noted that gulls were widespread and detected miles from the shoreline during aerial surveys of Lake Erie. We observed large concentrations of gulls near the Saginaw River Confined Disposal Facility (Figure 11).

Figure 6. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for waterfowl observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

Figure 7. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for swans and geese observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

Figure 8. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for dabbling ducks observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

Figure 9. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for diving ducks observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

Figure 10. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for sea ducks observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

Figure 11. Approximate locations and relative abundance (left) and estimated raw density (birds per ha) by transect segment (right) for waterbirds observed during aerial surveys conducted on Saginaw Bay, Lake Huron during fall (2010 and 2011) and spring (2011 and 2012) migration. Saginaw Bay basin contours (15 m digital elevation model) are provided on the left (darker areas indicate deeper water depths).

LITERATURE CITED

Allison, T., E. Jedrey, and S. Perkins. 2008. Avian issues for-offshore wind development. Marine Technology Society Journal 42:28-38.

American Bird Conservancy. 2003. The American Bird Conservancy guide to the 500 most important bird areas in the United States: key sites for birds and birding in all 50 states. Random House, New York, New York, USA.

Amorim, P., M. Figueiredo, M. Machete, T. Morato, A. Martins, and R. Santos. 2009. Spatial variability of seabird distribution associated with environmental factors: a case study of marine Important Bird Areas in the Azores. Ices Journal of Marine Science 66:29-40.

Anderson, M., E. Durbin, T. Kemp, S. Lauer, and E. Tramer. 2002. Birds of the Toledo area. Ohio Biological Survey, Columbus.

Arnett, E. B., D. B. Inkley, and D. H. Johnson. 2007. Impacts of wind energy facilities on wildlife and wildlife habitat. The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

Barclay, R., E. Baerwald, and J. Gruver. 2007. Variation in bat and bird fatalities at wind energy facilities: assessing the effects of rotor size and tower height. Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue Canadienne De Zoologie 85:381-387.

Barrios, L., and A. Rodriguez. 2004. Behavioural and environmental correlates of soaring-bird mortality at on-shore wind turbines. Journal of Applied Ecology 41:72-81.

Bellrose, F. C. 1980. Ducks, geese, and swans of North America. Stackpole Books, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, USA.

Benitez-Lopez, A., R. Alkemade, and P. Verweij. 2010. The impacts of roads and other infrastructure on mammal and bird populations: A meta-analysis. Biological

Conservation, 143:1307-1316.

Bookhout, T. A., K. E. Bednarik, and R. W. Kroll. 1989. The Great Lakes marshes. Pages 131-156 in L.M. Smith, R.L. Pederson, and R.M. Kaminski, editors. Habitat management for migrating and wintering waterfowl in North America. Texas Tech University Press, Lubbock, USA.

Buckland, S. T., D. R. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, J. L. Laake, D. L. Borchers, and L. Thomas. 2001. Introduction to distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Campbell, L. 1968. Birds of the Toledo area. Toledo Blade Company, Toledo, Ohio.

Camphuysen, K., T. Fox, M. Leopold, and K. Petersen. 2004. Towards standardised seabirds at sea census techniques in connection with environmental impact assessments for offshore wind farms in the U.K. Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, report submitted to Collaborative Offshore Windfarm Research Into the Environment (BAM – 02-2002).

Carrete, M., J. Sanchez-Zapata, J. Benitez, M. Lobon, and J. Donazar. 2009. Large scale risk-assessment of wind-farms on population viability of a globally endangered long-lived raptor. Biological Conservation 142:2954-2961.

Chamberlain, D. E., M. R. Rehfisch, A. D. Fox, M. Desholm, and S. Anthony. 2006. The effect of avoidance rates on bird mortality predictions made by wind turbine collision risk models. Ibis 148:198-202.

Cordts, S. 2011. Coordinated November Canvasback Inventory – 2010. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Custer, C. M. and T. W. Custer. 1996. Food habits of diving ducks in the Great Lakes after the zebra mussel invasion. Journal of Field Ornithology 67:86-99.

Dennis, D. G., and R. E. Chandler. 1974. Waterfowl use of the Ontario shorelines of the southern Great Lakes during migration. Pages 58-65. *In* Canadian Wildlife Service waterfowl studies in eastern Canada, 1969-73 (H. Boyd, ed.). Canadian Wildlife Service Report Series No. 29.

Desholm, M., and J. Kahlert. 2005. Avian collision risk at an offshore wind farm. Biology Letters 1: 296–298.

Desholm, M., A. Fox, P. Beasley, and J. Kahlert. 2006. Remote techniques for counting and estimating the number of bird-wind turbine collisions at sea: a review. Ibis 148:76-89.

Desholm, M. 2009. Avian sensitivity to mortality: prioritizing migratory bird species for assessment at proposed wind farms. Journal of Environmental Management 90:2672-2679.

Drewitt, A., and R. Langston. 2008. Collision effects of wind-power generators and other obstacles on birds. Year in Ecology and Conservation Biology 1134:233-266.

Eagle, A. C., E. M. Hay-Chmielewski, K. T. Cleveland, A. L. Derosier, M. E. Herbert, and R. A. Rustem, editors. 2005. Michigan's wildlife action plan. Michigan Department of Natural Resources. Lansing, USA. <http://www.michigan.gov/dnrwildlifeactionplan>. Accessed 13 February 2009.

Eichhorn, M., and M. Drechsler. 2010. Spatial trade-offs between wind power production and bird collision avoidance in agricultural landscapes. Ecology and Society 15. <http://apps.isiknowledge.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/full_record.do?product=WOS&search _mode=GeneralSearch&qid=57&SID=2AOAbOPa6heG7IkIA5b&page=1&doc=1>

Erickson, W. P., G. D. Johnson, D. P. Young, M. D. Strickland, R. E. Good, M. Bourassa, K. Bay, and K. Sernka. 2002. Synthesis and comparison of baseline avian and bat use, raptor nesting and mortality information from proposed and existing wind developments. West, Inc., Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Ewert, D. N., G. J. Soulliere, R. D. Macleod, M. C. Shieldcastle, P. G. Rodewald, E. Fujimura, J. Shieldcastle, and R. J. Gates. 2005. Migratory bird stopover site attributes in the western Lake Erie basin. Final report to The George Gund Foundation.

Exo, K. M., O. Hüppop, and S. Garthe. 2003. Birds and offshore wind facilities: a hot topic in marine ecology. Wader Study Group Bulletin 100:50–53.

Fox, A., M. Desholm, J. Kahlert, T. Christensen, and I. Petersen. 2006. Information needs to support environmental impact assessment of the effects of European marine offshore wind farms on birds. Ibis 148:129-144.

Garthe, S, and O. Huppop. 2004. Scaling possible adverse effects of marine wind farms on seabirds: developing and applying a vulnerability index. Journal of Applied Ecology 41:724-734.

Garthe, S., N. Markones, O. Huppop, and S. Adler. 2009. Effects of hydrographic and meteorological factors on seasonal seabird abundance in the southern North Sea. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 391:243-255.

Gehring, J. L., P. Kerlinger, and A. Manville. 2009. Communication towers, lights, and birds: successful methods of reducing the frequency of avian collisions. Ecological Applications 19:505-514.

Great Lakes Basin Commission. 1975. Great Lakes Basin framework study. U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

Hamilton, D. J., and C. D. Ankney. 1994. Consumption of zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha* by diving ducks in Lakes Erie and St. Clair. Wildfowl 45:159-166.

Hüppop, O., J. Dierschke, K. Exo, E. Fredrich, and R. Hill. 2006. Bird migration studies and potential collision risk with offshore wind turbines. Ibis 148:90-109.

Jain, A. A. 2005. Bird and bat behavior and mortality at a northern Iowa windfarm. Thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, USA.

Johnson, G. D.,W. P. Erickson, and M. D. Strickland. 2000. Avian monitoring studies at the Buffalo Ridge Wind Resource Area, Minnesota: Results of a 4-year study. West Inc. Final report submitted to Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.

Johnson et al. 2007. Use of data to develop mitigation measures for wind power development impacts to birds. Pages 241–257 *In* Birds and Wind Farms: Risk Assessment and Mitigation (M. de Lucas, G.F.E. Janss, and M. Ferrer, eds.). Quercus, Madrid.

Kahlert, J., I. K. Petersen, A. D. Fox, M. Desholm, and I. Clausager. 2004. Investigations of birds during construction and operation of Nysted Offshore Wind Farm at Rødsand, Annual Status Report 2003. National Environmental Research Institute Report Commissioned by Energi E2 A/S. Rønde: NERI. <http://uk.nystedhavmoellepark.dk/upload/pdf/Birds2003.pdf>.

Knapton, R. W., S. A. Petrie, and G. Herring. 2000. Human disturbance of diving ducks on Long Point Bay, Lake Erie. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:923-930.

Knutson, M. G., G. Butcher, J. Fitzgerald, and J. Shieldcastle. 2001. Partners in Flight bird conservation plan for the upper Great Lakes Plain (Physiographic Area 16). U.S. Geological Service, Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center in cooperation with Partners in Flight, La Crosse, Wisconsin, USA.

Larsen, J. K., and J. Madsen. 2000. Effects of wind turbines and other physical elements on field utilization by pink-footed geese (*Anser brachyrhynchus*): a landscape perspective. Landscape Ecology 15:755-764.

Larsen, J., and M. Guillemette. 2007. Effects of wind turbines on flight behaviour of wintering common eiders: implications for habitat use and collision risk. Journal of Applied Ecology 44:516-522.

Lott, K., M. Seymour, and R. Russell. 2011. Mapping pelagic bird distribution and abundance as a decision-making tool for offshore wind turbine development and conservation planning. Report to funders.

Maclean, I. M. D., M. Frederiksen, and M. M. Rehfisch. 2007. Potential use of population viability analysis to assess the impact of offshore windfarms on bird populations. COWRIE PVA-03-07. <http://www.offshorewind.co.uk/Assets/FINAL_COWRIE_PVA-03-07_04.11.07.pdf>.

Madsen, J., and D. Boertmann. 2008. Animal behavioral adaptation to changing landscapes: spring-staging geese habituate to wind farms. Landscape Ecology 23:1007-1011.

Masden, E. A., D. T. Haydon, A. D. Fox, and R. W. Furness. 2010. Barriers to movement: modeling energetic costs of avoiding marine wind farms amongst breeding seabirds. Marine Pollution Bulletin 60:1085-1091.

Mikinetics Consulting, LLC and Private Sector Consultants, Inc. 2009. Report of the Michigan Great Lakes Wind Council. Report to Gov. Granholm. <http://www.michiganglowcouncil.org/GLOW%20Report%209-1-09_FINAL.pdf>.

Monfils, M. J. 2009. Bird use of diked and undiked coastal wetlands in Michigan. Dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA.

Petersen, I. K., I. Clausager, and T. K. Christensen. 2004. Bird numbers and distribution in the Horns Rev Offshore Wind Farm Area. NERI report. Rønde: National Environmental Research Institute. <http://www.hornsrev.dk/Miljoeforhold/miljoerapporter/Bird_numbers_2003%20status_report.pdf>.

Mueller, W., N. Cutright, and N. Seefelt. 2011. Coordinated bird monitoring: aerial avian surveys of western Lake Michigan 2010-2011. Report to funders.

North American Waterfowl Management Plan. 2004. North American waterfowl management plan: strengthening the biological foundation (Implementation Framework). U.S. DOI, Fish and Wildlife Service and Environment Canada, Canadian Wildlife Service.

Peterson, C. 2011. Risks to birds and wildlife from offshore wind farms: BOEMRE NC Task

Force. <http://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/State-Activities/ RiskBirdsWildlife Offshore.aspx>.

Polasky, S., E. Nelson, J. Camm, B. Csuti, P. Fackler, E. Lonsdorf, C. Montgomery, D. White, J. Arthur, B. Graber-Yonts, R. Haight, J. Kagan, A. Starfield, and C. Tobalske. 2008. Where to put things? Spatial land management to sustain biodiversity and economic returns. Biological Conservation 141:1505–1524.

Prince, H. H., P. I. Padding, and R. W. Knapton. 1992. Waterfowl use of the Laurentian Great Lakes. Journal Great Lakes Research 18:673-699.

Rodgers, J. A. and H. T. Smith. 1997. Buffer zone distances to protect foraging and loafing waterbirds from human disturbance in Florida. Wildlife Society Bulletin 25:139-145.

Rodgers, J. A. and S. T. Schwikert. 2000. Buffer-zone distances to protect foraging and loafing waterbirds from disturbance by personal watercraft and outboard-powered boats. Conservation Biology 16:216-224.

Sea Duck Joint Venture. 2007. Recommendations for monitoring distribution, abundance, and trends for North American Sea Ducks. Report produced by the Sea Duck Joint Venture. <http://seaduckjv.org>.

Smallwood, K. S., and B. Karas. 2009. Avian and bat fatality rates at old-generation and repowered wind turbines in California. Journal of Wildlife Management 73:1062-1071.

Smallwood, K., L. Rugge, and M. Morrison. 2009. Influence of behavior on bird mortality in wind energy developments. Journal of Wildlife Management 73:1082-1098.

Smallwood, K. S., and C. G. Thelander. 2004. Developing methods to reduce mortality in the Altamont Pass Wind Resource Area. Final report by BioResource Consultants to the California Energy Commission, Public Interest Energy Research 500-04-052.

Stepanian, M. A. and T. A. Waite. 2003. Species density of waterbirds in offshore habitats in western Lake Erie. Journal of Field Ornithology 74:381-393.

Stewart, G., A. Pullin, and C. Coles. 2007. Poor evidence-base for assessment of wind farm impacts on birds. Environmental Conservation 34:1-11.

Soulliere, G. J., T. E. Maples, and E. N. Kafcas. 2000. Twenty-five years of Canvasback inventory in Michigan. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Report No. 3322, Lansing, USA.

Soulliere, G. J., B. A. Potter, J. M. Coluccy, R. C. Gatti, C. L. Roy, D. R. Luukkonen, P. W.

Brown, and M. W. Eichholz. 2007a. Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture waterfowl habitat conservation strategy. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota, USA.

Soulliere, G. J., B. A. Potter, D. J. Holm, D. A. Granfors, M. J. Monfils, S. J. Lewis, and W. E. Thogmartin. 2007b. Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture waterbird habitat conservation strategy. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota, USA.

Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture. 2007. Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture implementation plan. G. J. Soulliere and B. A. Potter, compilers. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota, USA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. Draft interim guidelines to avoid and minimize wildlife impacts from wind turbines. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Alexandria, VA, USA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Canadian Wildlife Service. 1987. Standard operating procedures for aerial waterfowl breeding ground population and habitat surveys. Unpublished manual as revised, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland, USA.

West, A., and R. Caldow. 2006. The development and use of individuals-based models to predict the effects of habitat loss and disturbance on waders and waterfowl. Ibis 148:158-168.

Winkelman, J. E. 1985. Vogelhinder door middlegrote windturbines -- ver vlieggedrag, slachtoffers en verstoring (Bird impact by middle-sized wind turbines - on flight behavior, victims, and disturbance.) Limosa 58:117–121.

Winkelman, J. E. 1990. Nachtelijke aanvaringskansen voor vogels in de Sep-proefwindcentrale te Oosterbierum (Fr.) (Nocturnal collision risks for and behavior of birds approaching a rotor in operation in the experimental wind park near Oosterbierum, Friesland, The Netherlands; English summary). Rijksinstituut voor Natuurbeheer, Arnhem. RIN-Rapport 90/17.

Winkelman, J. E. 1992. De invloed van de Sep-proefwindcentrale te Oosterbierum (Fr.) op vogels, 1. Aanvaringsslachtoffers (The impact of the Sep Wind Park near Oosterbierum [Fr.], The Netherlands, on birds, 1. Collision victims.) English summary only. Pages 69–71. DLO-Instituut voor Bos- en Natuuronderzoek, Arnhem, Netherlands. RIN-Rapport 92/2.

Winkelman, J. E. 1994. Bird/wind turbine investigations in Europe. Pages 43–47. *In* Proceedings of the National Avian-Wind Power Planning Meeting, Lakewood, Colorado, 20–21 July 1994. Proceedings prepared by LGL Ltd., environmental research associates, King City, Ontario. Author's address: Birdlife/Vogelbescherming Nederland, Driebergweweg, The Netherlands.

Winkelman, J. E. 1995. Bird/wind turbine investigations in Europe. Pages 110-119. *In* Proceedings of National Avian-Wind Planning Meeting, Denver, CO, July 1994.

Wires, L. R. and F. J. Cuthbert. 2001. Prioritization of waterbird colony sites for conservation in the U.S. Great Lakes. Final report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.