Appendix 9.2 Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling

Introduction

1.1. Birds that are not displaced would be potentially vulnerable to collision with the turbines. The level of collision with wind turbines is presumed to be dependent on the level of flight activity over the proposed Development and the ability of birds to detect and manoeuvre around rotating turbine blades. Birds that collide with a turbine are likely to be killed or fatally injured. This may in turn affect the maintenance of bird populations

1.2. Further studies in the field of bird-windfarm research are required to establish with certainty the extent to which birds are able to avoid collision with wind turbines, although an increasing body of evidence suggests that avoidance capacity is very high (Whitfield & Madders 2006, Urquhart & Whitfield 2016, SNH 2017). The indications from studies are that collisions are rare events and occur mainly at sites where there are unusual concentrations of birds and turbines, or where the behaviour of the birds concerned leads to high-risk situations (eg Gill *et al*. 1996, Percival 1998, de Lucas *et al.* 2007). Examples include migration flyways, and where the food resource, and therefore level of bird activity, is exceptional.

1.3. Band *et al.* (2007) described a method by which field data on bird flight activity can be gathered and used to quantify crudely the likelihood of collisions with turbines: the 'Band' Collision Risk Model (CRM). This method is more suitable for some species than others (Madders & Whitfield 2006). For example, fast moving raptors like merlin and most songbirds are difficult to detect beyond a distance of a few hundred metres and nocturnal species are difficult to detect at all. As a result it is rarely possible to generate reliable estimates of flight activity for these species and collision risk is best determined qualitatively.

1.4. The Band CRM involves two methods to predict estimated collision fatalities, depending on the pattern of flight of the species involved: 'predictable' and 'unpredictable' flight methods. The predictable flight method (PFM) is appropriate when birds tend to move through an area in a relatively consistent direction, such as during migration or when moving between localised feeding and roosting sites. The unpredictable flight method (UFM) is more appropriate when flights are not in any particular direction and assumes that they are random. These two methods also differ in their field data requirements (see Appendix 9.1).

1.5. The two methods differ in the unit of exposure to collision risk. The PFM estimates a horizontal risk area which is the area of the turbine rotors facing a bird as it flies towards (with the 'intention' of flying through) the Proposed Development. The extent of the Risk Area is given by the horizontal span of the proposed turbine array facing the bird on its typical flight direction multiplied by the vertical span of the proposed turbine rotors.

1.6. The UFM employs an estimated risk volume, in keeping with the assumption that flight directions are random in space. The UFM of the Band CRM was used to estimate collision risk on hen harrier in the breeding season, short-eared owl during the breeding season, and golden eagle in both the breeding and non-breeding season, based on flight activity levels and behaviour, turbine numbers and dimensions, and bird biometrics and flight characteristics. Dimensions and operational parameters of the candidate turbine model were used to populate the CRM, including an assumed hub height of 125 m and a rotor diameter of 150 m (see Chapter 3 Description of proposed Development). The appropriate recorded flight height band was therefore 50m – 200 m. (Table 1).

1.7. Data on bird flight speed and biometrics were taken from Bruderer & Boldt (2001) and Snow & Perrins (1998), and the published avoidance rates was used (SNH 2017). For each season, day length was calculated using the method of Forsythe *et al*. (1995).

1.8. Utilising all flight observations collected across the study area from all GVPs was likely to result in underestimates or overestimates of collision risk because data were collected for areas in which no turbines were (ultimately) proposed. Therefore, it was appropriate to employ only those observations in which flights were liable to incur a potential risk of collision; i.e., within the areas occupied by proposed turbines. Consequently, the CRM used only observations collected within a flight activity assessment area (FA), comprising a 500 m buffer (centred on the turbine tower) around proposed turbine locations. This size of buffer encompasses rotor blade length, possible shifts in proposed turbine location due to micro-siting and, crucially, potential spatial errors in flight recording accuracy due to the effects of parallax. Flight time within this buffer was calculated from the proportion of the length of each flight which fell within the 500 m buffer multiplied by the total duration of each flight (i.e. effectively assuming a constant speed for each flight). Time spent at different flight heights was estimated from time-interval data on height. To ensure that the CRM used robust measures of flight activity, a 2 km distance truncation was assumed in the area visible from each VP.

1.9. The UFM of the Band CRM was used to estimate collision risk for goshawk during the year. Following the analyses described above a total of seven flights were included in the CRM. Data on goshawk flight speed (9.9 m/s) was taken from Bruderer & Boldt (2001) and biometrics (0.55m length, 1.50m wingspan) from Snow & Perrins (1998) and a 98% avoidance rate was used (SNH 2017).

1.10. The UFM estimated 0.005 annual goshawk collisions or one collision every 182 years (Table 3).

Input Data and Model Results

Table 1 Input Data

WIND FARM PARAMETERS		
Size of windfarm envelope	883	ha
Number of turbines	13	
Rotor diameter	150	m
Hub height	125	m
Max. rotor depth in metres	2.0	m
Max. chord	4.20	m
Pitch	6.0	degrees
Rotation period	4.60	s
Turbine operation time	87	%

BIRD PARAMETERS		
Length	0.50	m
Wingspan	1.5	m
Flapping (0) or gliding (+1)	0	
Assumed flight speed	10	ms^-1
Number of hours birds potentially present	4494	per year
Assumed avoidance rate	98	%

BAND USED TO DEFINE 'RISK HEIGHT'		
Max height	200	m
Min height	50	m

	Watch Data		Bird Flight Data	
VP	Area (ha)	Time (hrs)	Total (s)	'Risk height' (s)
1	556.1	79.0	53.0	0.0
5	95.1	187.0	0.0	0.0
6	1.6	79.0	0.0	0.0
7	53.4	79.0	0.0	0.0
8				
9	161.2	187.0	0.0	0.0
10	111.4	79.0	0.0	0.0
15	360.4	108.1	143.0	0.0
16	275.4	108.0	187.0	139.0
17	140.0	82.0	0.0	0.0
18	47.9	187.0	0.0	0.0
19	216.3	30.0	63.0	0.0
20	229.7	26.0	62.0	0.0
Totals	2248.5	1231.1	508.0	139.0

Table 2 Collision Probability

K: [1D or [3D] (0 or 1)	1	
NoBlades	3	
MaxChord	4.20	m
Pitch (degrees)	6.0	
BirdLength	0.50	m
Wingspan	1.5	m
F: Flapping (0) or gliding (+1)	0	
Bird speed	10	m/sec
RotorDiam	150	m
RotationPeriod	4.60	sec
integration interval	0.05	
Bird aspect ratioo: β	0.33	

Calculation of alpha and p(collision) as a function of radius

			Upwind:			Downwind:		
r/R radius	c/C chord	α alpha	collide length	p(collision)	y(x)	collide length	p(collision)	y(x)
0				1.00	0.000		1.00	0.000
0.05	0.575	1.93	7.79	0.51	0.051	7.29	0.48	0.048
0.1	0.622	0.97	4.23	0.28	0.056	3.69	0.24	0.049
0.15	0.781	0.64	3.41	0.22	0.067	2.72	0.18	0.054
0.2	0.939	0.48	3.03	0.20	0.080	2.21	0.15	0.058
0.25	0.971	0.39	2.57	0.17	0.085	1.72	0.11	0.057
0.3	0.923	0.32	2.15	0.14	0.085	1.34	0.09	0.053
0.35	0.875	0.28	1.89	0.12	0.087	1.13	0.07	0.052
0.4	0.827	0.24	1.70	0.11	0.089	0.97	0.06	0.051
0.45	0.780	0.21	1.54	0.10	0.091	0.86	0.06	0.051
0.5	0.732	0.19	1.41	0.09	0.093	0.77	0.05	0.051
0.55	0.684	0.18	1.30	0.09	0.094	0.70	0.05	0.051
0.6	0.637	0.16	1.21	0.08	0.095	0.65	0.04	0.051
0.65	0.589	0.15	1.12	0.07	0.096	0.61	0.04	0.052
0.7	0.541	0.14	1.05	0.07	0.097	0.57	0.04	0.053
0.75	0.494	0.13	0.98	0.06	0.097	0.55	0.04	0.054
0.8	0.446	0.12	0.92	0.06	0.097	0.53	0.03	0.056
0.85	0.398	0.11	0.86	0.06	0.097	0.51	0.03	0.058
0.9	0.350	0.11	0.81	0.05	0.096	0.50	0.03	0.060
0.95	0.303	0.10	0.76	0.05	0.095	0.50	0.03	0.063
1	0.255	0.10	0.71	0.05	0.094	0.51	0.03	0.067

Overall p(collision) = **Upwind** **8.5%** **Downwind** **5.3%**

Average **6.9%**

Table 3 Model Results (weighted)

Flight Activity Per Unit Time & Area			Weighted By Observation Effort		
VP	**Observation effort (HaHr)**	**Flying time at 'risk height' (Hahr^-1)**	**VP**	**Weighting**	**Adjusted time at 'risk height' (Hahr^-1)**
1	43931.90	0	1	0.213	0
5	17783.70	0	5	0.086	0
6	126.40	0	6	0.001	0
7	4218.60	0	7	0.020	0
8			8		
9	30144.40	0	9	0.146	0
10	8800.60	0	10	0.043	0
15	38952.03	0	15	0.189	0
16	29743.20	1.29815E-06	16	0.144	1.86889E-07
17	11480.00	0	17	0.056	0
18	8957.30	0	18	0.043	0
19	6489.00	0	19	0.031	0
20	5972.20	0	20	0.029	0
Totals	*206599.33*	*1.08179E-07*	*Totals*	1.000	1.86889E-07
			Mean activity hr^-1 in wind farm		
				Risk height	0.01650%
				Rotor height	0.01650%

MORTALITY ESTIMATE		
Flight risk volume (Vw)	1.32E+09	m^3
Rotor radius^2	5625	m
Combined rotor swept area (Va)	229729	m^2
Vr = Va * (d + l)	574322	m^3
Bird occupancy (n)	0.74	hrs / yr
Bird occupancy of rotor swept vol (b)	1.16	bird-secs
Bird transit time (t)	0.25	secs
No. of transits through rotors	4.58	per year
Estimated no. of collisions	0.27	per year
After allowing for avoidance	0.005	per year
i.e. equivalent to one bird every	**182.3**	**years**

References

Band, W., Madders, M. & Whitfield, D.P. (2007*).* Developing field and analytical methods to assess avian collision risk at wind farms. In de Lucas, M, Janss, G. and Ferrer, M. (eds) *Birds and Wind Power*. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.

Bruderer, B. and Boldt, A. 2001. Flight characteristics of birds: I. Radar measurements of speeds. Ibis 143, pp 178–204.

de Lucas, M., Janss, G.F.E. and Ferrer, M. (eds) (2007). *Birds and Wind Power: Risk Assessment and Mitigation*. Quercus, Madrid

Forsythe, W.C., Rykiel Jr., E.J., Stahl, R.S., Wu, H., & Schoolfield, R.M. (1995) A model comparison for daylength as a function of latitude and day of year. Ecological Modelling. 80, pp 87 - 95

Gill, J.P., Townsley, M. and Mudge, G.P., (1996). *Review of the impacts of wind farms and other aerial structures upon birds*. SNH Review 21: 68pp

Madders, M. & Whitfield, D.P. (2006). Upland raptors and the assessment of wind farm impacts. Ibis, 148, pp 43-56.

Percival, S.M., (1998). Birds and Turbines: managing potential planning issues. Proc. of the 20th BWEA Conference 1998: pp 345-350.

SNH (2017). *Avoidance Rates for the onshore SNH Wind Farm Collision Risk Model*. SNH Information and Guidance Note. SNH, Battleby.

Snow, D. & Perrins, C. M. (1998). The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Concise Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Urquhart, B. & Whitfield, D.P. (2016) Derivation of an avoidance rate for red kite Milvus milvus suitable for onshore wind farm collision risk modelling Natural Research Information Note 7. available at https://www.natural-research.org/ecological-research-charity/our-publications

Whitfield, D.P. & Madders, M (2006) A review of the impacts of wind farms on hen harriers Circus cyaneus and an estimation of collision avoidance rates. Natural Research Information Note 1. (revised) available at https://www.natural-research.org/ecological-research-charity/our-publications