

# Bat and Bird Data Analysis and Results Summary

May 2021 to Jan 2023

Progress Report #5



US Wind Metocean Buoy Campaign

Prepared by:



Normandeau Associates, Inc.  
4581 NW 6th Street, Suite H  
Gainesville, FL 32609  
[www.normandeau.com](http://www.normandeau.com)

July 2023

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes bat and bird acoustic data collected between 19 May 2021 and 10 January 2023 at the E14 US Wind buoy. Results are presented cumulatively such that findings reported in prior reports are contained in subsequent reports. This report adds data from the second year of monitoring collected from 20 May 2022 to 10 January 2023. Bat and bird acoustic sensors continue to collect data for the rest of the second year at the time of this reporting. Here we present the bat and bird acoustic results associated with the above-water acoustic sensors deployed on the buoy. To date, we have recorded 67 bat and 131 bird detections, representing 18 unique species identified by their vocalization characteristics (Table 1). Bat acoustic detections were produced by three species: eastern red bat (*Lasiurus borealis*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), and silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*). Eastern red bats and silver-haired bats accounted for the majority of bat vocalization sequences at 49.3% (n=33) and 41.8% (n=28) respectively. Bird acoustic detections were produced by 15 species (Table 1). Gull species accounted for 80.2% of all avian vocalization sequences, with most calls produced by herring gulls (n=97).

**Table 1. Bat and Bird Species Identified between 19 May 2021 and 10 Jan 2023**

Taxonomic Group	Species / Species Group	Vocalization Sequences
Bats	Eastern Red Bat	33
	Hoary Bat	6
	Silver-haired Bat	28
<b>Bats Total</b>		<b>67</b>
Birds	Semipalmated Plover	1
	Spotted Sandpiper	1
	Solitary Sandpiper	4
	Laughing Gull	5
	Herring Gull	97
	Great Black-backed Gull	3
	Royal Tern	1
	Common Loon	1
	Brown Pelican	10
	Wood Thrush	1
	White-throated Sparrow	1
	Northern Waterthrush	3
	Magnolia Warbler	1
	Chestnut-sided Warbler	1
	Blackpoll Warbler	1
<b>Birds Total</b>		<b>131</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>198</b>

## Justification

Bats have been observed offshore for over 100 years (Merriam 1887; Thomas 1921) yet the extent of their presence in the pelagic environment is only recently beginning to be understood. In the Eastern US, most species found offshore are long-distance migratory species, which include eastern red bats, hoary bats, and silver-haired bats (Sjollema et al. 2014). Short-distance migratory species from the genera *Myotis* and *Perimyotis* have also been detected. Offshore bat activity peaks significantly throughout the autumn migration period of August–early November (Peterson et al. 2014; Lagerveld et al. 2015, 2017, 2020). Bats have experienced significant population declines via turbine collisions at terrestrial wind energy developments; whether a similar collision risk will be experienced at offshore facilities is an open question.

Off the coast of Maryland (USA) the offshore environment provides habitat for waterbird species, including sea ducks, loons, gulls, scoters, terns, alcids, gannets, shearwaters, petrels, and shorebirds. Some passerine species may also use the offshore environment during long-distance seasonal migrations (DeLuca et al. 2015). Understanding the prevalence of certain bird species within the US Wind project area is paramount to evaluating relative exposure and potential risks to species when considering adverse effects such as collision and displacement (Garthe and Hüppop 2004; Furness et al. 2013; Robinson Willmott et al. 2013).

Understanding the prevalence of bats and birds in the offshore environment and under what ambient conditions they occur prior to, during, and after wind farm construction will provide US Wind the capacity to detect changes to species prevalence and support an informed response to any potential species impacts and identification of any mitigation strategies.

## Operations and Analysis Summary


The SM4 Bat acoustic detector was operational for 272 days in the first year of monitoring and 113 days so far in the second year of monitoring (Figure 1, Table 2). For the the SM4 Bat acoustic sensor the period where timestamps were not recorded was considered non-operational because the detector was set to record from an hour before sunset to an hour after sunrise, and it was not possible to determine if this is the actual time the detector was operational. This lack of timestamp spans 16 January 2022 to 05 April 2022. Even though we could not be certain of when the SM4 Bat acoustic sensor was operational, we still examined the audio files for calls, and none were found. The SM4 Bat detector experienced non-operational periods between 30 December 2021 and 13 January 2022, which was likely due to a power supply issue, and between 09 September 2022 to 10 January 2023 due to catastrophic damage to the battery.

The SM4 Bird acoustic sensor was operational or partially operational for 340 days in the first year of monitoring and 113 days so far in the second year of monitoring (Figure 2, Table 2). Partially operational refers to periods where the sensor was collecting data but no accurate timestamps were being recorded. However, the sensor was set to record 24/7 and so we know that false negatives are unlikely and when data were analyzed, bird calls were found. As with the SM4 Bat detector, this timestamp error period occurred between 16 January 2022 and 05 April 2022. Observations without timestamps are reported with species totals but are removed from figures that show detection dates. There were 43 mostly gull vocalization sequences recorded during the clock error period, and we were unable to match the vocalizations to a specific day within the data collection period. As with the SM4 Bat detector, between 19 December 2021 and


13 January 2022, the SM4 Bird acoustic sensor was completely non-operational, which was likely due to a power supply issue, and between 09 September 2022 to 10 January 2023 due to catastrophic damage to the battery.

### US Wind Buoy E14 Acoustics Operations - Bat

Year 1 Operations status 19 May 2021 to 19 May 2022



Year 2 Operations status 20 May 2022 to current




Acoustic Sensor Status ■ Currently Deployed ■ Non-Operational ■ Operational


**Figure 1. Bat acoustic sensor operations on the E14 US Wind buoy during data collection periods 1–5.**

### US Wind Buoy E14 Acoustics Operations - Bird

Year 1 Operations status 19 May 2021 to 19 May 2022



Year 2 Operations status 20 May 2022 to current



Acoustic Sensor Status ■ Currently Deployed ■ Non-Operational ■ Operational ■ Partially Operational

**Figure 2. Bird acoustic sensor operations on the E14 US Wind buoy during data collection periods 1–5. Partially operational refers to a time period where data were collected but timestamps were not accurately recorded.**

**Table 2. Deployment and Operation Information Associated with SM4 Bat Acoustic Data and SM4 Bird Acoustic Data Collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy**

Taxonomic Group	Collection Period	Collection Period Date Range	Collection Period (days)	Detector Operational Periods	Detector Operational Period (days)	% Days Operational	Data Status
Bats	1	19 May 2021–30 Aug 2021	103	19 May 2021–30 Aug 2021	103	100.0%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	2	30 Aug 2021–13 Jan 2022	136	30 Aug 2021–30 Dec 2021	122	89.7%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	3	13 Jan 2022–05 Apr 2022	82	13 Jan 2022–16 Jan 2022*	3	3.7%	Only analyzed and reported where timestamp data is available
	4	5 Apr 2022–19 May 2022	44	5 Apr 2022–19 May 2022	44	100.0%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	5	19 May 2022–10 Jan 2023	236	19 May 2022–09 Sep 2022	113	47.9%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	6	10 Jan 2023–ongoing	-	Currently deployed	-	-	Not yet collected
Birds	1	19 May 2021–30 Aug 2021	103	19 May 2021–30 Aug 2021	103	100.0%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	2	30 Aug 2021–13 Jan 2022	136	30 August 2021–19 Dec 2021	111	81.6%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	3	13 Jan 2022–05 Apr 2022	82	13 Jan 2022–05 Apr 2022**	82 - Timestamp data unavailable for 78 days	100.0%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	4	05 Apr 2022–19 May 2022	44	05 Apr 2022–19 May 2022	44	100.0%	Analyzed and reported in this volume

Taxonomic Group	Collection Period	Collection Period Date Range	Collection Period (days)	Detector Operational Periods	Detector Operational Period (days)	% Days Operational	Data Status
	5	19 May 2022– 10 Jan 2023	236	19 May 2022– 09 Sep 2022	113	47.9%	Analyzed and reported in this volume
	6	10 Jan 2023– ongoing	-	Currently deployed	-	-	Not yet collected

\* Acoustic recordings collected but instrument clock failed. No bat calls were found during this period.

\*\* Acoustic recordings collected but instrument clock failed. Data were still analyzed and presented where timestamps were not required.

## Bat Acoustic Analysis Summary

Upon data receipt we uploaded the contents of each card to the Normandeau ReMOTe server for storage and processing. We then ran each data set through bat acoustic identification software SonoBat (Arcata, USA). Generally, running files through a scrubber can eliminate WAV files that are algorithmically determined to be noise files rather than bats, based on features of the sonogram. For example, WAV files with bandwidth below 20 kHz can be identified and eliminated as produced by audible insect noises, and files that have pulses of sound above 20 kHz can be kept for further analysis. With the buoy data, it is difficult to pre-filter noise because, unlike insect chatter, noise associated with the other equipment on the buoy, such as the LiDAR, make detectable pulsing ultrasonic noise that scrubber algorithms will not eliminate. We therefore used the SonoBat automated identification classifier on all recorded WAV files.


We determined the most typical SonoBat output for non-bat high-frequency recordings (i.e., noises generated by peripheral buoy sensors) was a constant pulse approximately every 10 m/s with a mean characteristic frequency of  $\approx 39.75$  kHz and a bandwidth of  $\approx 4$  kHz. The characteristics of these sounds are not like any bat species, and we determined which calls were more likely bats based on these parameters, effectively scrubbing all the files to a reduced batch for manual vetting ( $\approx 90\%$  reduction).

## Bat Acoustic Results Summary

To date, we have recorded 67 discrete bat call sequences at the E14 buoy (Figure 3, Table 3). No bat recordings were captured between 16 January 2022 and 4 April 2022 when timestamps were incorrectly recorded. Bat activity was highest on 01 September 2022 with 15 vocalizations. One vocalization from an eastern red bat was recorded during the spring 2021 migratory period (Figure 3). The majority of vocalization sequences were recorded during the fall migratory period (August–October) (Figure 3). Increased activity during the fall migratory period is consistent with the literature. Overall, bat activity was very low throughout the summer months and consistent with the literature and other survey data, which shows that bat activity is higher during fall migration. Bats were recorded at wind speeds ranging between 1.5 m/s to 14.1 m/s with the median number of detections occurring at 5.4 m/s (Figure 4). Bat activity declined sharply when wind speeds were above 8 m/s (Figure 4).

Spectrograms collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy for eastern red bat, hoary bat, and silver-haired bat are shown in Figure 5, Figure 6, and Figure 7.





**Figure 3. Bat occurrences at the E14 US Wind buoy during collection period 19 May 2021–10 January 2023.**

**Table 3. Bat Occurrences by Month**

No bat recordings were captured between 25 Jan 2022 and 05 April 2022 when timestamps were not correctly recorded. Vocalization sequences are counted per date by recording timestamp in UTC-5.

Month Year	Species	Vocalization Sequences
May 2021	Eastern red bat	1
Aug 2021	Eastern red bat	3
Sep 2021	Silver-haired bat	12
	Eastern red bat	5
Oct 2021	Hoary bat	3
	Silver-haired bat	13
Jul 2022	Eastern red bat	1
	Hoary bat	1
Aug 2022	Eastern red bat	6
	Hoary bat	2
Sep 2022	Eastern red bat	17
	Silver-haired bat	3




Figure 4. Bat acoustic detections recorded per wind speed (m/s) observed at the US Wind Buoy E14.




Figure 5. Spectrogram of eastern red bat collected at the E14 US Wind buoy.




Figure 6. Spectrogram of hoary bat collected at the E14 US Wind buoy.




Figure 7. Spectrogram of silver-haired bat collected at the E14 US Wind buoy.

### Bird Acoustic Analysis Summary

Bird acoustic data were processed with Wildlife Acoustics Kaleidoscope Pro software using automated detection parameters determined for the flight calls of species in Table 4 using flight call audio data in the Cornell Lab of Ornithology Macaulay Library archives (<https://search.macaulaylibrary.org/catalog>). These 30 species were chosen based on sightings

noted in ebird.org for the Eastern US region and cross-referenced with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Note that detection parameters for the species listed do not necessarily exclude other species or non-bird sounds so manual auditory (headphones) and visual (spectrogram) review of the detections is necessary to confirm any bird call within or outside the list and to exclude false positives. Additional bird species were confirmed from detections that did not fall within those listed in Table 4, focusing on but not limited to gulls, terns, and sandpipers. This species list is not to be taken as exhaustive as the Kaleidoscope settings can also detect species outside this list.

Manual auditory and visual review was conducted on every detection in the first 200 detections within each cluster generated by the Kaleidoscope Pro software auto-detection cluster analysis. Any clusters with fewer than 200 detections had every detection reviewed. Any detections that were not birds were confirmed to be water, wind, buoy noise, or some combination of those, and are not listed. For this analysis, one call corresponds to at least one confirmed detection within any one-minute span. Two calls from the same species within the same one-minute period are counted as one occurrence.


**Table 4. Bird Species whose Flight Calls were Used for Automatic Detection Parameter Selection**

Herring gull	Bonaparte's gull	Great black-backed gull
Cape may warbler	Northern parula	Palm warbler
Ovenbird	American redstart	Yellow-rumped warbler
Gray-cheeked thrush	Black-throated blue warbler	Black-and-white warbler
Blackpoll warbler	Common yellowthroat	Bay-breasted warbler
Least bittern	Green heron	Veery
Magnolia warbler	Chestnut-sided warbler	White-throated sparrow
Blackburnian warbler	Bobolink	Blue grosbeak
Yellow warbler	Savannah sparrow	Indigo bunting
Swainson's thrush	Wood thrush	Northern waterthrush

## Bird Acoustic Results Summary

To date, we have detected 15 species across 131 vocalization sequences at the E14 buoy with most calls occurring during the late spring/early summer and late summer/early fall (Figure 8). Overall, bird activity at the buoy was consistently low during the summer months. Gull species accounted for 105 (80.2%) of the 131 bird vocalization sequences (Table 5). The most commonly occurring species was herring gull (n=97). We observed four vocalization sequences attributed to warbler species: chestnut-sided warbler, blackpoll warbler, magnolia warbler, and northern waterthrush (Table 5). Birds were recorded in wind speeds ranging between 0.5 m/s up to 16.7 m/s with the median number of detections occurring at 3.7 m/s (Figure 9). Bird activity declined sharply when wind speeds were above 6.0 m/s (Figure 9). Representative acoustic bird calls from each species detected at the buoy are pictured in Figure 10 through Figure 20.

### Daily Bird Acoustic Activity




**Figure 8. Daily bird occurrences at the E14 US Wind buoy during collection period 19 May 2021–10 January 2023. This figure does not include the 43 birds recorded during the period when accurate timestamps were missing.**

**Table 5. Bird Occurrences by Month (or Data Period for Individuals Recorded when Instrument had a Clock Error)**

Month Year	Species	Vocalization Sequences
May 2021	Chestnut-sided Warbler	1
Jun 2021	Herring Gull	12
Aug 2021	Herring Gull	8
	Semipalmated Plover	1
	Solitary Sandpiper	2
	Spotted Sandpiper	1
	Wood Thrush	1
Sep 2021	White-throated Sparrow	1
Oct 2021	Laughing Gull	1
	Northern Waterthrush	1
Nov 2021	Blackpoll Warbler	1
	Herring Gull	1
Dec 2021	Common Loon	1
25 Jan 2022 to 05 Apr 2022	Herring gull	38
	Great black-backed gull	3
	Laughing gull	1
	Magnolia warbler	1
May 2022	Brown Pelican	10
	Herring Gull	38
	Laughing Gull	3

Month Year	Species	Vocalization Sequences
Jul 2022	Solitary Sandpiper	1
Aug 2022	Northern Waterthrush	1
	Royal Tern	1
	Solitary Sandpiper	1
Sep 2022	Northern Waterthrush	1



**Figure 9. Bird acoustic detections recorded per wind speed (m/s) at the US Wind Buoy E14 . This figure does not include the 43 birds recorded during the period when accurate timestamps were missing.**




Figure 10. Spectrogram of magnolia warbler call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 11. Spectrogram of chestnut-sided warbler call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.






Figure 12. Spectrogram of blackpoll warbler call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 13. Spectrogram of wood thrush call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.






Figure 14. Spectrogram of solitary sandpiper call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 15. Spectrogram of spotted sandpiper call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 16. Spectrogram of semipalmated plover call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 17. Spectrogram of common loon call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 18. Spectrogram of herring gull call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 19. Spectrogram of laughing gull call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.




Figure 20. Spectrogram of great black-backed gull call collected at the E14 US Wind Buoy.

## Motus Detections

Table 6 lists the tags detected by the Motus receiver at E14 (E-14 CTT SensorStation ID# 8389). To date, only test tags have been detected and no species tags. Motus.org removed an erroneous tag detection that was listed in previous reports.

**Table 6. Motus detections from the receiver at the US Wind Buoy E14.**

Tag	Species	Date (UTC)
<i>No species detected</i>		

## Discussion

Relationships between birds and bats with wind speed differed between the two taxa. Bat activity was more uniform across the wind speed range with some activity drop off above 8 m/s (Figure 4). In contrast, bird activity declined sharply above 6 m/s (Figure 9). This difference in wind speed preferences may be due to migration tendencies of birds and bats with birds often preferring low wind speeds (Richardson 1990, Ramenofsky et al. 2012), while bats preferring higher wind speeds. This tendency is particularly important in adverse weather as bats try to minimize energy expenditure (Dechmann et al. 2017). Pettit and O’Keefe (2017) also found bats to prefer higher wind speeds in the fall, which is when nearly all detections in this study were found.

## Literature Cited

- Dechmann DKN, Wikelski M, Ellis-Soto D, Safi K, O'Mara MT. 2017 Determinants of spring migration departure decision in a bat. *Biology Letters*. 13: 20170395.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2017.0395>
- DeLuca WV, Woodworth BK, Rimmer CC, Marra PP, Taylor PD, McFarland KP, Mackenzie SA, Norris DR. 2015. Transoceanic migration by a 12 g songbird. *Biology Letters* 11, 20141045.
- Furness RW, Wade HM, Masden E. 2013. Assessing vulnerability of marine bird populations to offshore wind farms. *Journal of Environmental Management* 119:56–66.
- Garthe S, Hüppop O. 2004. Scaling possible adverse effects of marine wind farms on seabirds: Developing and applying a vulnerability index. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 41:724–734.
- Lagerveld S, Poerink BJ, de Vries P. 2015. Monitoring bat activity at the Dutch EEZ in 2014. Report no. C094/15. Wageningen (UR): IMARES.
- Lagerveld S, Gerla D, van der Wal J, de Vries P, Brabant R, Stienen E, Deneudt K, Manshanden J, Scholl M. 2017. Spatial and temporal occurrence of bats in the southern North Sea area. Report no. Wageningen University & Research Report C090/17). Wageningen (UR): Wageningen University & Research Centre.
- Lagerveld S, Noort CA, Meesters L, Bach L, Bach P, Geelhoed S. 2020. Assessing fatality risk of bats at offshore wind turbines. Report no. C025/20. Wageningen (UR): Wageningen Marine Research. <https://doi.org/10.18174/518591>
- Merriam CH. 1887. Do any Canadian bats migrate? Evidence in the affirmative. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 4:85–87.
- Peterson TS, Pelletier SK, Boyden SA, Watrous KS. 2014. Offshore acoustic monitoring of bats in the Gulf of Maine. *Northeastern Naturalist* 21(1):86–107.
- Pettit, JL, and JM O'Keefe. 2017. Day of year, temperature, wind, and precipitation predict timing of bat migration. *Journal of Mammalogy* 98:1236–1248.
- Ramenofsky M, Cornelius JM, Helm B. 2012 Physiological and behavioral responses of migrants to environmental cues. *J. Ornithol.* 153, S181–S191. (doi:10.1007/s10336-012-0817-3)
- Richardson W. 1990 Timing of bird migration in relation to weather: updated review. In *Bird migration* (ed. E. Gwinner), pp. 78 –101. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Robinson Willmott J, Forcey G, Kent A. 2013. The relative vulnerability of migratory bird species to offshore wind energy projects on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf: An assessment method and database. Final Report to the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Office of Renewable Energy Programs. OCS Study BOEM 2013-207. pp. 275. Available from [www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5319.pdf](http://www.data.boem.gov/PI/PDFImages/ESPIS/5/5319.pdf)
- Sjollema AL, Gates JE, Hilderbrand RH, Sherwell J. 2014. Offshore activity of bats along the Mid-Atlantic Coast. *Northeastern Naturalist* 21(2):154–163.
- Thomas O. 1921. Bats on migration. *Journal of Mammalogy* 2:167.