

KEEYASK TRANSMISSION PROJECT

OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER AND RUSTY BLACKBIRD SENSORY DISTURBANCE MONITORING

Prepared for

Manitoba Hydro

By

ECOSTEM Ltd. and Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc.

June 2021

This report should be cited as follows:

ECOSTEM Ltd. and Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc. 2021. Keeyask Transmission Project Olive-sided Flycatcher and Rusty Blackbird Sensory Disturbance Monitoring. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by ECOSTEM Ltd. and Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc., June 2021.

SUMMARY

Background

The Keeyask Transmission Project (the Project) provides generation outlet transmission (GOT) capacity and construction power (CP) and for the Keeyask Generating Station, located in northern Manitoba along the Nelson River at Gull (Keeyask) Rapids upstream of Stephens Lake. The GOT lines extend 38 km from the Keeyask Switching Station to the Radisson Converter Station at Gillam. The CP line extends 21 km from the Keeyask Switching Station to the KN36 transmission line (Map) which extends from the Kelsey Generating Station to the Radisson Converter Station. The R26K line runs parallel to KN36. Construction of the Project began in October 2014.

Olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird are migratory songbirds that are found in the Keeyask region. Both species are considered species at risk in Canada and are protected under the federal *Species at Risk Act*. In Manitoba, the olive-sided flycatcher is also listed as Threatened under *The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act*.

Why is the study being done?

Both the olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird are near the edge of their breeding ranges in northern Manitoba and are found in relatively low numbers in the Keeyask region. Both are species at risk, have been experiencing widespread declines throughout their ranges, and may be vulnerable to Project effects. The goal of this study was to monitor the effect of Project-related disturbance on these species near the transmission line.



Rusty blackbird

What was done?

Potential olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird nesting territories were mapped near the Project right-of-way in spring 2016, 2017, and 2019. Automated recording units, designed to record bird calls, were placed within the mapped territories. For each potential nesting territory surveyed at a disturbed site, a potential territory at a site with no disturbance was also surveyed.

Recordings from automated recording units were analyzed and olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird calls were identified and counted. The number of calls for each location within the recorder listening area was calculated, and maps were produced showing areas with high and low olive-sided flycatcher or rusty blackbird activity.



Biologist setting up an automated recording unit to record bird calls

What was found?

There was considerable variation in the amount of olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird activity in each potential territory. The call rate was high in some disturbed and undisturbed areas and was low in others. While olive-sided flycatchers sang most often near sunrise, no pattern of activity for rusty blackbirds was identified.

What does it mean?

Areas with high numbers of calls likely contained preferred perching locations and suitable breeding habitat. Areas with few or no calls may have been in poor-quality habitat, birds may have been perching temporarily while searching for a territory, or birds may have relocated partway through the breeding season. Some areas showed low or no activity near the transmission line right-of-way. Low activity could indicate poor quality habitat or the confounding effect of other factors (e.g., higher or lower vegetation density affecting the estimated distance to calls).

What will be done next?

To determine whether the Project is affecting olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird habitat use, additional habitat mapping as well as statistical and GIS analyses will be completed. This will focus on separating the bird response to Project disturbance from other factors such as differences in habitat, vegetation density, and amount of sensory disturbance.

STUDY TEAM

We would like to thank Sherrie Mason, Rachel Boone and Jonathan Wiens of Manitoba Hydro for manuscript review and Ron Bretecher of North/South Consultants Inc. for logistical assistance in the field. Biologists and other personnel who designed, participated in, and drafted the survey results included:

- Dr. James Ehnes, ECOSTEM Ltd. – Design, data analysis and reporting
- Brock Epp, ECOSTEM Ltd. – Data analysis and reporting
- Robert Berger, Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc. – Design and reporting
- Alex McIlraith, Independent - Design and bird audio recording analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	METHODS.....	3
2.1	FIELD STUDIES	3
2.1.1	Pilot Study.....	3
2.1.2	Territory Mapping and Audio Recording.....	4
2.2	AUDIO RECORDING SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS.....	13
2.2.1	Audio Processing.....	13
2.2.2	Data Analysis	13
2.2.2.1	Data Preparation	14
2.2.2.2	Recorder Effort.....	15
2.2.2.3	Listening Areas and Call Distribution.....	16
2.2.2.4	Call Rates	16
3.0	RESULTS.....	17
3.1	OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER	17
3.1.1	Recorder Effort.....	17
3.1.2	Listening Areas and Call Distribution	17
3.1.3	Call Rates	24
3.2	RUSTY BLACKBIRD	26
3.2.1	Recorder Effort.....	26
3.2.2	Listening Areas and Call Distribution	26
3.2.3	Call Rates	32
4.0	DISCUSSION	34
5.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	37
6.0	LITERATURE CITED.....	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1:	Point types surveyed for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird in 2015.....	3
Table 2-2:	Automated recording unit sites surveyed for olive-sided flycatcher in 2016, 2017, and 2019.....	6
Table 2-3:	Automated recording unit sites surveyed for rusty blackbird in 2016, 2017, and 2019.....	6
Table 2-4:	Territories, recorders ¹ , and total number of calls in the cleaned datasets for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird by survey year.....	15
Table 3-1:	Recorder effort and call detection for olive-sided flycatcher by survey year.....	17
Table 3-2:	Recorder effort and call detection for rusty blackbird by survey year	26

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1:	Example of ARU placements within a potential bird territory at a disturbed site5	
Figure 3-1:	Average number of olive-sided flycatcher calls per day by listening area in 2017.....	18
Figure 3-2:	Average number of olive-sided flycatcher calls per day by listening area in 2019.....	18
Figure 3-3:	Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by hour over the 2017 and 2019 monitoring periods	24
Figure 3-4:	Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by day over the 2017 monitoring period.....	25
Figure 3-5:	Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by day over the 2019 monitoring period.....	25
Figure 3-6:	Average number of rusty blackbird calls per day by listening area in 2017.....	27
Figure 3-7:	Average number of rusty blackbird calls per day by listening area in 2019.....	27
Figure 3-9:	Average call rate of rusty blackbird by hour over the 2017 and 2019 monitoring periods	32
Figure 3-10:	Average call rate of rusty blackbird by day over the 2017 monitoring period	33
Figure 3-11:	Average call rate of rusty blackbird by day over the 2019 monitoring period	33

LIST OF MAPS

Map 2-1:	Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2016	7
Map 2-2:	Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2017	8
Map 2-3:	Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2019	9
Map 2-4:	Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2016	10
Map 2-5:	Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2017	11
Map 2-6:	Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2019	12
Map 3-1:	Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in eastern listening areas in 2017	20
Map 3-2:	Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in western listening areas in 2017	21
Map 3-3:	Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in eastern listening areas in 2019	22
Map 3-4:	Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in western listening areas in 2019	23
Map 3-5:	Distribution of rusty blackbird in listening areas in 2017	29
Map 3-6:	Distribution of rusty blackbird in eastern listening areas in 2019	30
Map 3-7:	Distribution of rusty blackbird in western listening areas in 2019	31

LIST OF PHOTOS

Photo 1-1:	Olive-sided flycatcher.....	2
Photo 1-2:	Rusty blackbird.....	2
Photo 2-1:	Four-microphone automated recording unit housed in protective case	4

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Bird Audio Recording Analysis Methods	40
---	----

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Keeyask Transmission Project (the Project or KTP) includes the generation outlet transmission lines and the construction power line. The primary function of the Project is to provide construction power and generation outlet transmission capacity for the Keeyask Generating Station being constructed in northern Manitoba along the Nelson River at Gull (Keeyask) Rapids upstream of Stephens Lake. The Project is located approximately 300 km northeast of Thompson within the Split Lake Resource Management Area.

The generation outlet transmission lines (GOT) transmit electricity from the 138 kV ac switchyard at the Keeyask Switching Station to the 138 kV ac switchyard at the existing Radisson Converter Station. The three lines are typically located in a single 275 m wide corridor approximately 38 km long; however, the width and configuration of the lines varies.

The construction power line (CP) is a 21 km 138 kV transmission line that taps the Kelsey to Radisson 138 kV transmission line (KN36) between the Ilford Station and 29 km from the Gillam Station tap. The R26K line runs parallel to KN36. The width of the R26K right-of-way is 60 m for most of its length, except for the locations where the line shares a right-of-way with the GOT lines.

Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopis cooperi*; Photo 1-1) and rusty blackbird (*Euphagus carolinus*; Photo 1-2) are migratory songbirds protected under the federal *Species at Risk Act* (SARA). The olive-sided flycatcher is listed as Threatened under the SARA and is listed as Special Concern by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC). In Manitoba, the olive-sided flycatcher is listed as Threatened under *The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act*. Its breeding habitat consists mainly of mature coniferous forest with open patches created by natural disturbance (e.g., fire), wetlands, or forestry clear-cuts (Altman and Sallabanks 2012 in Environment Canada 2016). Snags (dead standing trees) and live trees left behind after logging are important for perching while foraging for flying insects in open areas (Altman and Sallabanks 2012 in Environment Canada 2016).

The rusty blackbird is listed as Special Concern under the SARA and has no designation under *The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act* of Manitoba. Despite being a migratory bird, the rusty blackbird is not protected under the federal *Migratory Birds Convention Act 1994*. Rusty blackbirds inhabit the boreal forest during the breeding season, using wetland habitat such as sedge meadows, beaver ponds, muskegs, swamps, riparian scrub, and shrubby patches of willow and alder (COSEWIC 2017). Their diet consists mainly of aquatic invertebrates such as insect larvae and snails, and also of grasshoppers, beetles, and spiders (COSEWIC 2017).

Pilot studies for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird were conducted in 2015, to identify and enumerate breeding pairs of birds in the Keeyask region. Disturbance surveys were conducted in 2016, 2017, and 2019, to determine if and how the Project affects the distribution and abundance of each species.



Photo 1-1: Olive-sided flycatcher



Photo 1-2: Rusty blackbird

2.0 METHODS

2.1 FIELD STUDIES

2.1.1 PILOT STUDY

The goal of the 2015 pilot study was to determine if enough olive-sided flycatchers and rusty blackbirds were in the study area to support a credible study design. Survey points were located throughout the Keeyask region to locate territories of breeding olive-sided flycatchers and rusty blackbirds. Surveys for KTP were conducted concurrently with those for the Keeyask Generation Project (KGP); four types of points were surveyed in 2015 (Table 2-1):

- Habitat association points - located every 50 m on 600 m-long transects that were placed in locations thought to be high or intermediate-quality olive-sided flycatcher or rusty blackbird habitat throughout Study Zone 4. These points were established to provide information on habitat use in the Keeyask region for the expert information model to be developed following KGP construction monitoring.
- Field points - located every 100 m on transects that were 600 m long near major roads, or 300 m long near the Project footprint.
- Systematic points - roadside stop survey with points located every 300 m along Provincial Road (PR) 280, the North Access Road (NAR), and South Access Road (SAR).
- Sample habitat association points - located every 50 m on 600 m transects that were placed in olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird habitat. These points were established to provide information on habitat use in the Keeyask region for the habitat quality model to be developed following KGP construction monitoring.

Table 2-1: Point types surveyed for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird in 2015

Survey Point Type	Number Surveyed
Habitat association	25
Olive-sided flycatcher field	110
Rusty blackbird field	63
Systematic	106
Sample habitat association	55
Total	359

Pilot surveys were conducted in June and July 2015. Surveys began a half-hour before sunrise and ended no later than 10 AM. At each survey point, observers watched and listened for olive-sided flycatchers and rusty blackbirds for a period of 10 minutes. If no bird was heard or observed

the observer travelled to the next survey point and repeated the process. When an olive-sided flycatcher or rusty blackbird was heard or observed at one of these locations, observers marked its position using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. The bird was observed until three perches were marked. This was defined as the bird's territory in 2015. Territory sizes were not estimated as only three perch locations were collected. Observers maintained a sufficient distance from the bird to avoid disturbance and record natural perch locations.

Recorders (Tascam DR100-MKII) and first-generation automated recording units (ARUs) were used to verify the observations (Photo 2-1). Both datasets were used to test the quality and capabilities of the second-generation ARUs.




Photo 2-1: Four-microphone automated recording unit housed in protective case

2.1.2 TERRITORY MAPPING AND AUDIO RECORDING

Olive-sided flycatcher (OSFL) and rusty blackbird (RUBL) nesting territories identified in 2015 were re-visited from late May to early July 2016, 2017, and 2019, and additional sites were surveyed. Between sunrise and 10 AM, observers watched and listened for OSFL and RUBL for a period of 10 minutes. If no bird was heard or observed, the observer repeated the process at the next site. When a bird was heard or observed at a site, observers marked its position using a GPS unit. The bird was observed until at least five perches were marked, defining its territory. Observers maintained a sufficient distance from the bird to avoid disturbance and record natural perch locations. A paired habitat sample design was employed, where survey sites represented either Project-disturbed or undisturbed areas. Project-disturbed sites (disturbed sites) were within 500 m of the Project. For each disturbed site, an undisturbed site, located in similar habitat but

beyond the expected range of disturbance for olive-sided flycatchers and rusty blackbirds (500 m), was also surveyed.

Two to four second-generation ARUs were placed in or near potential territories at disturbed sites, at distances of 100 m, 300 m, 500 m, and 700 m from the nearest road (Figure 2-1) or transmission line. Three or four ARUs were placed in or near each territory at undisturbed sites, at 100 m, 300 m, 500 m, and 700 m from a non-habitat patch edge such that they were centrally located through the long side of the habitat patch. See Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc. (WRCS 2018, 2020) for detailed field methods.

The ARUs were programmed to record for 5 minutes at 10-minute intervals (i.e., six times per hour) for seven hours beginning half an hour before sunrise and for four hours beginning an hour before sunset. Audio recording units were typically left in place for 10 days (the set period). The target listening period for OSFL and RUBL was the seven hours beginning half an hour before sunrise. The minimum set period was seven days. Sixty-six recordings were made daily at each potential territory over the duration of the survey period.



Figure 2-1: Example of ARU placements within a potential bird territory at a disturbed site

The total number of potential territories and ARUs set in them for KTP and KGP varied across the three survey years. For OSFL, in 2016, 131 ARUs were set in 38 potential territories (Table 2-2; Map 2-1). A total of 87 and 89 ARUs were set in 2017 (Map 2-2) and 2019 (Map 2-3), respectively, for 29 potential territories in each year. The number of ARUs per territory ranged from two to seven in 2016, and from two to four in 2017 and 2019.


For RUBL, 98 ARUs were set in 37 potential territories in 2016 (Table 2-3; Map 2-4). In 2017 (Map 2-5), 172 ARUs were set in 42 potential territories, and in 2019 (Map 2-6), 123 ARUs were set in 38 potential territories.

Table 2-2: Automated recording unit sites surveyed for olive-sided flycatcher in 2016, 2017, and 2019


Sensory Disturbance	2016	2017	2019
North Access Road	34	22	16
Undisturbed	33	22	10
South Access Road	3	-	3
Undisturbed	7	-	3
Hwy 280	27	14	9
Undisturbed	14	5	9
CP Transmission Line	7	12	18
Undisturbed	6	12	21
Total	131	87	89

Table 2-3: Automated recording unit sites surveyed for rusty blackbird in 2016, 2017, and 2019


Sensory Disturbance	2016	2017	2019
North Access Road	18	48	28
Undisturbed	17	47	31
South Access Road	3	12	4
Undisturbed	6	12	3
Hwy 280	12	14	5
Undisturbed	14	7	5
CP Transmission Line	15	22	25
Undisturbed	13	10	22
Total	98	172	123



Map 2-1: Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2016



Map 2-2: Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2017




Map 2-3: Olive-sided flycatcher automated recording units in listening areas in 2019



Map 2-4: Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2016



Map 2-5: Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2017



Map 2-6: Rusty blackbird automated recording units in listening areas in 2019

2.2 AUDIO RECORDING SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS

2.2.1 AUDIO PROCESSING

To identify the presence or absence of OSFL or RUBL calls, analyses of bird vocalizations were performed using the statistical package R (Hafner and Katz 2018). For the purposes of this report, the words song and call are used interchangeably; however, for bird identification purposes, the true territorial song of the olive-sided flycatcher (i.e., the distinctive whistled song that was famously rendered as '*quick, three beers!*' by early field guide authors) and for rusty blackbird (i.e., song consists of two or three notes, followed by a higher, rising note, like the creak of rusty hinges), were the only two sound types identified using the statistical package R. A stepwise process was used to remove most false positives, where other species were initially identified as the target species. Classification of audio clips involved setting a threshold for target and off-target calls and calculating a difference between the two (see Appendix 1 for detailed analysis methods). All calls identified as OSFL or RUBL were isolated and reviewed for potential false positives not removed during the initial identification process.

Sound pressure level in decibels, or 'sound volume', was used to estimate the distance to a calling bird (Appendix 1). Direction was estimated using the equivalent of Interaural Level Difference. Manually collected bird song samples were used to calibrate the distance and direction to known locations of olive-sided flycatchers and rusty blackbirds. Individuals were georeferenced using GPS. The distance to the observer was estimated using a rangefinder. Samples were collected at about 20 m increasing increments until the bird could no longer be heard. An algorithm was devised to find the peak root mean square amplitude within each clip and convert it to a decibel value with an accurate time stamp. The four peak values were then used to triangulate the direction of the call as measured along the horizontal plane of the microphone array. In the final data set, distance of the calling bird was estimated using decibel-distance curves with the largest decibel value measured by the four microphones.

2.2.2 DATA ANALYSIS

At the time of this report, data for several aspects of the sensory disturbance and habitat association studies were still in the process of being extracted from the recorder data. Other data, including habitat mapping and interpretation of key habitat attributes, were in preliminary stages. Data analysis for this report focused on the preliminary descriptive analysis of bird call data for OSFL and RUBL. The results are exploratory and will be used to guide the final analysis once all data become available. All of the methods described in this section were applied separately for OSFL and RUBL.

The data available for this report included bird call occurrence, including the call date and time; the estimated direction and distance of the call from the recorder; and recorder set time and overall recorder effort, represented by the total number of audio recordings made by the recorder.

For each of the bird species, descriptive analysis was undertaken through the following general steps:

- Data preparation:
 - Validation, cleaning, and correction of the raw call and recorder data, including identification of data entry errors, misidentified calls, missing data, and removal of duplicate data.
 - Description of overall recorder effort, call detection, and potential recorder issues that would impact the sensory disturbance analysis.
- Map the distribution of calls:
 - Spatial distribution of standardized call density (i.e., heat map). Call density refers to number of calls per unit area per unit time (e.g., number of calls per grid cell per day).
 - Identification of potential breeding pair territories.
- Descriptive analysis of call rates, including daily trends and trends over the breeding season.

2.2.2.1 DATA PREPARATION

Bird call data were compared with their associated recorder data. Any mismatches between the recorder ID in the bird call data were identified and corrected. Duplicate data were identified by sorting the call data by recorder, date, and time. Calls occurring at the same time, during the same recording, and with identical geographic coordinates were identified as duplicates and filtered from the data.

Individual calls were plotted using their estimated geographic location (i.e., UTM location estimated using distance and direction from recorder location) in a GIS (MapInfo Pro). The distributions of calls were examined for unusual patterns and unexpected locations. Potential errors in position estimates were flagged, the distance and direction estimate calculations were checked for errors, and corrections were applied if justifiable.

Examination of the pattern of call positions around recorders identified a subset of calls with anomalous distributions. Investigation of the raw recorder data determined that a regularly programmed “click” noise produced by the recorder for timing purposes sometimes resulted in false positive calls. A probability score was calculated that identified the likelihood that a call was actually a “click”. Testing determined that selecting a probability score of 0.6 identified clicks 93.5% of the time, with a false positivity rate of only 0.2%. This was selected as the optimal score. All data points with a probability score of 0.6 or greater were filtered from the dataset. Examination of the distribution of the filtered data points confirmed that the anomalous patterns were removed.

As a final step, all calls that were recorded outside of the target recording window for each species were removed from the dataset. Calls may have been recorded outside the target window for the following reasons:

1. They were incidental calls that were detected during the recording windows for other species of interest (i.e., species other than OSFL and RUBL), and
2. Recorder malfunction (e.g., power interruptions causing internal clock to reset).

Table 2-4 provides the total number of calls for OSFL and RUBL after data preparation.

Table 2-4: Territories, recorders¹, and total number of calls in the cleaned datasets for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird by survey year

	2016	2017	2019	All
Olive-sided flycatcher				
Possible territories	4	8	13	25
Recorders	10	24	36	70
Calls detected	16,889	40,647	58,120	115,656
Rusty blackbird				
Possible territories	9	8	14	31
Recorders	22	32	45	99
Calls detected	1,964	1,311	7,533	10,808

Notes: ¹ The total number of recorders includes only those that detected calls and may be lower than the total number of recorders set for that year (see Table 2-2 and Table 2-3).

2.2.2.2 RECORDER EFFORT

Recorder effort refers to the degree to which a given recorder produced the fully programmed number of valid audio recordings for the total time it was set up in the field. Effort data available for this report were in the form of the total number of full recordings made by each recorder. To complete the full analysis, recorder effort per day is needed. This has been provided for some of the recorders and is in progress for the rest.

Recorders were programmed to produce 66 five-minute recordings in a day (42 recordings during the target time window for OSFL and RUBL, and 24 recordings for other species of interest). For example, if a recorder was set for 10 days, and had 100% recorder effort, it should have made 660 five-minute audio recordings. A recorder may have had less than 100% effort due to recorder malfunction (mechanical or battery failure), or the time of day when the recorder was set up and/or removed truncated a recording window.

Data from recorders with seven or more days of recordings were retained for the analysis included in this report. In the preliminary study design, seven days was adopted as the minimum number to adequately demonstrate habitat use. Some of the excluded recorders will likely be used in future analyses.

2.2.2.3 LISTENING AREAS AND CALL DISTRIBUTION

A set of automated recording units was located in an area where the target species was confirmed to be perching. These areas represented possible breeding pair territories. The geographic area within which bird calls could be detected is referred to as the recorder listening area. Recorder listening areas were outlined by buffering the retained recorder location in a given listening area by the 99th percentile distance for the pooled data of the target species in a GIS. The 99th percentile, rather than the maximum distance, was used to account for a degree of positional error inherent in the distance estimator algorithm. The distribution of calls within the areas was represented by a heat map showing the average number of calls per day by location.

Usage of each individual listening area was assessed by calculating the call rate for the area, which was averaged over all ARUs with sufficient effort that were set in the listening area. The call rate for individual ARUs was the total number of calls divided by the total number of days in which recordings were made (calls per day). The period over which calls were detected in the listening areas was determined by the dates of the first and last calls that were detected over the set-up period.

Heat maps were created by tessellating the listening area polygons produced in the step above into 20 m wide (260 m²) hexagons for each year. Each hexagon was assigned a unique identifier code. The call locations were assigned the identifier code for the hexagon in which they fell. The average number of calls per day was calculated for each hexagon by dividing the total number of calls within the hexagon by the total number of days that the recorder logged data.

2.2.2.4 CALL RATES

For each species, calls were standardized to a mean number of calls per minute. The total number of calls detected in each audio recording was divided by five (the number of minutes in the recording) to obtain the number of calls per minute. These values were averaged over the total number of recordings in the period of interest.

For each recorder, average hourly call rates were calculated by dividing the sum of call rates for the hour by six (the total number of five-minute recording periods per hour) to get an overall average for the hour. Average daily call rates were calculated by averaging the hourly call rates over a given day.

These calculations assume that in a given recording day, all the programmed recordings were produced. In cases where the recorder did not obtain the full number of recordings in a day, the calculated averages may be over or underestimated. Standardization will remove these biases. For this preliminary exploratory analysis, it was not expected that missing recordings were widespread enough to substantially influence the patterns.

Descriptive statistics showing average trends in call rates within the daily target time window, as well as over the recording period, were produced. To standardize the results and avoid emphasizing outliers, data were truncated to remove dates that were only captured by recorders in a single territory.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER

3.1.1 RECORDER EFFORT

Recorder percent effort ranged from 0% to 100% across the three survey years. The year with the overall lowest recorder effort was 2016, with an overall average of 56% (Table 3-1). The overall average recorder effort in 2017 and 2019 was 90% and 95%, respectively.

Based on the total number of recordings, seven (54%) of the recorders in 2016 were considered to have low effort (six or fewer days worth of recording data; Table 3-1). In 2017, three (13%) of the recorders had low effort, and in 2019, one recorder (3%) had low effort.

Of the recorders set in 2016, 10 (77%) detected OSFL calls (Table 3-1). In 2017, 24 (100%) of the recorders detected calls, and 36 (92%) detected calls in 2019.

Due to the overall low effort of many recorders in 2016 and recorder effort data still to come, standardization of those data to produce heat maps and call rates was not completed. Consequently, the 2016 call data were excluded from the heat map and call rate analysis for this report.

Table 3-1: Recorder effort and call detection for olive-sided flycatcher by survey year


Metric	2016	2017	2019
Total number of ARUs	13	24	39
Average percent effort ¹	56.0	90.4	95.1
Number of ARUs with low effort ²	7	3	1
Percent of ARUs that detected calls	76.9	100.0	92.3

Notes: ¹ Mean percent of set-period in which the ARU made recordings. Ten days of recordings or more = 100% effort. ² ARUs with six or fewer days of full recordings.

3.1.2 LISTENING AREAS AND CALL DISTRIBUTION


OSFL use of the listening areas varied across the ARUs. Considering only the recorders that detected OSFL calls, the average number of calls during the total daily recording time (i.e., 210 minutes for a recorder with full effort) in each listening area in 2017 (Figure 3-1) ranged from a minimum of less than 51 (L11 OSFL D) to a maximum of 378 (L02 OSFL P). The time span between the first and last detected calls within the territories ranged from approximately 10 days to 14 days.

In 2019 the average number of calls per day ranged from a maximum of 368 (L04 OSFL D) to a minimum of one (L01 OSFL P; Figure 3-2). The time span between the first and last detected calls within the territories ranged from approximately 5 days to 12 days.



Notes: Numbers above the bars represent the number of days between the first and last detected call. All recorders active for more than six days.


Figure 3-1: Average number of olive-sided flycatcher calls per day by listening area in 2017




Notes: Numbers above the bars represent the number of days between the first and last detected call. All recorders active for more than six days.

Figure 3-2: Average number of olive-sided flycatcher calls per day by listening area in 2019


Map 3-1 to Map 3-4 show heat maps of the average number of calls per day throughout the recorder listening areas. The heat maps show that the call density was uneven throughout the listening area for both 2017 and 2019. Most listening areas contained one or more “hot spots,” where calls were more frequently occurring, while other portions of the listening areas had few to no calls over the recording period. There were hot spots and areas with few or no calls in disturbed and undisturbed listening areas.




Map 3-1: Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in eastern listening areas in 2017



Map 3-2: Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in western listening areas in 2017




Map 3-3: Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in eastern listening areas in 2019



Map 3-4: Distribution of olive-sided flycatcher in western listening areas in 2019

3.1.3 CALL RATES

The average call rate (calls/minute) for OSFL varied over the morning (i.e., 4 AM to 11 AM; Figure 3-3). The average call rate was considerably higher between 4 AM and 5 AM than during the rest of the morning. The call rate between 4 AM and 5 AM was approximately 3.7 calls/minute in 2017 and 4.0 calls/minute in 2019. The call rate then decreased to 0.7 and 0.6 calls per minute between 5 AM and 6 AM in 2017 and 2019, respectively, and to approximately 0.2 and 0.1 calls per minute between 10 AM and 11 AM, respectively.




Notes: n = the number of recorders plus the cumulative number of recording days over the monitoring period. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 3-3: Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by hour over the 2017 and 2019 monitoring periods


The day-to-day variation in the average daily call rate ranged by an order of magnitude over the monitoring period for both 2017 and 2019 (Figure 3-4). In 2017, average call rates over the day ranged from a minimum of 0.1 calls/minute (Julian day 167, or June 16) to a maximum of 1.7 calls per minute (Julian day 181, or June 30). In 2019, average call rates over the day ranged from a minimum of 0.1 calls/minute (Julian day 168, or June 17) to a maximum of 1.4 calls/minute (Julian day 181, or June 30).

Daily average call rates over the 2017 or 2019 monitoring periods did not show any trends or other patterns. The patterns for 2017 and 2019 were not similar.



Notes: Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Numbers in error bars represent the number of recorders with call data on that day.

Figure 3-4: Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by day over the 2017 monitoring period



Notes: Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Numbers in error bars represent the number of recorders with call data on that day.

Figure 3-5: Average call rate of olive-sided flycatcher by day over the 2019 monitoring period

3.2 RUSTY BLACKBIRD

3.2.1 RECORDER EFFORT

Recorder percent effort ranged from 0% to 100% across the three survey years. The year with the overall lowest recorder effort was 2016, with an overall average of 56% (Table 3-2). The overall average recorder effort in 2017 and 2019 was 99% and 93%, respectively.

Based on the total number of recordings, 13 (46%) of the recorders in 2016 were considered to have low effort (six or fewer days worth of recording data; Table 3-2). In 2017, none of the recorders had low effort, and in 2019, one recorder (2%) had low effort.

Of the recorders set in 2016, 22 (79%) detected at least one RUBL call (Table 3-2). In 2017, all of the recorders detected calls, and 45 (96%) detected calls in 2019.

Due to the overall low effort of many recorders in 2016 and recorder effort data still to come, standardization of those data to produce heat maps and call rates was not completed. Consequently, the 2016 call data was excluded from the heat map and call rate analysis for this report.

Table 3-2: Recorder effort and call detection for rusty blackbird by survey year


Metric	2016	2017	2019
Total number of ARUs	28	32	47
Average percent effort ¹	56.4	99.0	93.2
Number of ARUs with low effort ²	13	0	1
Percent of ARUs that detected calls	78.6	100.0	95.7

Notes: ¹ Mean percent of set-period in which the ARU made recordings. Ten days of recordings or more = 100% effort. ² ARUs with six or fewer days of full recordings.

3.2.2 LISTENING AREAS AND CALL DISTRIBUTION


RUBL use of the listening areas varied across the ARUs. Considering only the recorders that detected RUBL calls, the average number of calls during the total daily recording time (i.e., 210 minutes for a recorder with full effort) in each territory in 2017 (Figure 3-5) ranged from a minimum of 0.1 (L01 RUBL P) to a maximum of 9.6 (L04 RUBL D). The time span between the first and last detected calls within the territories ranged from approximately 1 day to 12 days.

In 2019 the average number of calls per day ranged from a minimum of 0.3 (C02 RUBL D) to a maximum of 61 (C02 RUBL P; Figure 3-7). The time span between the first and last detected calls within the territories ranged from approximately 6 days to 12 days.



Notes: Numbers above the bars represent the number of days between the first and last detected call. All recorders active for more than six days.


Figure 3-6: Average number of rusty blackbird calls per day by listening area in 2017




Notes: Numbers above the bars represent the number of days between the first and last detected call. All recorders active for more than six days.

Figure 3-7: Average number of rusty blackbird calls per day by listening area in 2019


Map 3-5 to Map 3-7 show heat maps of the average number of calls per day throughout the ARU areas of detection. As expected, the heat maps show that the distribution of calls was uneven throughout the listening area for both 2017 and 2019. Most listening areas contained one or more “hot spots”, where calls were more frequently occurring, while other portions of the listening areas had few to no calls over the recording period. There were hot spots and areas with few or no calls in disturbed and undisturbed listening areas.



Map 3-5: Distribution of rusty blackbird in listening areas in 2017




Map 3-6: Distribution of rusty blackbird in eastern listening areas in 2019



Map 3-7: Distribution of rusty blackbird in western listening areas in 2019

3.2.3 CALL RATES

The average call rate (calls/minute) for RUBL was variable over the morning on average (i.e., 4 AM to 11 AM; Figure 3-8), but there were no obvious increasing or decreasing trends with time. In 2017, the average call rate remained similar over the entire morning but was highest between 5 AM and 6 AM. In 2019, the call rate appeared to be highest between 4 AM and 5 AM, but overall remained similar throughout the morning.




Notes: n = the number of recorders plus the cumulative number of recording days over the monitoring period. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 3-8: Average call rate of rusty blackbird by hour over the 2017 and 2019 monitoring periods


The day-to-day variation in the average daily call rate ranged by an order of magnitude over the monitoring period for 2017 (Figure 3-9). Average call rates over the day ranged from a minimum of 0.01 calls/minute to a maximum of 0.12 calls per minute. In 2019, average call rates over the day ranged from a minimum of 0.05 calls/minute to a maximum of 0.36 calls/minute (Julian day 178, or June 27; Figure 3-10).

Daily average call rates in 2017 did not show any trends or other patterns. In 2019, the average call rates appeared to increase starting on day 174 (June 23) to the end of the survey period. Average call rates during this time were two to three times higher than earlier in the season and compared to the entire 2017 survey period.



Note: Numbers in error bars represent the number of recorders with call data on that day. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 3-9: Average call rate of rusty blackbird by day over the 2017 monitoring period



Note: Numbers in error bars represent the number of recorders with call data on that day. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 3-10: Average call rate of rusty blackbird by day over the 2019 monitoring period

4.0 DISCUSSION

Olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird are species at risk and vulnerable to potential Project effects (WRCS 2018, 2020). The main objectives of the study were to evaluate how sensory disturbances from the access roads and transmission lines influence olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird distribution and relative abundance and to evaluate how Project-related disturbance alters habitat effectiveness. To achieve the scientifically credible approach for bird species at risk, a novel approach with automated recording units was used to generate the high-effort data requirements that were impossible to collect with human effort alone. Although there is precedent for using automated recording units for avian studies (Shonfield and Bayne 2017), it was necessary to estimate distance and direction to the vocalizing birds. Traditional methods that can acquire positional or movement data for wildlife usually involve trapping and radio-collaring animals. A non-invasive automated technique such as the one used in this study has not been used by the scientific community to monitor birds.

One of the novel aspects of this monitoring approach is that the recorders simultaneously captured sound in four directions, which enabled estimating the distance and direction of the bird relative to the recorder. The availability of these data enables relating bird call locations to the factors that influence bird habitat use, such as habitat quality and sensory disturbance. Other novel aspects of this monitoring included calibrated real-time clocks, which enabled a simultaneous capture of songs on two recorders; low power use so that lengthy field run-times could be achieved; and multiple power battery configurations so that the recorders could be used for different types of studies. All required features were not available on commercial products; as such, a custom design was necessary to meet the needs of this study.

Given the novel nature of this study, it was expected that technical difficulties would arise and require solutions. Despite the technical difficulties, a very considerable amount of bird call data were collected and processed (approximately 408,000 calls for KTP and KGP).

In all three survey years, individuals or breeding pairs for both OSFL and RUBL were successfully identified at many locations in the KTP and KGP study areas. This suggests that there is a well-established population for both bird species in the Keeyask region. There was a high success rate in identifying areas that were utilized by both OSFL and RUBL, which is based on successful detection of the species by ARUs placed in those areas. For OSFL, between 94% and 100% of the listening areas established over the three survey years were utilized by OSFL to some degree, and between 89% and 100% were utilized by RUBL. The total number of calls detected by the ARUs over the three survey years ranged from 41,475 to 120,979 for OSFL, and from 9,535 to 13,316 for RUBL.

To date, the multivariate analyses have focused on identifying possible technical issues with the call data and exploring the data to evaluate the best approach to standardizing call density. Overall recorder effort varied across the three survey years for both OSFL and RUBL. In particular, average recorder effort was low in 2016, but was high in 2017 and 2019. The reason

for the relatively low effort in 2016 was minor technical issues with the first-generation ARUs during their first year of deployment.

The spatial distribution of call rates and the heat maps for OSFL and RUBL indicated a large degree of spatial variability in call density within the recorder listening areas. The most obvious partial, or perhaps complete, explanation for this finding is that it reflects a combination of natural variability in habitat quality and the locations of perch trees relative to territory boundaries. The validity of this will be examined through future analyses that will also consider the effects of sensory disturbance level (e.g., traffic volumes) and confounding factors such as partial data standardization, vegetation density and weather.

Heat maps generally revealed one or more hot spots, or locations with particularly high activity in both the disturbed and undisturbed listening areas, which likely indicated preferred perching locations for the singing individual. Perch tree selection by OSFL is based primarily on tree species and height (Robertson 2012), while RUBL tends to select standing dead trees as perches (McNulty et al. 2015). All other things being equal, higher call rates and the number of hot spots within a listening area likely indicate areas of high-quality habitat for the species and suggests the presence of a breeding pair on-territory. Variations in activity relative to habitat quality will be examined through future analyses.

Some listening areas had multiple hot spots and very high average call rates. While this may reflect a high proportion of high-quality habitat for the species, it may also be indicative that confounding factors are present in the data. For OSFL, recording processing determined that the ARUs can detect calls greater than 300 m away from the unit. Typically, the ARUs were spaced approximately 200 m apart, resulting in approximately 100 m of overlap between the recorders. If an individual's preferred perches occurred within this overlapping zone, it is likely that both recorders detected the call, resulting in double-counting.

Another potential confounding factor relates to the positional error inherent in the distance and direction estimator algorithm, which is caused by variability in terrain, weather, perch position and height, and direction of bird while singing. For this reason, each recorder may place the hot spot at a slightly different location in the listening area, giving the impression of two hot spots where there was actually one.

While double-counting may have influenced the heat maps to some extent (a hexagon may have included call locations from more than one recorder), the overall average call rates for each listening area were based on data from individual ARUs, and potential double-counting was not a factor. Looking at average call rates for the different listening areas, outliers with very high rates may be a stronger indication that birds from more than one breeding pair were detected in the listening area. Additional analyses will be implemented to determine if this listening area detected more than one breeding pair.

There were poorly defined hot spots, or few calls altogether, in some listening areas. While this may be indicative of poor habitat quality, it could also be under-utilized habitat. That is, the amount of suitable habitat may exceed what can be used by the local population. Several listening areas had either few or no recorded calls despite there being a confirmed presence of an individual at

the time that the listening area was established in the field. Possible reasons for this finding include territory abandonment due to poor habitat quality, bird mortality, the placement of recorders at the fringe of a potential breeding territory, or sensory disturbance. Because paired OSFL males with successful nests tend to reduce their singing rate and are less likely to be detected than unpaired males (Wright 1997), listening areas with fewer calls could also suggest a successfully mated male. Conversely, the presence of a perching bird during the initial site visit may not have been indicative of a nesting territory; a bird may have been perching in the area temporarily while searching for a territory or may have relocated part way through the breeding season (Wright 1997).

The daily pattern of call rates differed between OSFL and RUBL. OSFL showed a strong decreasing trend over the morning, with a very high call rate between 4 AM and 5 AM, then dropping substantially between 5 AM and 6 AM and decreasing gradually to 11 AM. This pattern supports the findings of other studies (e.g., Wright 1997) that indicate that calling frequency is highest in the hour surrounding sunrise, which occurs between approximately 4 AM and 5:15 AM during the survey period in the Keeyask region. In contrast, RUBL did not show a similar daily pattern. In 2017, call rates remained similar throughout the morning, and in 2019, they appeared to be higher between 10 AM and 11 AM compared to between 4 AM and 5 AM. An ARU study in Alberta indicated that RUBL were most likely to be detected early in the morning and that few were detected during the day (Nordell and Bayne 2017).

For both species, there appeared to be no obvious increasing or decreasing trends in call rate from earlier to later in the breeding season. In fact, the call rate varied substantially each day over the survey period. The one possible exception was for RUBL in 2019, where the average calls per day appeared to increase after June 22. It is uncertain at this time if this represents a change in bird behaviour, or if it is an artifact of the subset of listening areas recording at this time. After June 26, the number of ARUs recording calls decreased, and the remaining ARUs may have been in areas that had higher call rates throughout the season. The day-to-day pattern in call rates was likely affected by a combination of other factors, such as weather conditions, or differences in ambient noise from day to day.

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The ARUs provided considerable high-quality data for the study despite some technical difficulties. There was a large degree of spatial variability in OSFL and RUBL call density within the disturbed and undisturbed recorder listening areas. Some listening areas had multiple hot spots and very high average call rates, likely indicating preferred perching locations and suitable breeding habitat. Listening areas with poorly defined hot spots or few calls altogether may be indicative of poor habitat quality, under-utilized habitat that is suitable for breeding, or males that have finished breeding and are rearing young. Confounding factors in the analysis of heat maps included potential double-counting, positional error inherent in the distance and direction estimator algorithm, vegetation density, variations in the level of sensory disturbance, and recording more than one breeding pair in some listening areas. The forthcoming multivariate statistical and GIS analysis will incorporate the road disturbance, transmission line disturbance (if any), weather, and habitat quality data to control for the factors that influence the OSFL and RUBL call rates.

6.0 LITERATURE CITED

- COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada). 2017. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the rusty blackbird *Euphagus carolinus* in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, Ottawa, ON. 64 pp.
- Environment Canada. 2016. Recovery strategy for the olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) in Canada. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series. Environment Canada, Ottawa, ON. 52 pp.
- Hafner, S.D. and Katz, J. 2018. A short introduction to acoustic template matching with monitoR. Available from https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/monitoR/vignettes/monitoR_QuickStart.pdf [accessed May 15, 2018].
- McNulty, S., Glennon, M., and McCormack, M. 2015. Rusty blackbirds in New York State: ecology, current status, and future. *Adirondack Journal of Environmental Studies* 20: 87–99.
- Nelson, B.S. and Suthers, R.A. 2004. Sound localization in a small passerine bird: discrimination of azimuth as a function of head orientation and sound frequency. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 207: 4121–4133.
- Nordell, C. and Bayne, E.M. 2017. Rusty blackbird (*Euphagus carolinus*) population and distribution data in the Athabasca and Cold Lake Oil Sands region of Alberta using automated recording units (ARUs). Bioacoustic Unit, University of Alberta & Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute, Edmonton, AB. 20 pp.
- Robertson, B.A. 2012. Investigating targets of avian habitat management to eliminate and ecological trap. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 7(2): <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00533-070202>.
- Roman, N., Wang, D., and Brown, G. 2003. Speech segregation based on sound localization. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 114: 2236–2252. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1610463>.
- Shonfield, J. and Bayne, E.M. 2017. Autonomous recording units in avian ecological research: current use and future applications. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 12(1): 14. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00974-120114>.
- WRCS (Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc.). 2018. Keeyask Generation Project, Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP 2018-13, Olive-sided Flycatcher and Rusty Blackbird Sensory Disturbance Monitoring 2017. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB, Inc., June 2018.
- WRCS. 2020. Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan Report #TEMP-2020-15: Olive-sided Flycatcher and Rusty Blackbird Sensory Disturbance Monitoring

2019. A report prepared for Manitoba Hydro by Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc., June 2020.
- Wright, J.M. 1997. Preliminary study of olive-sided flycatchers, July 1994–April 1997. Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Final research report. Endangered species conservation fund federal aid studies SE-3-3, 4, and 5. Juneau, AK. 34 pp.
- Yip, D.A., Leston, L., Bayne, E.M., Sólymos, P., and Grover, A. 2017. Experimentally derived detection distances from audio recordings and human observers enable integrated analysis of point count data. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 12(1): 11. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ACE-00997-120111>.

APPENDIX 1: BIRD AUDIO RECORDING ANALYSIS METHODS

Automated Recording Units (ARUs)

Although there is extensive precedent for using automated recording units (ARUs) for avian studies (Shonfield and Bayne 2017), we had difficulty finding an ARU to meet our needs. In some of the species at risk studies proposed for the *Keeyask Generation Project Terrestrial Effects Monitoring Plan* (TEMP), for example, it was necessary to estimate distance and direction to the vocalizing birds. This required more than two channels of audio recording. Study design also demanded a large number of recorders to meet sample size requirements. After surveying the available technology, no recorders were found that could record four channels at a reasonable cost. Wildlife Resource Consulting Services MB Inc. commissioned Myrica Systems Inc. to design custom ARUs and a local contract assembler was hired to build them.

There were a number of criteria to be met in the ARU design:

- **Time accuracy:** ARUs contained a temperature-compensated quartz clock with an accuracy of +/- 2 minutes per year over a range of -40°C to 85°C.
- **Flexible time scheduling:** Timing parameters included start times, recording duration, interval, and number repetitions. Recordings can be corrected for sunrise and sunset over the season; units were loaded with daily sunrise and sunset times determined from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) calculations given the year, latitude, and longitude.
- **Lengthy unattended run time:** The design was optimized for minimal power consumption. ARUs could be powered from AA, D and 6V lantern batteries as required to meet recording time requirements.
- **Audio sensitivity:** Microphones were mounted in a separate case containing low-noise pre-amplifiers. Gain was set to match the sensitivity of human observers trained to identify bird calls.
- **Noise insensitivity:** Filtering was designed to remove frequencies above and below the range of interest for the bird species being recorded. This reduces, for example, wind noise. Microphones were also fitted with open-cell foam “windsocks”.
- **Environmental tolerance:** ARUs were designed and components chosen to operate in the full range of temperatures expected in the field. Microphone cables were sheathed in metal braid to resist chewing by rodents. Electronics were protected in weatherproof cases.
- **Directionality:** Each of four microphones was mounted in a recessed hole on each face of a square enclosure. This provided a degree of audio isolation of each from its neighbours. The ‘north’ microphone was labelled on enclosures to permit alignment in the field.
- **Data storage:** ARUs were fitted with secure digital (SD) cards (8 gigabyte [GB] or 32GB) as appropriate for each study. The audio sampling rate was also varied to match study, storage, and analysis requirements (16.0 kilohertz [kHz] or 44.1 kHz). Files were compressed in Ogg Vorbis format (OGG) using a patent-and-royalty-free algorithm, which provided no noticeable signal degradation. Each field recording consisted of two stereo recordings on the SD card (A

and B). An audible time marker (click) was used to verify synchronization of the two stereo recordings.

- **Data identification:** Each ARU had a serial number label and was programmed with the same number in software. Recording file names contained the day of the year (DOY), hour (HH) and minute (MM) that the recording started. For example, two stereo recordings would be labelled 1832110A.ogg and 1832110B.ogg. As a back-up, data were embedded within the audio file that included time, date, and serial number.

Pre-processing Data

For each survey year, field recordings from each recorder were copied from SD cards into a directory structure on a hard drive matching the respective year, study, and site. Each recording for olive-sided flycatcher and rusty blackbird was 300 seconds in length. Data from each year comprised several terabytes despite data being in compressed format. Data were kept in separate working and backup repositories.

Analysis of bird vocalizations was performed using the statistical package R¹. In order for data to be analyzed in R, OGG files had to be converted to wave (WAV) format using either SOX² or LameXP³. It was determined that an audio bandwidth of 5.5 kHz was sufficient to recognize the species of interest in recordings. For this reason, OGG files were converted to WAV format with a sampling rate of 11.025 kHz; this reduced the storage volume of uncompressed data and speeded file reading during analysis.

¹R (www.r-project.org), a free statistical analysis software environment. The Package 'monitoR' (<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=monitoR>) was used. monitoR is described briefly in "A short introduction to acoustic template matching with monitoR." Sasha D. Hafner and Jonathan Katz. February 14, 2018 (available from www.r-project.org) and in more detail in: "monitoR: Automation Tools For Landscape-scale Acoustic Monitoring - PhD Dissertation. Jonathan Katz. The University of Vermont. May, 2015.

²SOX (<http://sox.sourceforge.net>) is a free command line application for converting formats of and processing data in audio files.

³LameXP (<http://lamexp.sourceforge.net>) is a free audio file format converter with a windows front end.

Species Detection

Templates were created from exemplars of species vocalizations (calls) of interest. MonitoR uses a method called template matching to identify species by their sounds. The method can be thought of as taking a low-resolution spectrogram and measuring its correlation against the spectrogram of a whole recording. In fact, templates can be plotted as spectrograms.

It was necessary to use multiple exemplars for a given species to cover the range in variation of calls. It was also necessary to measure correlation against other non-target sounds (calls and environmental sound) that also had a high correlation with the same species.

Due to the very large collection of recordings for analysis, a balance needed to be struck between the detail of templates used and the speed of analysis; recording analysis with detailed templates would take much longer. Attention was also paid to the duration and frequency bandwidth chosen for each template. To reduce analysis time to a practical order of magnitude, a two-step process of analysis was required.

In the first step, a limited number of low-resolution templates were used to discover candidate calls of the target species, recognizing that there would be many false positives. These candidate calls were extracted as two-second sound clips with each clip starting one second prior to the centre of the call detection and running to one second after the centre of the call. Datasets were also created at this step that included clip file name and statistics about the candidate clip. A clip spectrogram was created for each clip that was useful for validation. By the second step, the volume of data had been greatly reduced and only clips were processed. These could then be analyzed at high resolution to remove most false positives.

Classification of clips involved setting a threshold for target and off-target calls and calculating a difference between the two. A viewing system for validation was developed to allow experts to view each call (clip) as a spectrogram along with its classification and to listen to it by simply clicking on the spectrogram. Summary statistics were created for all detections to aid in validation.

Distance and Direction Estimation

Sound pressure level in decibels (SPL), which humans perceive as ‘sound volume’, has been shown to provide a good estimate of distance to a calling bird (Yip et al. 2017). Direction can be estimated using the equivalent of Interaural Level Difference (ILD); from a human perspective this would be equivalent to using sound volume as a cue about direction (Nelson and Suthers 2004). Although many automated direction estimation algorithms use Interaural Time Difference (ITD), humans do not use this for high frequencies (Roman et al. 2003). There were several reasons why we were concerned that ITD might be unreliable in our studies. Some include: low signal to noise ratios (SNR), reverberation, environmental noise like wind, etc. In addition, our recording hardware was expected to have small differences that would be more pronounced at the high frequencies of bird calls. Microphones and circuits were identical by design, but tolerances in components were not and phase errors were expected. Exact synchronization of the two stereo recordings was problematic, even with the synchronization click that was used. We concluded that ILD was the best choice.

In order to calculate distance and direction to a singing bird recorded by the four-channel recorders, it was necessary to calibrate the system using bird songs recorded at varying distances. When a singing olive-sided flycatcher or rusty blackbird was observed, the observer would record the calls using the manual recording mode of the ARU. The distance of the bird from the observer was estimated using a rangefinder or waypoints taken at the observer's location and the bird's perch after it moved. Recordings were taken at approximately 20 m increasing increments until the bird could no longer be heard. Several dozen examples were collected using these techniques.

An algorithm was devised to find the peak root mean square (RMS) amplitude within each clip and convert it to a decibel value with an accurate time stamp. The four peak values were then used to triangulate the direction of the call; it was assumed that the calling bird was in the horizontal plane of the microphone array.

In the final data set, distance of the calling bird was estimated using decibel-distance curves created with field calibration recordings. Using the sound clips, distances were estimated by choosing the largest decibel value measured by the four microphones.

