Improving predictions of collision risk for marine mammals and tidal turbines –understanding the most critical factors

## Carol Sparling<sup>1</sup>, Bill Band, Joe Onoufriou<sup>2</sup>, Dave Thompson<sup>2</sup>, Ruth Joy<sup>3,4</sup>, Jason Wood<sup>4,</sup> Elena San Martin<sup>5</sup> and Nigel West<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>SMRU Consulting Europe
<sup>2</sup>Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St Andrews
<sup>3</sup>SMRU Consulting North America
<sup>4</sup>Dept. of Statistics, Simon Fraser University
<sup>5</sup>ABPmer





# Marine Scotland's Strategic approach to reducing knowledge gaps and enabling tidal energy



MARINE MAMMALS																	
Information					Themes				Reasoning	Prioritisation							
ID	Knowledge Gap	Target Species/Group	Seasons	Target Regions	Renewables Sector	Acute effects	Chronic effects	Baseline	Methodologies	Relevance	Current or Very Likely Future Constraint?	Relevant to >1 Sector?	Relevant to >1 Project?	Relevant to >1 Region?	Currently	Score	Potential activity
MM.01	Fine scale behavioural responses of marine mammals around tidal turbines	Harbour seal	All	North Scotland; West Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	×	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	3	0	1	1	Y	6	Using active acoustics seals in 3D around tide
MM.02	Fine scale behavioural responses of marine mammals around tidal turbines	Harbour porpoise	All	North Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	x	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	1	0	1	1	Y	2	Using passive acousti porpoises in 3D aroun turbines
MM.03	Fine scale behavioural responses of marine mammals around tidal turbines	Grey seal	All	North Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	x	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	0	0	1	1	Y	0	Using active acoustics seals in 3D around tide
MM.04	Likelihood and rate of collision with tidal turbines	Harbour seal	All	North Scotland; West Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	x	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	3	0	1	1	Y	6	GPS/UHF tracking con active acoustics to de avoidance rates
MM.05	Likelihood and rate of collision with tidal turbines	Harbour porpoise	All	North Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	x	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	1	0	1	1	Y	2	Using active and pass acoustics to track por around tidal turbines
MM.06	Likelihood and rate of collision with tidal turbines	Grey seal	All	North Scotland; Northern Isles	Tidal	x	x			To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	0	0	1	1	Y	0	Using active acoustics seals in 3D around tide
MM.07	Incorporating understanding of how marine mammals use tidal areas into collision risk models	Harbour seal	All	North Scotland	Tidal	x	x		x	To increase evidence base for use in estimation of collision rates in collision risk modelling	1	1	1	1	Y	3	Tracking of animals in active areas
MM.08	Abundance and distribution of marine mammals in locations and habitats suitable for renewable developments	Cetaceans	All	Scotland	All			x		Required to inform sectoral plans and scoping responses. Existing data become dated, some regions have fewer data than others (e.g. across species, seasons, years)	1	1	1	1	Y	3	Static acoustic monito transect surveys (aer based)
MM.09	Abundance and distribution of marine mammals in locations and habitats suitable for renewable developments	Pinnipeds	All	Scotland	All			x		Required to inform sectoral plans and scoping responses. Existing data become dated, some regions have fewer data than others (e.g. across species, seasons, years) Paquired to inform eacherst plans	1	1	1	1	Y	3	Fine scale usage map: telemetry and haul out
										required to inform sectoral plans							







## Factors with the potential to affect predicted collision risk Factors influencing level of risk

- 'physical' factors:
- Integrating variation in risk over site specific tidal cycle
- Device specific characteristics blade profile shape, width

'biological' factors:

- Abundance/density (and variation therein e.g. with depth)
- Animal movement patterns swim speed, direction etc
- Behaviour in the presence of turbines avoidance/evasion
- Consequences of collisions (convert CRM to 'MRM')



#### Refining Estimates of Collision Risk for Harbour Seals and Tidal Turbines

Scottish Marine and Freshwater Science Vol 7 No 17 B Band, C Sparling, D Thompson, J Onoufriou, E San Martin and N West



#### **Refinements of CRM: Physical factors**

**Calculating collision risk over the tidal cycle** using site specific frequency distribution of current speeds and device specific operational characteristics to average the collision risk over each current speed across the tidal cycle :

Typically risk was 3-4 % lower than calculated estimated on the basis of a single mean rotor speed





**Blade thickness** – taking account of the blade thickness and accounting for the potential for trailing edge collisions (in addition to leading edge collisions) made a small but significant difference for upstream transits, and a more substantial addition to risk for downstream transits – consequence for mortality depends on view of risk of injury from leading edge vs trailing edge

Overall physical refinements led to only modest changes in CR.....

### **'Biological' Refinements of CRM:**

- Depth distribution empirically derived vs Uniform or U shaped dives
- Density derived from tagged seal transit rates vs static density estimates
- Behaviour empirically derived movement data vs assumption of mean swimming speed or passive drift
- Avoidance incorporating empirical evidence on mid-range avoidance from a range of more recent studies
- Consequences of collisions relaxing assumptions that all collisions = death



### **Depth distribution**

At the MeyGen site, seal telemetry data indicated a larger proportion of mid water diving than expected





CRM recalculated using empirical depth distribution, relative to basic Band model (assuming **uniform** depth distribution): 16m rotor= 22% reduction, 18m rotor = 13% reduction, 20m rotor = 1-2% reduction

As extent of mid water diving increases, the overlap between depth distribution and position of turbines increases, resulting in a **higher risk** than assuming all dives to the seabed to forage

#### local abundance/ density

Source of density estimate	Density, seals per km <sup>2</sup> (95% Cl)	Resulting CRM* per year (no avoidance)
SMRU Seal usage maps (Jones et al., 2015)	0.40 (0.17-0.64)	93 (40-149)
Site specific survey data (MeyGen ES)	0.202 (no CI given)	47
Scaled local telemetry data equivalent inc 500m buffer	0.10 (0,008-0.251)	23 (2-59)
Scaled local telemetry data equivalent inc 250m buffer	0.05 (0.004-0.138)	12 (1-32)



\*using refined model

Recalculation of collision risk at MeyGen based on seal telemetry data = lowest estimate was ~16% of original EIA estimates based on a uniform static density from wider scale data

Scale and location matters – fine scale difference in seal activity can have major effects! Increasing area doubled the density Shifting area south by 500 m and 1000 m into higher density area resulted in a density of 0.24 and 0.66 seals per km<sup>2</sup> respectively

#### **Movement behaviour**



- Transits were largely against the direction of current at slow speeds over ground
- Animals working to maintain position against the current would move through swept area very slowly
- Increased risk of individual collision for a given pass through swept area BUT decreased rate of passage per unit time and also have more time to detect and react
- Using empirical speed over ground distributions in the Band CRM resulted in a decrease of ~10% relative to assuming a single average swimming speed



## Behaviour in the presence of a turbine: Swim speed/direction

- Very similar to Pentland Firth seals:
- Seals oriented against the current
- Over ground speeds were low
- swimming speeds increased in stronger currents to maintain similar overground speeds





Ruth Joy $^{a,b,*},$  Jason D. Wood $^c,$  Carol E. Sparling $^d,$  Dom J. Tollita, Andrea E. Coppinge, Bernie J. McConnell  $^f$ 

### **Consequences of collision:**



Figure 5. View from bow mounted camera indicating direction of movement and line of impact during an abdomen impact trial. The green arrows indicate the centre point of the boat given the position of the nose piece and the red arrow indicates direction of movement. The point at which the green arrows converge indicates the point of impact on the animal.

omparison	OT U.O	nonzun	<b>KISK WI</b>	in Mortall	IV KISK
ompanoon					

Rotation Speed		12	rpm	6 rpm			
Direction	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Downstream			
Collision integral	0.283	0.239	0.169	0.143			
Mortality integral	0.220	0.192	0.042	0.040			
Mortality as a proportion of collisions	77.7%	80.3%	24.9%	28.0%			

#### **Combined refinements**



#### Figure 39 Comparison of collision estimates using progressively refined methods

Basic – mean swim speed, mean rotor speed, uniform depth distribution

#### **Empirical depth distribution**

As above plus integrated over tidal cycle plus mortality correction

As above plus empirical ground speeds

**Overall reduction in CR >40%** 

### Behaviour in the presence of a turbine

40

20

20

40

500

Change in usage (%)

- Tagged seals at Strangford Lough: 68% decrease in usage within 200 m of the turbine (95% CI 37-83%)
- Detectable difference to within 600 m. No evidence beyond 600 m
- Play back experiments suggest seals responding to similar distances
- Joe's analysing Pentland Firth telemetry data from period of turbine deployment to look for change in usage
- **Evidence for avoidance?**



Joy et al. 2018

## Analysis from Strangford Lough tagged seals and collision risk modelling

Incorporating empirical info on:

- Depth distribution
- Plus behavioural avoidance and swim speed and direction.

Overall ~90% reduction in computed strike risk compared to assumptions of uniform depth and no avoidance





Empirical measures of harbor seal behavior and avoidance of an operational tidal turbine

Ruth Joy $^{a,b,*},$  Jason D. Wood $^c,$  Carol E. Sparling $^d,$  Dom J. Tollit $^a,$  Andrea E. Copping $^e,$  Bernie J. McConnell $^f$ 

#### Conclusions

Biological factors had much bigger potential to influence predictions than physical tidal or device characteristics

Detailed site specific information provided quite different encounter rates compared to those based on static density estimates – scale and location matters

Behaviour important: in some cases behaviour very different to general assumptions made by most models

Consequences are important – moving away from assumption that all collisions are equal and worst case – Joe Onoufriou's talk later this session

Empirical estimates of avoidance ~68% within 200 metres compared to baseline – acoustic output may be important in terms of this response – Ben Wilson's talk later this session

Near field/evasion remains the 'holy grail' – next couple of talks will highlight the steps that we're making in this area, in collaboration with Marine Scotland and Industry partners





#### Predicting responses to multiple devices?

Combining physical mechanistic models of strike probability with information on animal behaviour derived from single devices – are simulation based approaches the way forward?

Don't currently have the data to fully parameterize such models but could be used to explore scenarios, determine sensitivities and drive future data collection/analyses

Really need to be thinking hard about how the data from monitoring can best be incorporated to inform predictions at array scale

# Thank you

Doug Gillespie, Laura Palmer, Jamie Macaulay, Dom Tollit, MeyGen & Atlantis, Cara Donovan, Fraser Johnson, Elaine Tait, Kate Brookes, Ross Culloch, Janelle Braithwaite, Scottish Natural Heritage, Andrea Copping



Carol Sparling ces@smruconsulting.com www.smruconsulting.com @SMRU\_Consulting



