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Objectives

- To describe spatial patterns of abundance in six Great Lakes waterbird species/species groups
- To integrate data from 5 different aerial surveyors over two years of data collection
- To incorporate habitat and environmental covariates to explain variation in abundance
**Taxonomic Groups**

- Long-tailed Duck
- Goldeneye
- Loon
- Gulls
- Scaup
- Merganser

**Why?**
- Helps with observations that aren’t identified to species
- Helps reduce the number of zeroes
Aerial Survey Techniques

Substrips:
- Marks on the wing allow observers to divide up the strip area into substrips
- These divisions can be used to estimate detection probability

Flight Height

Strip Width:
- Total area surveyed

from Certain and Bretagnolle (2008)
### Variation in Survey Methods Across Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)</th>
<th>Western Great Lakes Bird and Bat Observatory (WGLBBO)</th>
<th>Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI)</th>
<th>Michigan Division of Natural Resources (MDNR)</th>
<th>Biodiversity Research Institute (BRI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic area</td>
<td>Lake Michigan</td>
<td>Western shoreline of Lake Michigan</td>
<td>Portions of Northern Lake</td>
<td>Lake St. Clair and western Lake Erie</td>
<td>New York’s portion of Lake Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transect spacing</td>
<td>4.8 km</td>
<td>3.2 km</td>
<td>5 km</td>
<td>3.2 km</td>
<td>5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plane type</td>
<td>Partenavia P.68</td>
<td>Partenavia P68C</td>
<td>amphibious Cessna</td>
<td>amphibious Cessna</td>
<td>amphibious Cessna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude of flights</td>
<td>61-76 m (200-250 ft)</td>
<td>100 m</td>
<td>91 m (300 ft)</td>
<td>91 m (300 ft)</td>
<td>61 m (200 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight speed</td>
<td>200 km/hr</td>
<td>148 km/hr</td>
<td>130-200 km/hr</td>
<td>145 km/hr</td>
<td>145-169 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip width (when no distance provided)</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td>412 m</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance bands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species recorded</td>
<td>Waterbirds and waterfowl</td>
<td>Waterbirds and waterfowl</td>
<td>Waterbirds and waterfowl</td>
<td>Waterbirds and waterfowl</td>
<td>Waterbirds and waterfowl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

- To estimate abundance, we need to incorporate variation in detection
- Each surveyor implemented a different sampling protocol that could change between years
- Counts of birds were highly variable and included a large number of zeroes
Multi-Protocol Distance Sampling

- Combined distance detection protocols for each species along shared parameters of interest

- Three components:
  - Detection function based on distance
    - Half-normal or hazard function
  - Model for observed groups
    - Zero-inflated overdispersed Poisson
  - Group size regression
    - Allows group size to vary with distance to observer (i.e., detection probability)
Modeling Numbers of Groups

- Zero-inflation model
  - Estimates the probability that a species could be found at the site

- Overdispersed Poisson model
  - Given that the animal can be found at the site, this estimates the number of groups there
Environmental Covariates

- Zero-inflation covariates
  - Longitude
  - Time of year (fall, winter, spring)
  - Ice coverage (solid ice or not)

- Abundance covariates
  - Bathymetry (m)
  - Lake bottom substrate (6 categories)
  - Ice coverage (% coverage)
  - Area offset
Model Implementation

- A Bayesian framework using JAGS 4.0
- Convergence assessed visually and the Gelman-Rubin statistic
- A posterior predictive check using a Bayesian $p$-value was used to quantify goodness of fit
Bathymetry
Ice Cover

The graphs show the relationship between predicted abundance and ice coverage percentage for different species. The x-axis represents ice coverage percentage ranging from 0 to 100, while the y-axis represents predicted abundance ranging from 0 to 0.2. Each species (LTDU, GULL, GOLD, LOON, MERG, SCAU) has a distinct pattern indicating how their abundance changes with varying ice coverage.
Abundance Estimates
The multi-protocol distance model allowed us to describe patterns of abundance at the scale of four Great Lakes. All species had higher abundance in shallower waters, but the rate of change differed considerably among species. Most species were less likely to be present at high ice locations. Scaup were the opposite, and Long-tailed Ducks decreased but were still higher than zero ice. These results suggest error in our ice coverage estimates or attraction to icy edges for these species (or both).
Future Directions

- More aerial surveys to fill in gaps in inference
  - Groups are highly clustered, can make it difficult to predict to unsurveyed areas
  - Particularly a focus on areas of high regulatory or conservation interest
  - High annual variance due to ice coverage, so repeating surveys for multiple years will be key

- To make useful predictions, we would need estimates of ice coverage across the lakes
  - Current forecasting occurs up to 5 days out
    - Great Lakes Coastal Forecasting System
  - Longer time scale forecasting is an area of active research
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