2021

Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development

Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling



Natural Research Projects, Brathens Business Park, Hill of Brathens, Glassel, Banchory AB31 4BY

01330 826880

November 2021

Natural Research (Projects) Ltd. Company registered in Scotland: SC213640 Registered Office: 14 Carden Place, Aberdeen, AB10 1UR

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Methods	2
Results	6
References	6
Input data and Model Results	7



Introduction

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

1.2. Further studies in the field of bird-windfarm research are required to establish with certainty the extent to which birds can avoid collision with wind turbines, although an increasing body of evidence suggests that avoidance capacity is very high (Whitfield & Madders 2006, Urquhart & Whitfield 2016, SNH 2018). The indications from studies are that collisions are rare events and occur mainly at sites where there are unusual concentrations of birds and turbines, or where the behaviour of the birds concerned leads to high-risk situations (e.g., Gill *et al.* 1996, Percival 1998, de Lucas *et al.* 2007). Examples include migration flyways, and where the food resource, and therefore level of bird activity, is exceptional.

Methods

1.3. Band *et al.* (2007) described a method by which field data on bird flight activity can be gathered and used to quantify crudely the likelihood of collisions with turbines: the 'Band' Collision Risk Model (CRM).

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

1.5. The two methods differ in the unit of exposure to collision risk. The PFM estimates a horizontal risk area which is the area of the turbine rotors facing a bird as it flies towards (with the 'intention' of flying through) the proposed Development. The extent of the Risk Area is given by the horizontal span of the proposed turbine array facing the bird on its typical flight direction multiplied by the vertical span of the proposed turbine rotors. The UFM employs an estimated risk volume, in keeping with the assumption that flight directions are random in space. Collision risk is estimated based on flight activity levels and behaviour, turbine numbers and dimensions, and bird biometrics and flight characteristics.

1.6. Dimensions and operational parameters of the candidate turbine model were used to populate the CRM, including an assumed hub height of 84 m and a rotor diameter of 132 m (see **Chapter 3: Proposed Development** of the EIA Report). The appropriate recorded flight height band was therefore 10 m – 150 m for data collected between March 2018 and March 2020 **(Technical Appendix 9.1)**. A turbine operation rate of 85% is assumed.

Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development Environmental Impact Assessment Report Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling

1.7. The PFM of the Band CRM was used to estimate the collision risk of greylag goose (*Anser anser*) in the non-breeding and migratory period, for golden plover (*Pluvialis apricaria*) all year and for curlew (*Numenius arquata*) in the breeding season.

1.8. The UFM of the Band CRM was used to estimate the collision risk of hen harrier (*Circus cyaneus*).

1.9. Following NatureScot guidance (SNH 2014) species length and wingspan have been derived using a mean of the figures presented within Snow & Perrins (1998) and flight speeds were derived using Alerstam *et al.* (2007) or Provan & Whitfield (2006) (**Table 9.2.1**), and the published avoidance rates were used (SNH 2018).

1.10. For each month, day length was calculated using the method of Forsythe *et al*. (1995).

1.11. Flight data were obtained from a total of two Generic Vantage Points (GVPs) and four Migration Watch Points (MWPs). Viewsheds were estimated using a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) and a 20 m vertical offset above the ground surface (lowest point of rotor sweep at 18 m). Details of at-risk flights are given in **Table 9.2.2**. An 'at-risk' flight is one which passes into the 500 m turbine buffer with at least part of its flight at an altitude between 10 m and 150 m.

1.12. Utilising all flight observations collected across the study area from all GVPs (PFM and UFM) and MWPs (for PFM) was likely to result in underestimates or overestimates of collision risk because data were collected for areas in which no turbines were (ultimately) proposed. Therefore, it was appropriate to employ only those observations in which flights were liable to incur a potential risk of collision, i.e., within the areas occupied by proposed turbines. Consequently, the CRM used only observations collected within a flight activity assessment area, comprising a 500 m buffer (centred on the turbine tower) around proposed turbine locations. This size of buffer encompasses rotor blade length, possible shifts in proposed turbine location due to micro-siting and, crucially, potential spatial errors in flight recording accuracy.

1.13. Turbine dimensions of hub height 84 m and blade length 66 m were utilised, giving a rotor diameter encompassing a bottom blade tip at 18 m and a top blade tip at 150 m. Thus, the flight height recording bands between 10 - 30 m and 100 - 150 m were defined as at collision risk height. The proposed Development is being applied for "in perpetuity" therefore there is currently no proposed lifetime duration for it.

1.14. For the UFM flight time within this buffer was calculated from the proportion of the length of each flight which fell within the 500 m buffer multiplied by the total duration of each flight (i.e., effectively assuming a constant speed for each flight). Time spent at different flight heights was estimated from time-interval data on height. To ensure that the CRM used robust measures of flight activity, a 2 km distance truncation was assumed in the area visible from each GVP.

1.15. For the PFM all flights which passed within the 500 m buffer of turbine locations were included, and the count of birds involved in those flights used. For goose flights a precautionary provision that 25% of flights were not observed because they occurred in the hours of darkness was included (estimates of daylight hours according to latitude followed the algorithm of Forsythe *et al.* (1995).

Table 9.2.1. Bird biometrics and flight speeds utilised in the CRM.						
Species	Length (m)	Wingspan (m)	Flight speed (m/s)			
Greylag goose	0.83	1.64	17.0			
Golden plover	0.28	0.72	17.9			
Curlew	0.55	0.90	16.3			
Hen harrier	0.48	1.10	11.4			



Table 9.2.2. Flights recorded within GVP viewsheds and clipped to 500 m survey buffer. Part, or all, of these flights at a height of 10 – 150 m agl places them at r (shaded columns).

Species	Season	VP No.	Bout ID	No. of birds	<10 m	10-30 m	30-50 m	50-100 m				
	Apr-Aug	GVP2	HOL_180404_002_B001	1	150	30						
		GVP1	HOL_191219_001_B001	1	76							
		GVFI	HOL_191219_002_B003	1				47				
			HOL_180905_002_B001	1		130						
			HOL_180905_002_B002	1		229						
			HOL_181017_001_B002	1		147						
			HOL_181216_002_B001	1	41							
			HOL_190128_002_B001	1		62						
Hen harrier	Sep-Mar		HOL_190128_003_B001	1			137					
	C CP 1 I C	GVP2	HOL_190206_002_B001	1		35						
		0112	HOL_191219_003_B001	1	38							
			HOL_191219_003_B002	1	73							
			HOL_200129_002_B001	1	59							
			HOL_200129_002_B002	1	89							
			HOL_200129_002_B003	1	303							
			HOL_200306_002_B001	1	24							
			HOL_200312_002_B001	1		142						
Hen harrier To	tal			17	853	775	137	47				
			HOL_181010_001_B003	2								
			HOL_181118_001_B001	11								
			HOL_181118_001_B002	13								
			HOL_181118_001_B003	25				*				
							HOL_181204_001_B001	15				*
			HOL_181204_001_B002	15				*				
							HOL_181216_001_B002	20				*
			HOL_190206_001_B001	80 5	*	*		Ť				
			HOL_190314_001_B002					*				
			HOL_191009_001_B005 HOL_191101_001_B001	220 30				*				
			HOL_191101_001_B001 HOL_191101_001_B002	11				*				
		GVP1	HOL_191101_001_B002	4				*				
		GVPI	HOL 191101_001_B008	30				*				
			HOL_191101_001_B009	50				*				
			HOL_191101_001_B012	30								
			HOL_191219_002_B002	6								
Greylag goose	Sep-Mar		HOL_191220_001_B001	31								
			HOL_200129_001_B002	55			*	*				
			HOL_200223_001_B001	12				*				
			HOL_200223_001_B002	4								
			HOL_200225_001_B002	8			*	*				
			HOL 200225 001 B003	6				*				
			HOL 200225 001 B004	30				*				
			HOL 200225 001 B006	3				*				
			HOL_200225_001_B000	15								
			HOL_181001_001_B001	50								
			HOL_181017_001_B001	1				*				
			HOL 181017 001 B003	80								
		GVP2	HOL_181122_001_B001	5		*	*					
			HOL_181122_001_B002	40				*				
			HOL_181122_001_B003	6		*						
			HOL_181204_002_B001	8				*				
			HOL_190314_002_B002	5	*							



isk of a collision with the turbine blades					
100-150 m	>150 m				
*					
*					
*					
*					
*	*				
``					
*					
*					
*					

Table 9.2.2. F (shaded colum		orded wi	thin GVP viewsheds and c	lipped to 50	00 m survey buffer. Pa	art, or all, of these fligh	ts at a height of 10 – 1	50 m agl places them a	at risk of a collision with	the turbine blades
Species	Season	VP No.	Bout ID	No. of birds	<10 m	10-30 m	30-50 m	50-100 m	100-150 m	>150 m
			HOL_190327_001_B003	10			*			
ļ			HOL_190327_001_B004	1			*			
			HOL_190906_002_B001	5					*	
			HOL_190906_002_B003	5					*	
			HOL_191003_001_B002	25				*		
			HOL_191011_001_B001	9				*		
			HOL_191011_001_B003	30				*		
		GVP2	HOL_191118_001_B001	8				*	*	
			HOL_191118_001_B002	400			*		<u>^</u>	
			HOL_191118_001_B003 HOL_191126_001_B001	9 8			-1-	*		
			HOL_191220_001_B001 HOL_191220_003_B001	13					*	
	Sep-Mar		HOL_191220_003_B001 HOL_200223_002_B001	40		*	*	*		
	JCP-Mai		HOL_200223_002_B001	30			*			
			HOL 200225 002 B001	30				*		
			HOL 200225 002 B003	30					*	
			HOL_180322_001_B001	34					*	
Greylag goose		MWPA	HOL_180322_001_B003	9			*	*	*	*
			HOL_180322_001_B008	16					*	*
ļ			HOL_180322_001_B009	85					*	
			HOL_180918_001_B002	2						*
			HOL_181010_002_B016	35				*	*	*
		MWPB	HOL_190919_002_B001	25			*			
ļ			HOL_191009_002_B006	25				*		
ļ		<u> </u>	HOL_191011_002_B001	4			*			de
	Sep-Mar	lotal		1814	*	*	*	*	*	*
		GVP1	HOL_180413_001_B002	70				*		
		CVD2	HOL_180413_001_B005 HOL_180411_001_B001	60 14			*	T		
	Apr-Aug	MWPC	HOL_180402_001_B004	250		*	*	*	*	*
	Api-Aug		HOL_180402_001_B004	1				*		
			HOL_190409_002_B001	7					*	
		MWPB	HOL_190405_002_0001	40					*	
	Apr-Aug ⁻	Total	1102_190111_001_0001	442		*	*	*	*	*
Greylag goose				2256	*	*	*	*	*	*
			HOL_180604_001_B004	2			*	*		
		GVP1	HOL_180604_001_B005	2	*	*	*	*	*	
			HOL_180621_001_B002	2				*	*	
			HOL_180424_002_B001	1	*	*				
			HOL_180501_002_B001	1		*				
			HOL_180501_002_B002	1		*				
			HOL_180501_002_B003	1		*				
			HOL_180501_002_B004	2		*	ىلە			
Curlew	Apr-Aug		HOL_180501_002_B005	2			*			
		CULD	HOL_180501_002_B006	2		*	*	*		
		GVP2	HOL_180501_002_B007	1		*				
			HOL_180501_002_B008			*				
			HOL_180511_001_B001	2		*				
			HOL_180511_001_B001 HOL_180511_001_B002	2 1						
			HOL_180511_001_B001 HOL_180511_001_B002 HOL_180511_001_B003	2 1 2		*	*	*	*	
			HOL_180511_001_B001 HOL_180511_001_B002	2 1		*	*	*	*	



Table 9.2.2 (shaded colu		orded wi	thin GVP viewsheds and c	lipped to 500) m survey buffer. P	art, or all, of these fligh	nts at a height of 10 – 1	150 m agl places them a	at risk of a collision with	the turbine blades
Species	Season	VP No.	Bout ID	No. of birds	<10 m	10-30 m	30-50 m	50-100 m	100-150 m	>150 m
			HOL_180711_001_B001	1	*					
			HOL_180711_001_B002	1		*	*	*		
			HOL_180711_001_B003	1		*	*			
			HOL_190401_002_B001	1	*					
			HOL_190401_002_B002	1			*			
			HOL_190401_002_B003	1	*					
			HOL_190401_002_B004	2		*				
			HOL_190404_001_B001	1	*	*	*			
			HOL_190404_001_B002	1	Ť	*	<u>т</u>			
			HOL_190408_001_B001 HOL_190408_001_B002	1 1	*					
			HOL_190408_001_B002	2	•	*				
		GVP2	HOL_190408_001_B004	1		*				
		GVFZ	HOL_190506_002_B001	1		*				
urlew	Apr-Aug		HOL_190508_002_B001	1		*	*			
unew	, pi / tug		HOL_190508_002_B002	1		*	*			
			HOL_190514_001_B001	1		*				
			HOL_190514_001_B002	1	*	*				
			HOL_190604_002_B001	1		*				
			HOL_190618_002_B001	1	*	*				
			HOL_190629_001_B001	1	*					
			HOL_190629_001_B002	1	*					
			HOL_190629_001_B003	1	*					
			HOL_190629_001_B005	1	*					
			HOL_190715_002_B001	1		*				
		MWPA	HOL_180504_001_B003	1			*			
		MWPB	HOL_190501_002_B007	1		*				
			HOL_190508_003_B003	1	*	*	*	*		
	-	MWPC	HOL_180428_001_B002	2	44	*				
urlew Tota	1			59	*	*	*	*	*	
		GVP2	HOL_180511_001_B004	2	*		*			
			HOL_190408_001_B003	170			*	*		
	Apr-Aug	MWPA	HOL_180412_001_B001 HOL_180412_001_B002	150 110			*	Ψ		
			HOL_180412_001_B002	200			*	*		
		MWPC	HOL_180403_001_B007	4		*	*			
		MWPC	HOL_180403_001_B010	7	*	*	*	*		
	Apr-Aug	Total	102_100103_001_0010	643	*	*	*	*		
olden plover			HOL_190314_002_B001	80	*	*				
			HOL_190906_002_B002	1		*				
			HOL_191003_001_B001	6				*		
		GVP2	HOL_191003_001_B003	7	*					
	Sep-Mar		HOL_200130_003_B001	3		*	*			
			HOL_200130_003_B002	6	*	*	*	*		
			HOL_200130_003_B003	6	*	*	*			
			HOL_200225_002_B002	1		*				
		MWPA	HOL_180321_001_B002	28				*	*	
			HOL_181010_002_B014	25				*	*	
	- Sep-Mar	Total		163	*	*	*	*	*	
iolden plove	er Total			806	*	*	*	*	*	

1.16. The PFM was used for greylag goose, golden plover and curlew. Results are presented in Table 9.2.3.

1.17. The annual collision risk for greylag goose is predicted to be 0.75 birds or one bird every 1.3 years.

1.18. The annual collision risk for golden plover is predicted to be 1.12 birds or one bird every 0.9 years.

1.19. The annual collision risk for curlew is predicted to be 0.18 birds or one bird every 5.7 years.

Table 9.2.3. Results of PFM							
Species	Occupancy	Avoidance Rate (%)	Birds colliding per year				
Greylag goose	Non-breeding / migration	99.8	0.75				
Golden plover	All year	98.0	1.12				
Curlew	Breeding	98.0	0.18				

1.20. The UFM was used for hen harrier. Results are presented in **Table 9.2.4**.

1.21. The annual collision risk for hen harrier is predicted to be 0.025 birds, or one bird every 41 years.

Table 9.2.4. Results of UFM					
Species	Occupancy	Avoidance Rate (%)	Birds colliding per year		
Hen harrier	All year	99.0	0.025		

References

- Alerstam T., Rosén M., Bäckman J., Ericson P.G.P., Hellgren O. (2007). Flight speeds among bird species: allometric and phylogenetic effects. PLoS Biol, 5, 1656-1662
- Band, W., Madders, M., & Whitfield, D.P. (2007). Developing field and analytical methods to assess avian collision risk at wind farms. In: de Lucas, M., Janss, G.F.E. & Ferrer, M. (Eds.) Birds and Wind Farms: Risk Assessment and Mitigation, pp. 259-275. Quercus, Madrid.
- de Lucas, M., Janss, G.F.E. & Ferrer, M. (eds). (2007). Birds and Wind Power: Risk Assessment and Mitigation. Ouercus, Madrid.
- Forsythe, W.C., Rykiel Jr., E.J., Stahl, R.S., Wu, H. & Schoolfield, R.M. (1995). A model comparison for daylength as a function of latitude and day of year. Ecological Modelling. 80, pp 87 - 95.
- Gill, J.P., Townsley, M. & Mudge, G.P. (1996). Review of the impacts of wind farms and other aerial structures upon birds. SNH Review 21: 68pp.
- Madders, M. & Whitfield, D.P. (2006). Upland raptors and the assessment of wind farm impacts. Ibis, 148, pp 43-56.
- Percival, S.M. (1998). Birds and Turbines: managing potential planning issues. Proc. of the 20th BWEA Conference 1998: pp 345-350.
- Provan, S. & Whitfield, D.P. (2006). Avian flight speeds and biometrics for use in collision risk modelling. Report to Scottish Natural Heritage from Natural Research (Projects) Ltd.
- SNH. (2014). Bird Speeds and Biometrics for Collision Risk Modelling. SNH Information and Guidance Note. Scottish Natural Heritage, Inverness.
- SNH. (2018). Avoidance Rates for the onshore SNH Wind Farm Collision Risk Model. SNH Information and Guidance Note. Scottish Natural Heritage, Battleby.
- Snow, D. W. & Perrins, C. M. (1998). The Birds of the Western Palearctic. Concise Edition. Oxford University Press.
- Urguhart, B. & Whitfield, D.P. (2016). Derivation of an avoidance rate for red kite *Milvus milvus* suitable for onshore wind farm collision risk modelling Natural Research Information Note 7. Available at https://www.natural-research.org/ecologicalresearch-charity/our-publications



Input data and Model Results

Hen harrier

WIND FARM PA	RAMETERS	
Size of windfarm envelope	651.2	ha
Number of turbines	10	
Rotor diameter	132	m
Hub height	84.0	m
Max. rotor depth in metres	2.0	m
Max. chord	3.10	m
Pitch	15.0	degrees
Rotation period	4.70	s
Turbine operation time	85	%

BIRD PARAMETERS					
0.48	m				
1.10	m				
1					
11.4	ms^-1				
4510	hrs				
99	%				
	0.48 1.10 1 11.4 4510				

BAND USED TO DEFINE 'R	ISK HEIGHT'
Max height	150 m
Min height	10 m

VP	Watch	Data	Bird Flight Data		
	Area (ha)	Time (hrs)	Total (s)	'Risk height' (s)	
1	374.4	144.0	123	47	
2	318.9	144.0	1689	912	
Totals	693.3	288.0	1812	959	

Flight Ac	tivity Per Uni	t Time &	Weighted By Observation Effo			
	Area		weighte	a by Observ		
VP	Observation	Flying time	VP	Weighting	Adjusted time	
1	53913.60	0.000002	1	0.540	0.000001	
2	45921.60	0.0000055	2	0.460	0.0000025	
Totals	99835.20	0.0000029	Totals	1.000	0.0000026682	
			Mean a	ctivity hr^-1 ir	wind farm	
			Risk height 0.173			
			Rotor height 0.16			
		-				

MORTALITY EST	IMATE		K: [1D or [3D] (0 o	1	
			NoBlades	3	
Flight risk volume (Vw)	859584000	m^3	MaxChord	3.10	m
Rotor radius^2	4356	m	Pitch (degrees)	15.0	
Combined rotor swept area (Va)	136848	m^2			
Vr = Va * (d + l)	339382	m^3	BirdLength	0.48	m
Bird occupancy (n)	7.39	hrs / yr	Wingspan	1.10	m
Bird occupancy of rotor swept vol (b)	10.50	bird-secs	F: Flapping (0) or g	1	
Bird transit time (t)	0.22	secs			
No. of transits through rotors	48.28	per year	Bird speed	11.4	m/s
Estimated no. of collisions	2.45	per year	RotorDiam	132	m
After allowing for avoidance	0.025	per year	RotationPeriod	4.70	sec
i.e. equivalent to one bird every	40.8	years			
			integration interval	0.05	
	© Copyright				
	natur	al c H	Bird aspect ratioo:	0.44	

1.10	m	0.1	0.622
1		0.15	0.781
		0.2	0.939
11.4	m/sec	0.25	0.971
132	m	0.3	0.923
4.70	sec	0.35	0.875
		0.4	0.827
0.05		0.45	0.780
		0.5	0.732
0.44		0.55	0.684
		0.6	0.637
		0.65	0.589
		0.7	0.541
		0.75	0.494
		0.8	0.446
		0.85	0.398
		0.9	0.350

r/R

radius

0

0.05

c/C

chord

0.575

0.398 0.350 0.9

0.95 1

Overall p(collisi

0.303

0.255



Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development Environmental Impact Assessment Report Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling

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

	1	Upwind	d:		Downwind:						
α	collide				collide						
alpha	length	p(collision	n) y	'(x)	length	p(coll	ision)	y(x)			
			1.00	0.000			1.00	0.000			
2.58	6.	.72	0.38	0.038		5.80	0.32	0.032			
1.29	3.	.81 (0.21	0.043		2.81	0.16	0.031			
0.86	3.	.24	0.18	0.054		1.99	0.11	0.033			
0.65	3.	.02	0.17	0.068		1.52	0.08	0.034			
0.52	2.	.64	0.15	0.074		1.09	0.06	0.030			
0.43	2.	.41 (0.13	0.081		0.93	0.05	0.031			
0.37	2.	.15	0.12	0.084		0.75	0.04	0.029			
0.32	1.	.94	0.11	0.087		0.62	0.03	0.028			
0.29	1.	.78	0.10	0.089		0.52	0.03	0.026			
0.26	1.	.63	0.09	0.091		0.50	0.03	0.028			
0.23	1.	.51	0.08	0.093		0.55	0.03	0.034			
0.22	1.	.40	0.08	0.094		0.58	0.03	0.039			
0.20	1.	.30	0.07	0.095		0.60	0.03	0.044			
0.18	1.	.21	0.07	0.095		0.62	0.03	0.048			
0.17	1.	.13	0.06	0.095		0.62	0.03	0.052			
0.16	1.	.05	0.06	0.094		0.62	0.03	0.056			
0.15	0.	.98	0.05	0.093		0.62	0.03	0.059			
0.14	0.	.91	0.05	0.092		0.61	0.03	0.062			
0.14	0.	.85	0.05	0.090		0.60	0.03	0.064			
0.13	0.	.78	0.04	0.088		0.59	0.03	0.066			
sion) =		Upwind			Downwind			4.0%			

Average

6.0%

7

Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development Environmental Impact Assessment Report Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling

Greylag goose

Greylag goose	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	Total
Observation effort (hours)	48.00	60.00	32.00	16.00	16.00	20.00	45.00	71.00	308.00
No. birds observed in risk window	52	481	680	102	55	273	160	442	2245
25% for nocturnal flights not observed	13	120	170	26	14	68	40	111	561
Total number of flights	65	601	850	128	69	341	200	553	2806
No. birds per hour of observation	1.35	10.02	26.56	7.97	4.30	17.06	4.44	7.78	-
Available hours for flight activity	387	320	238	202	223	260	365	431	2426
Potential no. birds in risk window during month	523.95	3210.59	6326.86	1608.94	957.30	4434.10	1621.17	3351.44	22034.34

Proposed scheme

Item	Quantity Units
Collision risk window width	3077.5 m
Collision risk window height	140 m
X-sectional area of risk window	430850 m ²
Rotor diameter	132 m
No. of turbines	10
Area of rotors	136848 m ²
Proportion of risk window taken up by rotors	31.8 %
No. of rotor blades	3
Maximum chord width	3.1 m
Rotation period	4.7 seconds
Average pitch	15 degrees
Estimated operation time	85 %

Step	Description	Values	
А	Bird flights through risk window	22034.34	1
В	Survey hours	308.00	
D	Hours potentially active	2245	
E	Predicted total flights per year	22034.34	
F	Bird flights through rotors (E*proportion of risk window)	6998.61	
G	Probability of collision (Stage 2 of CRM)	6.3%	
Н	Turbine operation rate	0.85	
Ι	Collisions per year, no avoidance (F*G*H)	376.02	
J	Collisions per year with 99.8% avoidance	0.75	
e. equiv	alent to one bird every	1.3	years
		© Copyrigh	nt

natural

K: [1D or [3D] (0 or 1)	1	Calculation of al	pha and p(collisi	ion) as a funct	on of radius					
NoBlades	3					Upwind:			Downwind:	
MaxChord	3.1 m	r/R	c/C	а	collide			collide		
Pitch (degrees)	15	radius	chord	alpha	length	p(collision)	y(x)	length	p(collision) y	(x)
		0				1.00	0		1.00	0
BirdLength	0.83 m	0.05	0.575	3.85	13.42	0.50	0.05037	12.49	0.47	0.04691
Wingspan	1.64 m	0.1	0.622	1.93	7.25	0.27	0.05443	6.25	0.23	0.04694
F: Flapping (0) or gliding (+1)	0	0.15	0.781	1.28	5.74	0.22	0.06461	4.48	0.17	0.05050
		0.2	0.939	0.96	5.04	0.19	0.07575	3.54	0.13	0.05311
Bird speed	17 m/sec	0.25	0.971	0.77	4.28	0.16	0.08039	2.72	0.10	0.05116
RotorDiam	132 m	0.3	0.923	0.64	3.57	0.13	0.08039	2.09	0.08	0.04703
RotationPeriod	4.7 sec	0.35	0.875	0.55	3.05	0.11	0.08010	1.64	0.06	0.04319
		0.4	0.827	0.48	2.69	0.10	0.08072	1.36	0.05	0.04084
integration interval	0.05	0.45	0.780	0.43	2.46	0.09	0.08297	1.20	0.05	0.04069
		0.5	0.732	0.39	2.26	0.08	0.08493	1.09	0.04	0.04083
Bird aspect ratioo: b	0.51	0.55	0.684	0.35	2.10	0.08	0.08660	1.00	0.04	0.04125
		0.6	0.637	0.32	1.95	0.07	0.08799	0.93	0.03	0.04196
		0.65	0.589	0.30	1.83	0.07	0.08909	0.88	0.03	0.04296
		0.7	0.541	0.28	1.71	0.06	0.08990	0.84	0.03	0.04425
		0.75	0.494	0.26	1.61	0.06	0.09043	0.85	0.03	0.04767
		0.8	0.446	0.24	1.51	0.06	0.09066	0.87	0.03	0.05204
		0.85	0.398	0.23	1.42	0.05	0.09061	0.88	0.03	0.05612
		0.9	0.350	0.21	1.34	0.05	0.09028	0.89	0.03	0.05991
		0.95	0.303	0.20	1.26	0.05	0.08965	0.89	0.03	0.06342
		1	0.255	0.19	1.18	0.04	0.08874	0.89	0.03	0.06664
		c	Overall p(collision) =			Upwind	7.9%		Downwind	4.7%



Average

6.3%

8

Golden plover

Golden plover	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	Total	K: [1D or [3D] (0 or 1)
Observation effort (hours)	16.00	20.00	45.00	71.00	44.00	32.00	24.00	24.00	48.00	60.00	32.00	16.00	432.00	NoBlades
No. birds observed in risk window	15	1	108	641	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	0	797	MaxChord
No. birds per hour of observation	0.94	0.05	2.40	9.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.52	0.00	0.00	-	Pitch (degrees)
Available hours for flight activity	223	260	365	431	519	544	544	478	387	320	238	202	4510	
Potential no. birds in risk window during month	208.86	12.99	875.43	3888.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.06	165.54	0.00	0.00	5159.17	BirdLength

Proposed scheme

Item	Quantity	Units
Collision risk window width	3077.5	m
Collision risk window height	140	m
X-sectional area of risk window	430850	m²
Rotor diameter	132	m
No. of turbines	10	
Area of rotors	136848	m ²
Proportion of risk window taken up by rotors	31.8	%
No. of rotor blades	3	
Maximum chord width	3.1	m
Rotation period	4.7	seconds
Average pitch	15	degrees
Estimated operation time	85	%

Step	Description	Values	
А	Bird flights through risk window	797	
В	Survey hours	432	
D	Hours potentially active	4510	
E	Predicted total flights per year	5159.17	
F	Bird flights through rotors (E*proportion of risk window)	1638.67	
G	Probability of collision (Stage 2 of CRM)	4.0%	
Н	Turbine operation rate	0.85	
-	Collisions per year, no avoidance (F*G*H)	56.12	
J	Collisions per year with 98% avoidance	1.12	
i.e. equival	lent to one bird every	0.9	years
	Description ird flights through risk window 797 urvey hours 432 lours potentially active 4510 redicted total flights per year 5159.17 ird flights through rotors (E*proportion of risk window) 1638.67 robability of collision (Stage 2 of CRM) 4.0% urbine operation rate 0.85 iollisions per year, no avoidance (F*G*H) 56.12 ollisions per year with 98% avoidance 1.12		ıt

natural R E S E A R C H

NoBlades	3						Upw	nd:			Downwin	d:	
MaxChord	3.1 r	n	r/R	c/C	а	collide				collide			
Pitch (degrees)	15		radius	chord	alpha	length	p(collis	ion) y(x)		length	p(collision) y(x)	
			0					1.00	0		1	.00	0
BirdLength	0.28 r	n	0.05	0.575	4.06	10	0.37	0.37	0.03697	9.4	45 0	.34	0.03368
Wingspan	0.72 r	n	0.1	0.622	2.03	5	5.74	0.20	0.04093	4.3	74 0	.17	0.03381
F: Flapping (0) or gliding (+1)	0		0.15	0.781	1.35	4	4.76	0.17	0.05095	3.5	51 0	.13	0.03754
			0.2	0.939	1.01	4	1.34	0.15	0.06187	2.8	33 0	.10	0.04037
Bird speed	17.9 r	m/sec	0.25	0.971	0.81	3	3.72	0.13	0.06635	2.3	16 0	.08	0.03858
RotorDiam	132 r	n	0.3	0.923	0.68	3	3.10	0.11	0.06624	1.6	52 0	.06	0.03456
RotationPeriod	4.7 s	sec	0.35	0.875	0.58	2	2.64	0.09	0.06586	1.2	23 0	.04	0.03080
			0.4	0.827	0.51	2	2.29	0.08	0.06520	0.9	96 0	.03	0.02733
integration interval	0.05		0.45	0.780	0.45	2	2.00	0.07	0.06427	0.7	75 0	.03	0.02412
			0.5	0.732	0.41	1	L.77	0.06	0.06307	0.5	59 0	.02	0.02119
Bird aspect ratioo: b	0.39		0.55	0.684	0.37	1	1.58	0.06	0.06217	0.4	19 0	.02	0.01909
			0.6	0.637	0.34	1	1.44	0.05	0.06142	0.4	1 0	.01	0.01771
			0.65	0.589	0.31	1	1.30	0.05	0.06040	0.3	36 0	.01	0.01659
			0.7	0.541	0.29	1	1.18	0.04	0.05910	0.3	32 0	.01	0.01575
			0.75	0.494	0.27	1	L.08	0.04	0.05754	0.2	28 0	.01	0.01518
			0.8	0.446	0.25	0	0.98	0.03	0.05570	0.3	30 0	.01	0.01707
			0.85	0.398	0.24	0	0.88	0.03	0.05358	0.3	31 0	.01	0.01909
			0.9	0.350	0.23	0	0.80	0.03	0.05120	0.3	32 0	.01	0.02084
			0.95	0.303	0.21	0	0.72	0.03	0.04854	0.3	33 0	.01	0.02231
			1	0.255	0.20	0	0.64	0.02	0.04561	0.3	33 0	.01	0.02351
			Ove	rall p(collision)	=		Upwind		5.6%		Downwind		2.5%

1

Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development Environmental Impact Assessment Report Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling



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

Average

4.0%

9

Curlew

Curlew	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	Total
Observation effort (hours)	71.00	44.00	32.00	24.00	24.00	195.00
No. birds observed in risk window	11	25	12	3	0	51
No. birds per hour of observation	0.15	0.57	0.38	0.13	0.00	-
Available hours for flight activity	431	519	544	544	478	2515
Potential no. birds in risk window during month	66.73	294.83	204.16	67.95	0.00	633.67

Proposed scheme

Item	Quantity	Units
Collision risk window width	3077.5	m
Collision risk window height	140	m
X-sectional area of risk window	430850	m ²
Rotor diameter	132	m
No. of turbines	10	
Area of rotors	136848	m ²
Proportion of risk window taken up by rotors	31.8	%
No. of rotor blades	3	
Maximum chord width	3.1	m
Rotation period	4.7	seconds
Average pitch	15	degrees
Estimated operation time	85	%

Step	Description	Values	
А	Bird flights through risk window	51	
В	Survey hours	195.00	
D	Hours potentially active	2515	
E	Predicted total flights per year	633.67	
F	Bird flights through rotors (E*proportion of risk window)	201.27	
G	Probability of collision (Stage 2 of CRM)	5.2%	
Н	Turbine operation rate	0.85	
I	Collisions per year, no avoidance (F*G*H)	8.82	
J	Collisions per year with 98% avoidance	0.18	
i.e. equiva	5.7	years	
		© Copyrigh	it

natural R E S E A R C H K: [1D or [3D] (0 or 1) Calculation of alpha and p(collision) as a function 1 NoBlades 3 MaxChord **3.1** m r/R c/C а Pitch (degrees) chord alpha 15 radius 0 0.55 m 0.575 BirdLength 0.05 3.69 0.90 m 0.1 0.622 1.85 Wingspan F: Flapping (0) or gliding (0.15 0.781 1.23 0 0.92 0.2 0.939 Bird speed 16.3 m/sec 0.25 0.971 0.74 132 m 0.62 0.923 RotorDiam 0.3 RotationPeriod 4.7 sec 0.35 0.875 0.53 0.4 0.827 0.46 0.780 0.41 integration interval 0.05 0.45 0.732 0.37 0.5 0.684 0.34 0.61 0.55 Bird aspect ratioo: b 0.6 0.637 0.31 0.65 0.589 0.28 0.26 0.7 0.541 0.75 0.494 0.25 0.23 0.8 0.446 0.398 0.22 0.85 0.9 0.350 0.21

Overall p(collision) =

0.303

0.255

0.95

1

0.19

0.18



Hollandmey Renewable Energy Development Environmental Impact Assessment Report Technical Appendix 9.2: Ornithology Collision Risk Modelling

on	of	radius

	Upwind:			Downwind:			
ollide			collide				
ength	p(collision)	y(x)	length	p(collision)	y(x)		
	1.00	0		1.00	0		
10.15	5 0.40	0.03974	9.23	0.36	0.03613		
5.60	0.22	0.04389	4.61	0.18	0.03607		
4.63	1 0.18	0.05421	3.36	0.13	0.03949		
4.18	3 0.16	0.06553	2.68	0.10	0.04191		
3.59	9 0.14	0.07031	2.03	0.08	0.03982		
3.00	0.12	0.07040	1.52	0.06	0.03561		
2.64	4 0.10	0.07224	1.23	0.05	0.03374		
2.36	5 0.09	0.07387	1.03	0.04	0.03228		
2.13	3 0.08	0.07521	0.88	0.03	0.03112		
1.95	5 0.08	0.07625	0.77	0.03	0.03025		
1.79	9 0.07	0.07699	0.69	0.03	0.02969		
1.65	5 0.06	0.07743	0.63	0.02	0.02942		
1.52	2 0.06	0.07757	0.58	0.02	0.02946		
1.43	1 0.06	0.07741	0.56	0.02	0.03051		
1.3	1 0.05	0.07695	0.58	0.02	0.03418		
1.22	2 0.05	0.07618	0.60	0.02	0.03756		
1.13	3 0.04	0.07512	0.61	0.02	0.04063		
1.05	5 0.04	0.07377	0.62	0.02	0.04340		
0.9	7 0.04	0.07211	0.62	0.02	0.04588		
0.90	0.04	0.07015	0.61	0.02	0.04805		
	Upwind	6.8%		Downwind	3.5%		

Average

5.2%