Minnesota's Lake Superior Coastal Program

North Shore bat activity and habitat use

Rebecca Abel, M.S. and Ron Moen, Ph.D.

Center for Water and Environment
Natural Resources Research Institute
University of Minnesota
5013 Miller Trunk Highway
Duluth, MN 55811-1442

This project was funded in part under the Coastal Zone Management Act, by NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, in cooperation with Minnesota's Lake Superior Coastal Program.

21 March 2011

Project No. 306-14-11

Contract No. b31556

NRRI Technical Report No.NRRI/TR-2011/11

Please contact authors before citing as manuscripts are in review and in preparation

Summary

Wind power development is an emerging issue in northeastern Minnesota. A recent Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP) study showed strong potential for wind energy along the North Shore, even though wind speed maps indicate that northeastern Minnesota has less wind potential than other parts of the state. There are seven bat species in Minnesota, and all of them could be affected by wind power development. Baseline data on bat distribution and habitat use is essential for bat conservation. Little information exists on bats in the southern boreal forests of the Midwest. We measured summer bat habitat use and foraging activity at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites with bat detectors in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forests in northeastern Minnesota. We used three common acoustic bat activity indices to quantify acoustic bat data and examined the indices to determine how differences among activity indices influence statistical inferences of bat activity. We measured the effects of relative insect abundance and degree of vegetation density on bat activity. Bat detectors recorded 7,666 identifiable bat calls during 1,440 detector hours in 2009 and 8,554 bat calls during 930 detector hours in 2010. Bat activity was dominated by *Myotis* species (*Myotis lucifugus* and *M. septentrionalis*) and *Lasionycteris noctivagans.* Activity was concentrated at aquatic and linear corridor microsites, regardless of forest cover type. However, bats foraged at similar rates in each microsite type. Bat activity and foraging activity occurred earlier at night at interior forest sites relative to aquatic and linear corridor sites, suggesting that interior forest is used by bats to forage as they leave day roosts. The three acoustic activity indices we used resulted in similar conclusions of habitat use by bats, despite different biases of each. Bats would generally be flying in low wind conditions, especially when foraging. If wind turbines were deployed along the North Shore, we recommend monitoring bat activity to document potential effects at the site(s). However, because all bat species were present along the entire north shore of Lake Superior inland throughout the Coastal Zone area, wind turbines are unlikely to have a population level effect on bats unless many are installed.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Introduction

Over the past decade two new threats to bat populations have emerged. White-nose syndrome has caused many bat fatalities in eastern North America and has spread to new bat hibernacula every year since its discovery in 2006 (Blehert *et al*. 2009, Boyles and Willis 2010). Increased bat mortality can also be attributed to the growing wind power industry. Migrating bats are killed at utility-scale wind turbines (Kunz *et al*. 2007*a*, Kunz *et al*. 2007*b*, Baerwald *et al.* 2008). Bat fatality estimates for utility-scale wind turbines are projected based on installed turbine capacity and results of previous bat fatality studies (Arnett *et al*. 2008), whereas fatalities caused by white-nose syndrome have often been directly measured.

White-nose syndrome is spreading west in North America while large utility-scale wind farms have regional distribution and are present in many Midwest states and the Pacific Northwest. Another development with the potential to affect local bat populations is the installation of small household- or community-size wind turbines (≤ 100 kilowatt capacity). Small wind turbines could potentially affect resident populations of bats foraging at low altitudes. Small wind turbines have lower tower height and smaller blades (AWEA 2009), and would be more spatially dispersed than utility-scale wind turbines. The effect of small wind turbines on bats is currently unknown.

Wind power development is an emerging issue in northeastern Minnesota. A recent Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP) study showed strong potential for wind energy along the North Shore (Mageau *et al.* 2008) even though statewide wind speed maps indicate that northeastern Minnesota has less wind potential than other parts of the state. Avoiding turbine construction in areas where bats are concentrated would provide benefits to wildlife and enhance the image of wind power development. Developing large wind power installations requires a permitting process, but small-scale wind turbines that provide energy for schools, towns, or homes would be subject to local zoning regulations. It would be beneficial to learn more about the distribution and abundance of bats along the North Shore before wind power sites are developed.

Baseline data on bat distribution and habitat use would help estimate the potential effects of threats to bat populations anywhere. Some parts of North America still have little baseline data on bat habitat use even though it has been the subject of many bat studies over the past two decades (Patriquin and Barclay 2003, Menzel *et al.* 2005). For example, there have been few studies of bats in the southern boreal forest of the upper Midwest. Recently, seven species of bats were acoustically detected at three sites in northeastern Minnesota during the spring and autumn (Nordquist 2006). Six species of bats were acoustically detected and four species were captured in mist-nets at three sites in northeastern Minnesota during the summer (Kruger and Peterson 2008). Habitat use was not addressed although species presence was confirmed.

Among the factors affecting bat habitat use are prey availability (Grindal and Brigham 1999) and the ease of flight (Loeb and O'Keefe 2006, Hayes and Loeb 2007). Insectivorous bats use aquatic, edge, and corridor features for foraging and commuting in forested habitats. Clutter-adapted insectivorous bat species can navigate through interior forest but forage in either open or dense forest habitats (Norberg and Rayner 1987, Sleep and Brigham 2003). Open-adapted insectivorous bat species are restricted to foraging in open habitats above the forest canopy, over water, or along linear corridors (Norberg and Rayner 1987).

Emergence periods of adult aquatic insects occur at different intervals throughout the summer (Judd 1962). These adult aquatic insects swarm above water bodies and provide bats with a higher density of prey (Grindal *et al.* 1999, Fukui *et al.* 2006). Forest edges created by corridors and streams are easier for bats to fly through than the forest interior and are more suitable than open spaces because they also provide shelter from the wind and predators (Krusic *et al.* 1996, Sleep and Brigham 2003, Hayes and Loeb 2007). Flying insects also use the habitat and shelter from the wind provided by forest edges and streams (Brittain 1982, Grindal and Brigham 1999).

The relationship between forest cover type and bat activity is less well-understood. Forest management that creates heterogeneous forest types and multiple age classes is thought to satisfy habitat requirements of most North American bat species (Krusic *et al.*1996, Jung *et al.* 1999, Patriquin and Barclay 2003, Menzel *et al.* 2005, Loeb and O'Keefe 2006), but different habitats are often found to be preferred. For example, male *M. lucifugus* preferred deciduous forest over coniferous forest in New Brunswick, Canada (Broders *et al.* 2006). *M. lucifugus* and *M. septentrionalis* activity was higher in aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) -white birch (*Betula* *papyrifera*) mixed-wood forest than either aspen or jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) forest cover types in Saskatchewan, Canada (Kalcounis *et al.* 1999). *Myotis* species were more active in coniferous forests but foraged more in deciduous forest than mixed-wood or coniferous forests in Alberta, Canada (Patriquin and Barclay 2003). Finally, temperate bat species are more active in deciduous forest than coniferous forest cover types in Britain (Walsh and Harris 1996). Use depends on the study and the location, with bats using most forest cover types to some extent.

Acoustic monitoring with bat detectors is the method most commonly used to study bats over large areas (Kunz *et al.* 2007*a*, Fischer *et al.* 2009). Bat detectors record high frequency sounds that bats emit and write a file each time a bat call is detected. The simplest index to measure bat activity is the number of files saved (NFS) per unit time, which is equivalent to the number of bat passes per unit time (Britzke *et al.*1999). The acoustic activity index (AAI) and the file size index (FSI) have also been used to quantify bat activity. The AAI converts the number of bat passes to the number of minutes bats are present per unit time (Miller 2001). Files of the same species that are recorded within a one minute period are discarded in the AAI to reduce the possible bias of the same bats being detected repeatedly (Miller 2001). The FSI is the total file size per unit time and is calculated from the sum of the file size of each bat pass (Broders 2003). In addition to the number of bat passes, the FSI accounts for the variability in the length of the call sequence and any variability in the file due to bat orientation or the type of echolocation signal (Broders 2003). There are positive linear correlations between the AAI and NFS (Miller 2001) and the FSI and NFS (Broders 2003). We used all three indices to avoid the bias associated with the FSI and the AAI (Abel 2011).

We measured bat activity with bat detectors placed at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest microsites within mixed-wood, deciduous, and coniferous forest cover types within the Coastal Zone Management Program boundaries along the North Shore of Lake Superior. We measured the spatial distribution of bat species along the north-south gradient of the study area. We examined the effects of estimated vegetation volume on bat activity. We counted feeding buzzes in call files to determine foraging activity at each microsite type and used light traps to capture insects and estimate insect density at aquatic and linear corridor sites. We used the NFS, AAI, and FSI to quantify bat activity in microsite and forest cover types. We also examined temporal patterns of bat activity. Finally, we captured bats in mist-nets near acoustic sampling sites to supplement acoustic bat survey data. Each of these measurements contributed to increased understanding of the distribution and composition of bat species along the North Shore.

Methods

Study Area

The study area encompasses portions of St. Louis, Lake, and Cook Counties along the North Shore of Lake Superior and includes the Minnesota Lake Superior Coastal Program (MLSCP) boundary (Fig. 1). The Lake Superior watershed has numerous streams, lakes and wetlands. Elevation ranges from 180 to 580 meters. The climate is continental, with precipitation ranging from 71 to 76 cm of rainfall and 152 to 163 cm of snowfall annually. The region consists almost entirely of the North Shore Highlands land type (Albert 1995). Dominant deciduous tree species are quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*), and maple (*Acer* spp.) along the shore. Coniferous tree species include jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*), white spruce (*Picea glauca*), tamarack (*Larix laricina*), balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*), northern white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), and Red pine (*Pinus resinosa*) is present in plantations (Albert 1995). Alder (*Alnus* spp.), willow (*Salix* spp.), and beaked hazel (*Corylus cornuta*) are often present in the understory.



Figure 1. Study area and acoustic survey sites in northeastern Minnesota during the summer months of 2009 and 2010. Most survey sites were located within the Minnesota Lake Superior Coastal Program (MLSCP) boundary.

Bat survey locations

Forested habitats were identified in landsat-based satellite imagery land cover classifications. The Gap Analysis Program (GAP) Level I land cover classification (MDNR 2007*a*) and the Land Use Land Cover (LULC) data set (MDNR 2007*b*) were used to identify deciduous, coniferous, and mixed-wood forest cover types. A restricted randomized sampling design was used to choose bat detector sites. We buffered aquatic features and linear corridor features 500 m with ArcGIS. Aquatic features were streams or inland lakes and linear corridors were trails, roads, or transmission line corridors. Random points were placed within the 500 m buffer in mixed-wood, coniferous, or deciduous forest cover types using ArcGIS. Points that were not accessible and points that were on private land were not sampled.

Acoustic bat surveys

Acoustic monitoring was conducted from May to September in 2009 and April through August in 2010. We used three Anabat II bat detectors with the Anabat Zero Crossings Analysis Interface Module (ZCAIM) (Titley Scientific, Australia). The Anabat system records bat passes until >1 second passes between successive pulses. If the maximum file length of 15 seconds is reached the system begins recording the next file. We standardized the sensitivity of each Anabat detector with the Bat Chirp Board (Nevada Bat Technology, Las Vegas, NV) (Larson and Hayes 2000). Bat detectors were placed at one linear corridor site and one aquatic site. We also placed a detector at an interior forest site that was ≥ 100 and ≤ 500 meters from any trail, road, or stream. Detectors at aquatic sites, linear corridors, and interior forest sites were separated by at least 1 km. We oriented detector microphones to point along the axis of the stream or corridor, or toward a forest gap at the interior forest sites.

We surveyed each site for three nights from 7:00 p.m. until 5:00 a.m. in 2009 and 2010. We surveyed only on nights with low wind speeds (≤ 6 mph) and no precipitation. Each detector was at a site until precipitation and wind criteria were met for three nights. The bat detector, ZCAIM, and a 12-volt sealed lead acid battery were housed in a weatherproof container measuring 30.5 cm x 15.2 cm x 15.2 cm. We attached the housing to a tree 3-4 meters above ground level (Fig. 2).



Figure 2. Weather-proof housing system designed for Anabat bat detectors. A 12 volt, 7.5 or 12 Amp-hour external battery, Anabat detector and Anabat ZCAIM with wiring is housed within the box and mounted to the trunk of a tree with elastic tie-downs and a bike lock for security. The microphone is protected from precipitation and debris by the reflection plate positioned 22.5 degrees below horizontal while still allowing ultra-sonic sounds to be reflected from the plate into the microphone.

We downloaded acoustical data from detectors and visually identified each call to genus and species by comparing characteristics of the shape, duration, and frequency of the recorded calls. Fragmented calls or files with less than two echolocation pulses were not included in analysis. We distinguished *M. lucifugus* and *M. septentrionalis* to genus (Krusic and Neefus 1996, Jung *et al*. 1999, Kalcounis *et al.* 1999). Other bats were identified to species. One site in 2010 was excluded from analysis because of the unusually high number of files, occurrence of feeding buzzes, and large size of files recorded.

Habitat and survey data recorded at each site included the forest cover type (deciduous, coniferous, or mixed-wood), microphone direction and microphone height, topography, and detector tree characteristics. We used the Minnesota Climatology Working Group (MCWG) website to obtain daily temperature and precipitation data for each sampling period (MCWG 2010). Wind speed for survey sites was recorded from the nearest weather station to each bat detector site and accessed from the Weather Underground website (WUPWS 2010). We obtained the local sunset time from the U.S. Naval Observatory website (USNO 2010).

Data analyses

We sorted sites in order from southwest to northeast using UTM coordinates and plotted the number of files of each species at each site using the Lake Superior shoreline as the x-axis to determine if species were present throughout the north-south gradient of the study area. We also estimated vegetation volume at the understory (0-3 m), sub-canopy (3-6 m) and canopy (> 6 m) levels at each site (Jung *et al.* 1999). Percentages at each of three levels were scored "1" for volumes ≤ 33%, "2" for volumes > 33% and ≤ 66% and "3" for volumes > 66%. Scores for each forest level were summed for a total vegetation density score for aquatic sites, linear corridors, and interior forest sites. We also randomly chose 100 bat call files from each of the 79 three-night surveys and counted files containing feeding buzzes to estimate foraging activity in aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest microsites in 2009 and 2010.

We used three different methods to evaluate acoustical bat activity data: the number of files saved (NFS), the acoustic activity index (AAI), and the file size index (FSI) (Britzke *et al.* 1999, Miller 2001, Broders 2003). We tested for consistency in habitat use conclusions drawn from the results of the NFS, AAI, and FSI. First we calculated the NFS after excluding any non-bat and fragmented bat call files by counting the number of files recorded in a three-night survey. We calculated the AAI as the count of one minute time intervals that each bat species was detected in a three-night survey (Miller 2001). If greater than one file of a given species is recorded in one minute, the other files are excluded from analysis when calculating the AAI. Lastly, we calculated the FSI by summing the size of Anabat files identified to species for each three-night survey.

We used the local sunset and sunrise times to calculate the minutes since sunset and minutes until sunrise for each acoustic bat file. We created frequency distributions of the number of files recorded in 60-minute bins from 0 to 300 minutes since sunset at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites to analyze whether bat files were recorded earlier at interior forest sites than aquatic or linear corridor sites. We also created frequency distributions of the number of files recorded in 60-minute bins from 0 to 300 minutes since sunset and 300 to 0 minutes until sunrise to determine temporal patterns of activity by species and by month.

Mist-net bat surveys

Bats were captured in mist nets from May to August in 2010. We used 2.6 meter tall mist nets with a mesh size of 38mm and lengths ranging from 6, 9, or 18 meters. Mist net sites were randomly chosen from acoustic sampling sites established in 2009. We avoided mist netting during the brightest periods of the lunar cycle (Anthony *et al.* 1981). We oriented mist nets perpendicular to streams, and below over-hanging tree branches to increase likelihood of capturing flying bats. We used mist netting procedures according to Kunz and Kurta (1988).

We removed captured bats from nets and placed each in their own cloth holding bag until they could be processed. We determined species, sex and reproductive status and then weighed and measured bats according to Kunz *et al*. (1996). Capture and handling of bats was conducted under the approval of the University of Minnesota Institutional Animal Care and Use Committe, protocol # 0907A69561. We adhered to the White-nose Syndrome handling and disinfection protocols established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (WNS 2010).

Insect sampling

We constructed ultra-violet insect light traps with three baffles made of 13 cm x 41 cm clear plastic surrounding a black light fluorescent bulb (Model # 2805, BioQuip Products, Rancho Dominguez, CA). Insects flying toward the light would hit the baffles and fall into a funnel and jar from which they could not escape. We trapped insects during one of three nights at each corridor and aquatic site beginning in July 2009. We did not sample insects at forest sites because bat activity is low even when insect activity is high in interior forest (Ober and Hayes 2008, Adams *et al.* 2009). Bat activity was significantly higher at an array of black lights than bat activity at an unlit site 20-60 m away (Adams *et al.* 2005). Therefore, we placed light traps >60 m from bat detectors to reduce the potential bias. Light traps were turned on around 7:00 pm and ran for approximately 10-12 hours during the night. We stored insects in 70% ethanol after field collection, then we oven-dried the insects at 150^{o} F for 2 days. We identified captured insects to orders preyed upon by bats (Anthony and Kunz 1977, Barclay 1991, Brigham 1990, Whitaker 2004). We used the dry weight of the insect samples as an index of relative insect abundance.

Statistical analyses

We analyzed bat activity for the most common species, *Myotis* species in 2009 and 2010, *L. noctivagans* in 2009 and *L. borealis* in 2010 using the NFS, AAI, and FSI. We tested bat activity data for normality using Wilk-Shapiro's W statistic. Data was not normally distributed after transformation, so we used the Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA (K-W ANOVA) to test the effects of forest cover type and microsite type on the bat activity ranks for each species. Pair-wise comparisons were performed for each significant result. We used regression to test for a relationship between bat activity and vegetation density. We used a Welch's ANOVA for unequal variance to test the effect of microsite type on vegetation density. We also used regression to test for a relationship between insect density and bat activity. To test the effects of forest cover type and microsite type on relative insect density, we used the K-W ANOVA. Finally, we used chi-squared analysis to determine the differences in temporal patterns of bat activity and presence of feeding buzzes in call files in aquatic, linear corridor, and forest sites.

GIS work and wind resource data

We used Geographic Information System (GIS) to overlay bat survey sites onto the North Shore Wind Resource map (Mageau *et al.* 2008). We converted the wind resource raster coverage to polygon coverage after first reclassifying it. We generated 3 random points within each high wind speed polygon (6.6-10.8 m/s) and used the distance from each random point to the closest linear corridor feature and the closest stream to measure the mean distance between high wind areas to forest features where bat activity is concentrated. We buffered 500 meters around each bat survey site then intersected the buffer with the wind resource polygon and measured the average wind speed (m/s) within the 500 $meter^2$ buffer and the wind speed at the bat survey site.

Software used

Software we used included ArcView 3.3, ArcMap 9.2, and ArcGIS 10.0 (Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. [ESRI], Redlands, CA) for Geographic Information System analysis. We also used CFCRead software v. 0.4.2.1 to download data and AnalookW software v. 0.3.3.17 to visualize bat call data (Chris Corben, Titley Scientific, Australia). We used Microsoft Access and Excel for data management and to generate random numbers for the feeding buzz analysis. We used Statistix v. 9.0.4.0 (Analytical Software, Tallahassee, FL) for all statistical analyses.

Results

Bat species composition and distribution

We detected all seven species of bats throughout the study area, from the southwestern-most to the northeastern-most site along the Lake Superior shoreline (Fig. 3). We recorded 7,666 identifiable bat calls and 5,710 unidentifiable or non-bat signals during 1,440 detector hours in 2009. In 2010 we recorded 8,554 bat calls and 3,184 unidentifiable or non-bat signals during 930 detector hours. We recorded *Myotis* species five times more often than any other species (Table 1). After *Myotis, Lasionycteris noctivagans* was the most common species recorded in 2009 with 14% as many files recorded as *Myotis* species. *Lasiurus borealis* was the most common species recorded after *Myotis* in 2010, with 8% as many files recorded as *Myotis* species. *Perimyotis subflavus* was the least commonly recorded species during the study. *L. cinereus, Eptesicus fuscus*, and *Perimyotis subflavus* were present in 2-3% of files in 2009 and in 1-2% of files in 2010. *L. noctivagans* and *L. borealis* were infrequently detected in 2010 and 2009, respectively, so we analyzed habitat use only for the *Myotis* species in 2009 and 2010, *L. noctivagans* in 2009, and *L. borealis* in 2010.

Table. Minnesota bat species and relative abundances during 2009 and 2010 in northeastern Minnesota. Percent of files per survey is based on the number of files recorded per survey (n_{2009} = 7,666; n_{2010} = 8,554). Percent of surveys detected is based on the number of surveys in which each species was detected.

		Percent of files per survey		**Percent of surveys detected**	
Common Name	**Latin Name**	**2009**	**2010**	**2009**	**2010**
Little Brown & Northern Long-eared Myotis	*Myotis lucifugus & Myotis septentrionalis*	81	86	100	90
Silver-haired Bat	*Lasionycteris noctivagans*	11	3	60	70
Eastern Red Bat	*Lasiurus borealis*	1	7	21	53
Hoary Bat	*Lasiurus cinereus*	3	2	35	53
Big Brown Bat	*Eptesicus fuscus*	2	1	42	63
Eastern Pipistrelle	*Perimyotis subflavus*	2	1	31	40



Figure 3. Spatial distribution of bat species along the North Shore of Lake Superior. Each symbol indicates the presence of species call files at bat detector surveys. The Lake Superior shoreline was used as the x-axis, and each bat survey site was ordered from the southwestern-most to the northeastern-most site using UTM coordinates. The survey area extended 210 km from southwest of Duluth, MN to north of Hovland, MN.

Bat habitat use

Bat activity measured for each of the common species, *Myotis* species in 2009 (Fig. 4a), *Lasionycteris noctivagans* in 2009 (Fig. 5), and *L. borealis* in 2010 (Fig. 6) was not different in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forest, with similar results for all indices (Table 2). In 2010 only, *Myotis* species were more active in deciduous than coniferous forest (Table 2), but bat activity in either deciduous or coniferous forest was not different from bat activity in mixed-wood forest (Fig. 4b).



Figure 4. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *Myotis* species in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forest cover types in A) 2009 and B) 2010. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each forest cover type. Brackets with letters indicate significant difference between groups for all three activity indices.



Figure 5. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *L. noctivagans* in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forest cover types in 2009. *L. noctivagans* was not detected at a high enough rate in 2010 for analysis. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each forest cover type.



Figure 6. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *L. borealis* in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forest cover types in 2010. *L. borealis* was not detected at a high enough rate in 2009 for analysis. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each forest cover type.

Table 1. Significance levels for activity of *Myotis* species, *L. noctivagans*, and *L. borealis* in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forest cover types sites using the number of files saved (NFS), acoustic activity index (AAI), and file size index (FSI) in 2009 and 2010. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA was used for analysis.

Year	**Index**	***Myotis* species**		***L. noctivagans***		***L. borealis***	
		$F_{2,45}$	P	$F_{2,45}$	P		
2009	Number of Files Saved	0.50	0.62	0.11	0.90		
	Acoustic Activity Index	0.60	0.57	0.11	0.90		
	File Size Index	0.30	0.74	0.24	0.79		
		$F_{2,28}$	P			$F_{2,28}$	P
2010	Number of Files Saved	3.40	0.05			1.10	0.36
	Acoustic Activity Index	3.50	0.04			1.10	0.36
	File Size Index	3.40	0.05			1.10	0.36

Bat activity of the common species, *Myotis* species in 2009 and 2010 (Fig. 7), *Lasionycteris noctivagans* in 2009 (Fig. 8), and *L. borealis* in 2010 (Fig. 9) was significantly different at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites, with similar results for all indices (Table 3). Bat activity using either the number of files saved (NFS), acoustic activity index (AAI), and file size index (FSI) and was always higher at aquatic sites than at interior forest sites. *Myotis* spp. activity at linear corridor sites was also higher than activity at interior forest sites. Bat activity using the NFS, AAI, and FSI was statistically similar in both the forest cover type and microsite type analysis.



Figure 7. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *Myotis* species at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites in A) 2009 and B) 2010. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each microsite type. Brackets with letters indicate significant difference between groups for all three activity indices.



Figure 8. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *L. noctivagans* at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites in 2009. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each microsite type. Brackets with letters indicate significant difference between groups for all three activity indices.



Figure 9. Mean (±SE) bat activity index values for *L. borealis* at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites in 2010. Sample size was too small for statistical analysis of *L. borealis* habitat use in 2009. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. All means are the geometric means for each microsite type. Brackets with letters indicate significant difference between groups for all three activity indices.

Table 2. Significance levels for activity of *Myotis* species, *L. noctivagans*, and *L. borealis* at aquatic sites, linear corridors and interior forest sites using the number of files saved (NFS), acoustic activity index (AAI), and file size index (FSI) in 2009 and 2010. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA was used for analysis.

Year	Index	***Myotis* species**		***L. noctivagans***		***L. borealis***	
		$F_{2,45}$	P	$F_{2,45}$	P		
2009	Number of Files Saved	12.8	<0.001	5.0	0.01		
	Acoustic Activity Index	12.5	<0.001	5.0	0.01		
	File Size Index	13.9	<0.001	5.2	0.01		
		$F_{2,28}$	P			$F_{2,28}$	P
2010	Number of Files Saved	11.6	<0.001			4.90	0.01
	Acoustic Activity Index	11.2	<0.001			4.90	0.01
	File Size Index	10.5	<0.001			4.80	0.02

Vegetation density was significantly higher in interior forest microsites than either aquatic or linear corridor microsites (Welch's ANOVA, $F_{2,35} = 15.4$, $P < 0.001$). Bat activity and vegetation density were weakly negatively correlated at all sites, with similar results for the NFS, AAI, and FSI (NFS: $R^2 = 0.11$, $P = 0.01$; AAI: $R^2 = 0.10$, $P = 0.01$; FSI: $R^2 = 0.12$, $P = 0.004$; Fig. 10).



Figure 10. Bat activity with varying levels of vegetation density using NFS, AAI, and FSI. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (Kb) sums per survey. Bat activity index values are $\log_{10}$ transformed. Numbers on the x-axis correspond to the score assigned for vegetation density, with increasing density as numbers increase from 1-6.

Bat activity and insect abundance

We trapped insects at 10 aquatic and 9 linear corridor sites. All identifiable insects trapped were in the orders consumed by bats and included Lepidoptera, Trichoptera, Diptera, Coleoptera, and Neuroptera. Lepidoptera were trapped at 79% of sites. Trichoptera, Diptera, and Coleoptera were trapped at 42%, 32%, and 11% of sites, respectively. Neuroptera was the least common order trapped at 5% of sites. Bat activity was weakly positively correlated with dry weight of insects, with similar results for the NFS, AAI, and FSI (NFS: R^2 = 0.24, P = 0.04; AAI: R^2 = 0.23, P = 0.04; FSI: R^2 = 0.21, P = 0.02; Fig. 11).



Figure 11. Linear regressions of insect density (dry g/night) and bat activity using $\log_{10}$ transformed NFS, AAI, and FSI. NFS is the mean number of files saved per survey, AAI is the average number of minutes bats were active per survey, and FSI is the average of the file size (kB) sums per survey.

Bat foraging activity

Samples of bat call files containing feeding buzzes had proportionately similar distributions at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites in 2009 (K-W ANOVA, $F_{2,38}$ = 2.7, *P* = 0.08) and 2010 ($F_{2,22}$ = 1.3, *P* = 0.29; Fig. 12). The sample size for *L. noctivagans, L. borealis, L. cinereus, E. fuscus*, and *P. subflavus* call files containing feeding buzzes was too small for statistical analysis so only the foraging activity from a sample of *Myotis* species files is presented here (Fig. 13). The frequency of *Myotis* species feeding buzzes in files was not different at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites (K-W ANOVA, $F_{2,48}$ = 0.8, *P* = 0.5).



Figure 12. Average (±SE) rate of occurrence of files containing feeding buzzes at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites from random samples (n = 10) of bat call files from each survey in 2009 and 2010.



Figure 13. Average (±SE) rate of occurrence of files containing feeding buzzes from each species in random samples (n = 10) of bat call files from each survey in 2009 and 2010.

Temporal patterns of activity

Bats in interior forest microsites were active earlier after sunset than bats at aquatic or linear corridor microsites (x_4^2 = 45, P < 0.001). The factor contributing most to the chi-squared value is the earlier occurrence of bat activity at interior forest microsites from the expected distribution (Fig. 14a). There was no significant difference in the time until sunrise of files recorded at aquatic, linear corridor, or interior forest sites. Feeding buzzes were also present in call files earlier in interior forest microsites than aquatic or linear corridor microsites ($x_4^2 = 69$, $P < 0.001$). The factor contributing most to the chi-squared value is the earlier occurrence of feeding buzzes at interior forest microsites from the expected distribution (Fig. 14b).



Figure 14. Frequency distribution of the time since sunset (60 minute bins) of A) acoustic bat files recorded before midnight and B) feeding buzzes recorded before midnight at aquatic, linear corridor, and interior forest sites.

The temporal activity of *E. fuscus*, *Myotis* species, *L. noctivagans*, *L. borealis*, and *P. subflavus* was bimodal, with the first activity peak within the first two hours after sunset, and the second peak just before sunrise (Fig. 15). *L. cinereus* activity was high just after sunset, but there also were three other peaks in activity throughout the night. Bat activity in the months of May, June, and September is bimodal with a peak just after sunset and another smaller peak before sunrise. Bat activity in July and August occurred at all times of the night, with slight increases in activity just after sunset and before sunrise (Fig. 16).



Figure 15. Frequency distribution with 60 minute bins showing the temporal activity of northeastern Minnesota during the 2009 and 2010 study. The time of each file was converted to minutes since sunset and minutes until sunrise. Black arrows indicate sunset and sunrise. The broken line indicates the switch between minutes since sunset and minutes until sunrise.



Figure 16. Frequency distribution with 60 minute bins showing the temporal activity by month of northeastern Minnesota bats combined in 2009 and 2010. The time of each file was converted to minutes since sunset and minutes until sunrise. Black arrows indicate sunset and sunrise. The broken line indicates the switch between minutes since sunset and minutes until sunrise.

Outlier site

We excluded one linear corridor site as an outlier in 2010 because of the unusual intensity of bat activity relative to other sites during the study period. We recorded 6,140 bat files over three nights, which was 40% of all files that we recorded in 2010. 98% of files were *Myotis* spp. and 2% were *L. noctivagans* and *L. borealis*. The rate of files recorded per minute was 4.4 ± 0.03 at this site and bat activity was consistently high during the entire night for three nights. Of a sample of 100 files from this site, 77% contained feeding buzzes whereas only 28 ± 2% of files from other sites contained feeding buzzes.

Mist netting

We captured three bats in mist nets during 20 mist-net hours in 2010. Each bat captured was an adult male *M. lucifugus*, and in good physical condition (Table 4).

Table 3. Morphometric measurements of captured bats in northeastern Minnesota during mist-net surveys in 2010.

Bat #	Weight (g)	Ear (mm)	Forearm (mm)	Thumb (mm)	Foot (mm)
1	7.3	11.0	37.9	6.5	8.9
2	8.8	12.3	39.7	6.7	9.9
3	7.1	11.4	35.0	6.2	8.9

Wind speed

Distance from high wind polygons to the nearest stream or corridor was 1500 to 2500 m (Fig. 17). Average wind speed in circular 500m^2 buffers around bat survey points was less than 6 m/s and there was no correlation between the number of bat files saved and the average wind speed in the 500 m^2 buffers around a site (Fig. 18). Average wind speed at bat survey points was also less than 6 m/s and there was no correlation between the number of bat files saved and the average wind speed at a survey site (Fig. 19).



Figure 17. Mean distance (±SE) to linear corridors (A) and streams (B) where bat activity is concentrated from random points placed within each high wind class polygon from the North Shore wind resource map (Mageau *et al.* 2008).



Figure 18. Average wind speed within $500m^2$ of bat surveys at aquatic, linear corridor and interior forest microsites and the number of bat call files saved. Wind speed data was calculated from the North Shore Wind Resource map (Mageau *et al.* 2008).



Figure 19. Wind speed at aquatic, linear corridor and interior forest microsites and the number of bat call files saved. Wind speed data was calculated from the North Shore Wind Resource map (Mageau *et al.* 2008).

Discussion

We recorded all seven resident bat species using bat detectors along the North Shore of Lake Superior in Minnesota (Hazard 1982, Caceres 2000). *Myotis lucifugus, M. septentrionalis, Lasiurus cinereus, L. borealis, Lasionycteris noctivagans,* and *Eptesicus fuscus* were all within the extent of their range, of which Minnesota is in the northern portion. *Perimyotis subflavus* is at the northern-most extent of its range in Minnesota but our records of *P. subflavus* extended 161 km further northeast along the North Shore than previous records in Minnesota (Hazard 1982, Nordquist 2006). Even though we detected all seven species, 84% were *Myotis* species. The overwhelming presence of the *Myotis* genus is consistent with a recent study conducted in northeastern Minnesota (Kruger and Peterson 2008, Miller 2010). *E. fuscus* make up a significant portion of the species composition during the spring and fall on the North Shore (Nordquist 2006), but our results from the summer months did not reflect this. Conclusions of bat habitat use in this study are based on the most commonly recorded species in the study area, *Myotis lucifugus* and *M. septentrionalis* collectively, and *L. noctivagans* and *L. borealis*.

The North Shore is dominated by forests with relatively low wind speeds compared to other parts of Minnesota. The areas with high wind speeds (6.6-10.8 m/s) along the North Shore are located in pockets near the shore of Lake Superior on ridges and other higher elevation areas (Mageau *et al.* 2008). Even though high wind sites exist on the North Shore, nightly bat activity should be low at sites with high wind speeds since bats are more concentrated at aquatic and linear corridors and bats are typically less active when wind speeds are high (Kunz *et al.* 2007*b*). In addition, because high-wind areas are on ridges, streams and most linear corridors would not be present.

Despite the patchy distribution of high-wind areas on the North shore, the mean distance of high-wind areas from the nearest corridor or stream where bat activity is concentrated is less than 2.5 km. Known lengths of commuting distances for *M. lucifugus* and *L. borealis* are 1.7 to 2.6 km and 7.4 km, respectively (Lacki *et al.* 2007). Even though it may be possible for commuting bats to fly to or through high-wind areas on the North Shore, bats would likely avoid foraging in and commuting through these areas during periods of high winds.

Instead, bats would remain in the aquatic and linear corridor sites in deciduous, mixed-wood, and coniferous forests. Bats are active in all forest cover types to some degree (Walsh and Harris 1996, Kalcounis *et al.* 1999, Patriquin and Barclay 2003, Broders *et al.* 2006). Linear corridors and aquatic features within forested habitats are important for bats in northeastern Minnesota. Even though bats may have been using corridors to commute to aquatic habitats, which are thought to have more insects (Krusic *et al.* 1996, Grindal *et al.* 1999), feeding buzzes indicate that bats were also encountering prey in linear corridors. The confounding effect of aquatic and linear corridor features present in all forest types may explain the inconsistent conclusions of forest type use and preference in bat literature. North Shore streams were always present historically but roads and trails were not always at their current density, nonetheless bats are currently benefiting from both. Stream corridors will continue to be maintained with current forest management efforts, but road and trail density may change with shifting management goals.

Aquatic and linear corridor sites had 5-10 times more bat activity than interior forest sites even though interior forest sites were only 100 m from the forest edge in all forest types. Additionally, bat activity began earlier at interior forest sites than at aquatic or linear corridor sites. Bats use the interior forest for roosting during the day and leave shortly after sunset to commute to foraging habitats (Thomas 1988, Grindal and Brigham 1999, Kalcounis *et al.* 1999, Hayes and Gruver 2000), but we found evidence that bats also forage as they commute through the interior forest. Light intensity, among other factors, is important in determining insect (Lewis and Taylor 1964, Brittain 1982, McGeachie 1989) and bat activity (Jones and Rydell 1994, Lang *et al*. 2006). The lower light level in interior forest at dusk enables nocturnal flying insects to become active earlier than in open habitats and bats respond accordingly. However, significantly less bat activity 50, 100, and 150 m from the forest edge (Krusic *et al.* 1996) implies that although bats do forage in interior forest early in the evening, bats concentrate their foraging effort at forested aquatic and linear corridor habitats for the remainder of the foraging period. An implication to improve bat survey efforts in temperate forested areas is the early period of bat activity in interior forest and the later concentration of bat activity at aquatic and corridor features.

The rather flat relationship between relative insect abundance and bat activity suggests that food is not a limiting resource in northeastern Minnesota. Adult aquatic insects emerge from the abundant water bodies throughout the summer because of different timing and length of emergence periods of different insect species (Judd 1962). Even though food may not be a limiting factor, bats still respond to insect swarms (Jones and Rydell 2003). Further evidence for this is the survey we treated as an outlier in 2010, with a disproportionately high rate of both bat activity and occurrence of feeding buzzes. The patchy distribution of aquatic insects in northeastern Minnesota may be a source of variability too large for insect light trapping alone to reveal a stronger relationship between bat activity and relative insect abundance.

There was high variation in bat activity among nights, surveys, and months during the summer. Similar levels of variation in bat activity have been found in Oregon (Hayes and Adam 1996, Hayes 1997), New Brunswick, Canada (Broders 2003), and Germany (Kusch and Idelberger 2005) over one season. Bat distribution varies spatially and temporally due to the differences in distributions of insect prey (Kusch and Idelberger 2005), among other factors (Ciechanowski *et al.* 2007). The variation in our bat activity data may be due to the spatial and temporal shifts in distribution of bats in their response to patchy insect distributions. Our sampling effort was enough to identify bat habitat use, but not to capture patterns in population-level variability. Surveying sites for multiple years or singly with multiple stationary bat detector sites over the entire season would have allowed us to address this issue further.

The acoustic activity index (AAI) was developed to address the bias of individual bats repeatedly passing bat detector microphones. Clutter-adapted and open-adapted bats are differentially affected by the AAI because of their use of different flight strategies (Abel 2011). The file size index (FSI) was developed to account for the lengths of bat call sequences in acoustic files (Broders 2003.) The FSI over represents small-bodied bats because of the higher pulse repetition rate in call files of small bats relative to call files of large bats (Abel 2011). Despite differences among the activity indices, all three resulted in similar conclusions of habitat use by bats.

Despite decreased bat activity in high wind speeds, turbines will operate at night even when wind speeds over land are typically low (Barthelmie *et al.* 1996). Bat fatalities at industrial-scale wind turbines are the most common during periods of low wind speeds (Kunz *et al*. 2007*b*) so some fatalities may occur if the North Shore is developed for wind power production, but to what extent is currently unknown. However, turbine curtailment techniques at wind energy facilities have been found to reduce the number of bat fatalities during periods of low wind speeds (Cryan and Barclay 2009, Baerwald *et al.* 2009). Further research on this topic and on bat migration in northeastern Minnesota is needed to better understand how turbine mitigation techniques can be used to benefit wildlife. In addition, there is currently little known about how community-scale turbines will affect foraging and commuting bats. The tower height, rotor-swept area, and speed of rotating blades is lower in smaller wind turbines than in industrial-scale wind turbines, therefore the mortality risk for bats may be lower. Future research should examine the effects of community-scale turbines on bats to address this lack in knowledge. It is also important to consider the scale at which turbines are deployed relative to the distribution of bats. There is no question that some bat mortality is likely to occur if wind turbines are deployed. However, with each bat species recorded along the entire North Shore it is unlikely that even a few turbines would have a population level effect.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the University of Minnesota Duluth and the Natural Resources Research Institute and those who contributed to this project. Support was received from the Integrated Biosciences Graduate Program housed in the University of Minnesota Duluth. We would also like to thank Bill Route and the National Park Service for the use of their equipment and Tim Catton and the Superior National Forest for field assistance in 2010. This project was funded in part under the Coastal Zone Management Act, by NOAA’s Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, in cooperation with Minnesota’s Lake Superior Coastal Program.

Literature Cited

Abel, R. L. 2011. Measuring habitat use by bats using acoustic methods in northeastern Minnesota. M.S. Thesis, University of Minnesota, Duluth. 52p.

Adams, M. D., B. S. Law, and K. O. French. 2005. Effect of lights on activity levels of forest bats: increasing the efficiency of surveys and species identification. Wildlife Research, 32: 173-182.

Adams, M. D., B. S. Law, and K. O. French. 2009. Vegetation structure influences the vertical stratification of open- and edge-space aerial-foraging bats in harvested forests. Forest Ecology and Management, 258: 2090-2100.

Albert, D. A. 1995. Regional landscape ecosystems of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin: a working map and classification. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-178. St. Paul, MN: U.S.D.A., U.S.F.S., North Central Forest Experiment Station. Jamestown, ND: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Online. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/habitat/rlandscp /index.htm Version 03JUN1998.

Anthony, E. L. P. and Kunz, T. H. 1977. Feeding strategies of the little brown bat, *Myotis lucifugus*, in southern New Hampshire. Ecological Society of America, 58: 775-786.

Anthony, E. L. P., M. H. Stack, and T H. Kunz. 1981. Night roosting and the nocturnal time budget of the little brown bat, Myotis lucifugus: Effects of reproductive status, prey density, and environmental conditions. Oecologia, 51: 151-156.

American Wind Energy Association [AWEA]. 2009. 2010 Small wind turbine global market study. http://www.awea.org/documents/2010_AWEA_Small_Wind_ Turbine_ Global_ Market_Study.pdf. Date accessed 29 November 2010.

Arnett, E. B., W. K. Brown, W. P. Erickson, J. K. Fiedler, B. L. Hamilton, T. H. Henry, A. Jain, G.D. Johnson, J. Kerns, R. R. Koford, C. P. Nicholson, T. J. O'Connell, M. D. Piorkowski, and R. D. Tankersley, Jr. 2008. Patterns of bat fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America. Journal of Wildlife Management, 72: 61-78.

Baerwald, E. F., J. Edworthy, M. Holder, and R. M. R. Barclay. 2009. A large-scale mitigation experiment to reduce bat fatalities at wind energy facilities. Journal of Wildlife Management, 73: 1077-1081.

Baerwald, E. F., G. H. D'Amours, B. J. Klug and R. M. R. Barclay. 2008. Barotrauma is a significant cause of bat fatalities at wind turbines. Current Biology, 18: R695-R696.

Barclay, R. M. R. 1991. Population structure of temperate zone insectivorous bats in relation to foraging behaviour and energy demand. The Journal of Animal Ecology, 60: 165-178.

Barthelmie, R. J., B. Grisogono, and S. C. Pryor. 1996. Observations and simulations of diurnal cycles of near-surface wind speeds over land and sea. Journal of Geophysical Research, 101: 21,327-21,337.

Blehert, D. S., A. C. Hicks, M. Behr, C. U. Meteyer, B. M. Berlowski-Zier, E. L. Buckles, J. T. H. Coleman, S. R. Darling, A. Gargas, R. Niver, J. C. Okoniewski, R. J. Rudd, and W. B. Stone. 2009. Bat white-nose syndrome: An emerging fungal pathogen? Science, 323: 227.

Boyles, J. G. and C. K. R. Willis. 2010. Could localized warm areas inside cold caves reduce mortality of hibernating bats affected by white-nose syndrome? Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 8: 92-98.

Brigham, R.M. 1990. Prey selection by big brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*) and common nighthawks (*Chordeiles minor).* American Midland Naturalist, 124: 73-80.

Brittain, J. E. 1982. Biology of mayflies. Annual Review of Entomology, 27: 119-147.

Britzke, E. R., K. L. Murray, B. M. Hadley and L.W. Robbins. 1999. Measuring bat activity with the Anabat II system. Bat Research News, 40: 1-5.

Broders, H. G. 2003. Another quantitative measure of bat species activity and sampling intensity considerations for the design of ultrasonic monitoring studies. Acta Chiropterologica, 5: 235-241.

Broders, H. G., G. J. Forbes, S. Woodley, and I. D. Thompson. 2006. Range extent and stand selection for roosting and foraging in forest-dwelling Northern long-eared bats and Little brown bats in the Greater Fundy ecosystem, New Brunswick. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 70: 1174-1184.

Caceres, M. C., and Barclay, R. M. R. 2000. *Myotis septentrionalis*. Mammalian Species, 634: 1-4.

Ciechanowski, M., T. Zajac, A. Bilas, and R. Dunajski. 2007. Spatiotemporal variation in activity of bat species differing in hunting tactics: effects of weather, moonlight, food abundance, and structural clutter. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 85: 1249-1263.

Cryan, P. M. and R. M. R. Barclay. 2009 Causes of bat fatalities at wind turbines: Hypotheses and predictions. Journal of Mammalogy, 90: 1330-1340.

Fischer, J., J. Stott, B. S. Law, M. D. Adams, and R. I. Forrester. 2009. Designing effective habitat studies: quantifying multiple sources of variability in bat activity. Acta Chiropterologica, 11: 127-137.

Fujita, M. S. and Kunz, T. H. 1984. *Pipistrellus subflavus*. Mammalian Species, 228: 1-6.

Fukui, D., M. Murakami, S. Nakano and T. Aoi. 2006. Effect of emergent aquatic insects on bat foraging in a riparian forest. Journal of Animal Ecology, 75: 1252-1258.

Grindal, S. D. and R. M. Brigham. 1999. Impacts of forest harvesting on habitat use by foraging insectivorous bats at different spatial scales. Ecoscience, 6: 25-34.

Grindal, S.D., J. L. Morissette, and R. M. Brigham. 1999. Concentration of bat activity in riparian habitats over an elevational gradient. Can. J. Zool, 77, 972-977.

Hayes, J. P. 1997. Temporal variation in activity of bats and the design of echolocation-monitoring studies. Journal of Mammalogy, 78: 514-524.

Hayes, J. P. and M. D. Adam. 1996. The influence of logging riparian areas on habitat utilization by bats in Western Oregon. Pp. 228-237, *in* Bats and Forests Symposium (R. M. R. Barclay and R. M. Brigham, eds.). British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Victoria, British Columbia, 292 pp.

Hayes, J. P. and J. C. Gruver. 2000. Vertical stratification of bat activity in an old growth forest in Western Washington. Northwest Science, 74: 102-108.

Hayes, J. P. and S. C. Loeb. 2007. The influences of forest management on bats in North America. Pp. 207-235, *in* Bats in Forests: Conservation and Management (M. J. Lacki, J. P. Hayes, and A. Kurta, eds.). The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 352 pp.

Hazard, E. B. 1982. The Mammals of Minnesota. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 280 pp.

Holdereid, M. W. and O. von Helversen. 2003. Echolocation range and wingbeat period match in aerial-hawking bats. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Biological Sciences, 270: 2293-2299.

Jones, G. 1994. Scaling of wingbeat and echolocation pulse emission rates in bats: why are aerial insectivorous bats so small? Functional Ecology, 8: 450-457.

Jones, G. and J. Rydell. 1994. Foraging strategy and predation risk as factore influencing emergence time in echolocating bats. Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 346: 445-455.

Jones, G. and J. Rydell. 2003. Attack and defense: Interactions between echolocating bats and their insect prey. Pp. 301-345, *in* Bat Ecology (T. H. Kunz and M. B. Fenton, eds.). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 779pp.

Judd, W. W. 1962. A study of the population of insects emerging as adults from Medway Creek at Arva, Ontario. American Midland Naturalist, 68: 463-473.

Jung, T. S., I. D. Thompson, R. D. Titman, and A. P. Applejohn. 1999. Habitat selection by forest bats in relation to mixed-wood stand types and structure in central ontario. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 63: 1306-1319.

Kalcounis, M. C., K. A. Hobson, R. M. Brigham, and K. R. Hecker. 1999. Bat activity in the boreal forest: Importance of stand type and vertical strata. Journal of Mammalogy, 80: 673-682.

Kruger, L., and R. O. Peterson. 2008. Occurrence of temperate bat species at three national parks in the Great Lakes region. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/GLKN/NRTR–2008/128. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Krusic, R. A. and C. D. Neefus. 1996. Habitat associations of bat species in the White Mountain National Forest. Pp. 185-198, *in* Bats and Forests Symposium (R. M. R. Barclay and R. M. Brigham, eds.). British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Victoria, British Columbia, 292 pp.

Krusic, R. A., M. Yamasaki, C. D. Neefus, and P. J. Pekins. 1996. Bat habitat use in White Mountain National Forest. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 60: 625-631.

Kunz, T. H. 1982. *Lasionycteris noctivagans*. Mammalian Species, 172: 1-5.

Kunz, T.H., E. B. Arnett, B. M. Cooper, W. P. Erickson, R. P. Larkin, T. Mabee, M. L. Morrison, M. D. Strickland, and J.M. Szewczak. 2007*a*. Assessing impacts of wind-energy development on nocturnally active birds and bats: a guidance document. Journal of Wildlife Management, 71: 2449-2486.

Kunz, T. H., E. B. Arnett, W. P. Erickson, A. R. Hoar, G. D. Johnson, R. P. Larkin, M. D. Strickland, R. W. Thresher, and M. D. Tuttle. 2007*b*. Ecological impacts of wind energy development on bats: questions, research needs and hypotheses. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 5: 315-324.

Kunz, T. H. and Kurta, A. 1988. Capture methods and holding devices. Pp. 1-29, *in* Ecological and behavioral methods for the study of bats (T. H. Kunz, ed.). Washington, DC, Smithsonian Institution Press, 901 pp.

Kunz, T. H., D. W. Thomas, G. C. Richards, C. R. Tidemann, E. D. Pierson, and P. A. Racey. 1996. Observational techniques for bats. Pp. 105-114, in Measuring and monitoring biological diversity (D. E. Wilson, F. R. Cole, J. D. Nichols, R. Rudran, and M. S. Foster, eds.). Washington, DC, Smithsonian Institution Press, 409 pp.

Kurta, A., and Baker, R. H. 1990. *Eptesicus fuscus*. Mammalian Species, 356: 1-10.

Kusch, J. and S. Idelberger. 2005. Spatial and temporal variability of bat foraging in a western European low mountain range forest. Mammalia, 69: 21-33.

Lacki, M. J., S. K. Amelon, and M. D. Baker. 2007. Foraging Ecology of Bats in Forests. Pp. 82-127, in Bats in Forests: Conservation and Management (M. J. Lacki, J. P. Hayes, and A. Kurta, eds.). Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, 329 pp.

Lang, A. B., E. K. V. Kalko, H. Römer, C. Bockholdt and D. K. N. Dechmann. 2006. Activity levels of bats and katydids in relation to lunar cycle. Oecologia, 146: 659-666.

Larson, D. J. and J. P. Hayes. 2000. Variability in sensitivity of Anabat II bat detectors and a method of calibration. Acta Chiropterologica, 2: 209-213.

Lewis, T. and L. R. Taylor. 1964. Diurnal periodicity of flight by insects. The Transactions of the Royal Entomological Society of London, 116: 393-435.

Loeb, S. C., and J. M. O'Keefe. 2006. Habitat use by forest bats in South Carolina in relation to local, stand, and landscape characteristics. Journal of Wildlife Management, 70: 1210-1218.

Mageau, M., B. Sunderland, and S. Stark. 2008. Wind Resource Development in the Minnesota Coastal Zone. Technical Report 306-02-08/A92528, Minnesota’s Lake Superior Coastal Program, Duluth, Minnesota.

McGeachie, W. J. 1989. The effects of moonlight illuminance, temperature and wind speed on light-trap catches of moths. Bulletin of Entomological Research, 79: 185-192.

Menzel, J. M., M. A. Menzel Jr., J. C. Kilgo, W. M. Ford, J. W. Edwards, and G. F. McCracken. 2005. Effect of habitat and foraging height on bat activity in the coastal plain of South Carolina. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 69: 235-245.

Miller, B. W. 2001. A method for determining relative activity of free flying bats using a new activity index for acoustical monitoring. Acta Chiropterologica, 3: 93-105.

Miller, B. W. 2010. Revised relative abundance estimates and temporal activity of bats at three Great Lakes national parks based on acoustic data. Natural Resource Report NPS/GLKN/NRR—2010/178. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Minnesota Climatology Working Group [MCWG]. 2010. University of Minnesota. 17 December 2010. <http://climate.umn.edu>.

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources [MDNR]. 2007a. GAP land cover metadata. Accessed 5 Jan 2008. <http://deli.dnr.state.mn.us/metadata.html?id=L390000102101.>

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources [MDNR]. 2007b. Landsat based land use-land cover. Accessed 5 Jan 2008. <http://deli.dnr.state.mn.us/metadata.Html?id=L250000120604>.

Norberg, U. M., and J. M. V. Rayner. 1987. Ecological morphology and flight in bats (*mammalia; chiroptera*): Wing adaptations, flight performance, foraging strategy and echolocation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences, 316: 335-427.

Nordquist, G. E. 2006. The importance of the North Shore of Lake Superior to the distribution and abundance of bats. Minnesota County Biological Survey Report No. 87. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Minnesota.

Ober, H. K. and J. P. Hayes. 2008. Influence of vegetation on bat use of riparian areas at multiple spatial scales. Journal of Wildlife Management, 72: 396-404.

Patriquin, K. J and R. M. R. Barclay. 2003. Foraging by bats in cleared, thinned and unharvested boreal forest. Journal of Applied Ecology, 40: 646-657.

Shump, K. A., Jr. and Shump, A. U. 1982a. *Lasiurus borealis*. Mammalian Species, 183: 1-6.

Shump, K. A., Jr. and Shump, A. U. 1982b. *Lasiurus cinereus*. Mammalian Species, 185: 1-5.

Sleep, D. J. H. and R. M. Brigham. 2003. An experimental test of clutter tolerance in bats. Journal of Mammalogy, 84: 216-224.

Thomas, D. W. 1988. The distribution of bats in different ages of douglas-fir forests. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 52: 619-626.

The United States Naval Observatory [USNO]. 2010. U.S. Navy. 17 December 2010. <http://www.usno. navy.mil/USNO/astronomical-applications/data-services/rs-one-year-us>.

Walsh, A. L. and S. Harris. 1996. Foraging habitat preferences of Vespertilionid bats in Britain. Journal of Applied Ecology, 33: 508-518.

Weather Underground Personal Weather Stations [WUPWS]. 2010. Weather Underground, Inc. 17 December 2010 < http://www.wunderground.com /weatherstation/index.asp>.

Whitaker, J. O., Jr. 2004. Prey selection in a temperate zone insectivorous bat community. Journal of Mammalogy, 85: 460-469.

White Nose Syndrome. [WNS]. 2010. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 13 January 2011 < http://www.fws.gov /whitenosesyndrome/about.html>

Appendix 1. Survey Photos

Figure 1.1. Weather-proof container designed to house the Anabat II bat detector system with a 12-volt battery for three nights. June, 2009. Taken by Becky Abel.

Figure 1.2. Example of aquatic bat detector survey site. The weather-proof bat detector system is circled. Baptism River, Minnesota. June 18, 2009. Taken by Becky Abel.

Figure 1.3. Example of linear corridor bat detector site on a snowmobile trail (detector not pictured). June 21, 2009. Taken by Becky Abel.

Figure 1.4. Example of an interior forest bat detector site (detector not pictured). Interior forest sites were at least 100 meters from forest features such as linear corridors and water bodies. July 6, 2009. Taken by Becky Abel.

Figure 1.5. Insect black light trap near a bat detector site. Most insects are attracted to ultra-violet light and become trapped after hitting the clear plastic baffles and falling into the funnel and jar pictured at the bottom. July, 2009. Taken by Becky Abel.

Appendix 2. Map of Bats and wind on the North Shore



Figure 2.1. North Shore wind resource and bat detector survey sites. Different sized symbols indicate the number of bat call files saved during each three-night survey.

Appendix 3. Supplemental tables

Table 2.1. Mean bat activity among bat activity indices for Minnesota bat species in 2009 and 2010.

		NFS	AAI	FSI
Year	**Species**	**Mean number of files saved (files)**	**Mean minutes present per survey (min)**	**Mean sum of file size per survey (kB)**
2009	*E. fuscus*	3.1 ± 1.3	2.6 ± 1.0	4.2 ± 1.9
	L. borealis	1.5 ± 0.8	1.0 ± 0.5	1.6 ± 0.9
	L. cinereus	4.2 ± 2.2	3.1 ± 1.4	4.2 ± 2.4
	L. noctivagans	17.9 ± 8.1	11.8 ± 4.3	27.3 ± 16.3
	Myotis species	119.2 ± 33.2	86.9 ± 21.8	220.6 ± 72.6
	P. subflavus	2.7 ± 1.0	2.4 ± 0.9	3.0 ± 1.2
2010	*E. fuscus*	4.5 ± 1.5	4.0 ± 1.3	8.1 ± 3.4
	L. borealis	18.2 ± 10.0	13.2 ± 6.6	30.8 ± 15.4
	L. cinereus	5.7 ± 1.8	5.2 ± 1.6	5.7 ± 2.0
	L. noctivagans	10.0 ± 2.6	9.2 ± 2.3	22.2 ± 8.5
	Myotis species	238.5 ± 78.7	138.3 ± 35.6	756.8 ± 307.3
	P. subflavus	2.8 ± 1.2	2.6 ± 1.1	2.4 ± 1.0

Appendix 4. Deliverables Listing and Additional Information

Partnerships – We worked with Superior National Forest biologist Tim Catton to expand the study area using additional bat detectors that belonged to the Superior National Forest. Detectors were set up near Ely, MN and also along the Coastal Zone boundary.

Future Plans – Moen will continue to use the bat detectors in the summer of 2011 in new sites.

The Performance Measures Checklist begins on the next page.

MINNESOTA'S LAKE SUPERIOR COASTAL PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS CHECKLIST

Check all that apply and submit with final report

Grantee: University of Minnesota -- P.I. Ron Moen

Project Title: North Shore bat activity and habitat use

Reporting Period: From: 7/1/2009 To: 3/31/2011

Government Coordination & Decision-Making			**If Yes, Please fill in below**	
1. Involves Educational Activities	**YES**	**NO**	**Number of Activities**	**Number of Participants**
A. Government Coordination & Decision-Making	☐	☒		
B. Public Access	☐	☒		
C. Coastal Habitat	☒	☐	3	125
D. Water Quality	☐	☒		
E. Coastal Hazards	☐	☒		
F. Coastal Dependent Uses & Community Development	☐	☒		
G. Involves training activities	☐	☒		
H. Involves marine debris stewardship activities	☐	☒		
2. Involves Training Activities	**YES**	**NO**		
A. Government Coordination & Decision-Making	☐	☒		
B. Public Access	☐	☒		
C. Coastal Habitat	☐	☒		
D. Water Quality	☐	☒		
E. Coastal Hazards	☐	☒		
F. Coastal Dependent Uses & Community Development	☐	☒		
Public Access	**YES**	**NO**	**Number of Sites**	
1. Provides a new public access site	☐	☒		
2. Provides an enhanced, existing public access site	☐	☒		
Coastal Habitat	**YES**	**NO**		
1. Involves the protection of coastal habitat acquisition or easement	☐	☒	**Number of Acres**	
A. Wetlands	☐	☒		
B. Beach/Dune	☐	☒		
C. Nearshore Habitat	☐	☒		
D. Other Key Habitat	☐	☒		
Habitat Type:				
2. Involves the restoration of coastal habitat	☐	☒	**Number of Acres**	
A. Wetlands	☐	☒		
B. Beach/Dune	☐	☒		
C. Nearshore Habitat	☐	☒		
D. Other Key Habitat	☐	☒		

Habitat Type:				
	YES	**NO**	**Number of Activities**	**Est. Pounds of Debris**
3. Involves debris removal program and activities	☐	☒		
Water Quality	**YES**	**NO**	**Number of Activities**	
1. Involves volunteering monitoring activities	☐	☒		
2. Involves the development and update of polluted runoff management ordinances, policies, or plans	☐	☒		
3. Involves completed project that implement polluted runoff management plans	☐	☒		
Coastal Hazards	**YES**	**NO**	**Community**	
1. Involves completed projects to reduce future damage from coastal hazards	☐	☒	If yes, list community names below	
2. Involves completed projects or campaigns to increase public awareness of coastal hazards	☐	☒	If yes, list community names below	
Coastal Dependent Uses & Community Development	**YES**	**NO**	**Community**	
1. Involves the development or update of local plans that incorporate sustainable growth coastal management practices	☐	☒	If yes, list community names below	
2. Involves the development or implementation of a waterfront redevelopment policy, ordinance, or plan	☐	☒	If yes, list community names below	
3. Involves a completed a project to implement a port or waterfront redevelopment plan	☐	☒	If yes, list community names below	

<u>COASTAL HAZARDS</u>:

1. List the communities' names that completed projects to reduce future damage from coastal resources

2. List the communities' names that completed projects or campaigns to increase public awareness of coastal hazards.

<u>COASTAL DEPENDENT USES & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u>:

1. List the communities' names that developed or updated plans that incorporated sustainable growth coastal management practices.

2. List the communities' names that development or implemented a waterfront redevelopment policy, ordinance, or plan.

3. List the communities' names that completed a project to implement a port or waterfront redevelopment plan.