University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

2011 Bird Strike North America Conference, Niagara Falls

Bird Strike Committee Proceedings

9-2011

The North Shore Marine Transfer Station: A Case Study

James E. Hall
National Transportation Safety Board

Ken Paskar

President of AvTeam and President of Friends of LaGuardia Airport

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/birdstrike2011

Hall, James E. and Paskar, Ken, "The North Shore Marine Transfer Station: A Case Study" (2011). 2011 Bird Strike North America Conference, Niagara Falls. 15. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/birdstrike2011/15

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Bird Strike Committee Proceedings at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2011 Bird Strike North America Conference, Niagara Falls by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



The North Shore Marine Transfer Station:
A Case Study

Presented to:
The 2011 North America Bird Strike Conference



Washburn Report

Table 3. Mean Number of Birds Using Trash-Transfer Facilties and Control Sites

Building Type	All Birds ^a Mean ±SE	Gulls ^{b, c} Mean ±SE	European Starlings Mean ±SE
Control	22.1 ±3.2 A ^d	1.2 ±0.2 A	0.6 ±0.1 A
Completely open	89.0 ±6.7 C	26.9 ±3.5 B	46.3 ±5.3 D
Three-sided, open	58.0 ±4.5 B	37.7 ±4.6 C	9.5 ±1.7 B
Three-sided, bays	85.1 ±5.1 C	60.2 ±5.7 D	26.1 ±2.4 C
Semi-enclosed	120.0 ±13.1 C	69.7 ±11.4 D	12.7 ±1.1 B
Fully enclosed ^e	85.2 ±8.3 C	61.1 ±9.4 D	20.3 ±4.3 C

^a Consists of the total number of birds of all species.

SE = Standard error of the mean.

^bConsists of the total number of gulls from 8 species.

^c For analyses of gulls, trash-transfer stations in Arizona and Missouri were excluded as gulls were not observed at facilities in these states.

^dMeans within the same column with the same letter are not different (P >0.05) according to a Kruskal-Wallis test.

One fully enclosed trash-transfer facility was excluded from these analyses due to its overwhelming influence on the data.

RISK MATRIX

		Alternative 1 ^a	Alternative 2 ^b	Alternative 3°		
		No facility (present situation)	Proposed facility	Proposed facility with modifications and wildlife hazard management plan		
Hazardous Bird Activity		High	High	Low		
		Medium	Medium	Low		
		Low	Low	Low		
		Risk Levels				

a Alternative 1: present situation (no MTS facility)

^b Alternative 2: MTS as proposed under the Part 360 application

[°] Alternative 3: MTS with (1) changes to building design and operational procedures and (2) the implementation of a wildlife hazard management plan