

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: <http://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.

<http://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



1,000 Ft.

Fence - 21' AMSL

LOC - 19' AMSL

Proposed Transfer Station High Point - 100.06' AMSL

Existing Transfer Station - 69' AMSL

Cement Stack - 108' AMSL

Building - 97' AMSL

2,500 Ft.

1,750 Ft.

Washburn Report

Table 3. Mean Number of Birds Using Trash-Transfer Facilities 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.

^b Consists 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.

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

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

SE = Standard error of the mean.

RISK MATRIX

		<u>Alternative 1^a</u> No facility (present situation)	<u>Alternative 2^b</u> Proposed facility	<u>Alternative 3^c</u> 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

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