

Development of Risk Mitigation Methods for the Protection of Bats in Close Proximity to **Onshore Wind Turbines (FLEDERWIND)**

Jannes Kreutzfeldt¹, Carolin Floeter¹, Michael Reich², Vladislav Kosarev³, Veit Dominik Kunz¹

1) Hamburg University of Applied Sciences (HAW Hamburg), Faculty Life Sciences, Department Environmental Engineering, Hamburg, contact: jannes.kreutzfeldt@haw-hamburg.de 2) Leibniz Universität Hannover, Institut für Umweltplanung 3) BioConsult SH GmbH & Co. KG, Husum



Introduction

The fast growing number of wind parks has significant impact on bats. Beside bat casualties during migration flights, wind turbines (WT) seem to attract bats and can cause additional lethal damage. Direct collision with the WT rotor blades or the barotrauma are currently seen to be most harmful. However, this is in contrast with the European law, which lists all European bat species, their breeding sites and resting places as being protected.

Optimization of Radar Bat Detection

- Radar system: Furuno X-Band navigation radar with 12 kW pulsed power output and 8 ft. slotted waveguide antenna (fig. 1).
- Fine tuning of the radar settings for a radar range $\leq 1,5$ km covering a small

Since it is currently unclear what attracts bats to WT, our aim is to investigate the attraction and further risk mitigation methods to protect the bat species and also to develop a bat-friendly WT design and operation.

We therefore propose the following steps

- Development of a spatial detection system for bats
- 2D spatial detection in a defined area of a WT
- Definition of the bat quantity and species
- Acquisition of the flight paths
- **Development of risk mitigation methods**
- Research of a bat-friendly illumination for WT

Associates and Cooperation



- Available Equipment Furuno FAR 2117 Radar
- Individual Power Meter for pulsed X-Band radiation
- Measuring station at the windfarm "Curslack"
- Batcorder
- Infrared Camera

windfarm and also providing reasonable radar resolution cells (fig. 2)

The max detection range (visible on the PPI – Plan-Position-Indicator) of the radar was found to be approximately 800 m for the Nyctalus noctula species. revealed with result was This experiments utilizing a bat model as well as dead bats (fig. 1).



Figure 1. Antenna und transceiver on radar stand (left). Experimental set-up of the bat model fixed to a string between two poles produces three echoes on the PPI (right). Echo of the model in the middle is visible at 600 m from radar (top), invisible at 900 m (bottom).



Figure 2. The PPI of the radar with a range setting of 1.5 km and no clutter reduction. The motorway (passing from west to east, approx. 800 north from the radar) shows strong reflection. The small red circle depicts three strong echos from a bat sized object.

Methodology: Detection of Bats with Radar, Acoustic Hardware and Infrared Camera



Radar Optimization - Reduction of Ground Clutter

- Significant ground clutter reduction when radar shield with clutter fence, which is highly impermeable for X-band electromagnetic radiation.
- The layout of the fence leads to a diffraction pattern, strongly



Conclusions

To further improve bat-friendly WTs, more insight into the attraction of bats to WT must be obtained. Therefore the behavior of bats and especially their flight paths must be investigated. To succeed, we have to involve several detection methods (RAI).





- -10 -20 -30

Figure 4. The PPI of the radar shows clutter reduction (see fig. 2, 3) between 345° and 95° (red sector), where the antenna is surrounded by a clutter fence. Radius: 6 m, fence height: 2.155 m, antenna height: 1.934 m.

detection RAI method The has several advantages compared to a single detection system (e.g. batcorder or radar only).

Spatial detection of bats with radar and reduced surface clutter has proven to dramatically increase radar resolution. Likewise, a clutter fence is recommended to further reduce clutter and optimize system sensitivity and performance.

clutter fence (as defined in Fig. 4) for bat sized objects for different distances and heights. The diffraction leads to the wiggeled isolines (1 dBm), where the yellow line shows the detection limitation of the radar.

References:

[1] Behr, O., Brinkmann, R., Korner-Nievergelt, F., Nagy, M., Niermann, I., Reich, M., Simon, R. (Hrsg.) (2015). Reduktion des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an Onshore-Windenergieanlagen (RENEBAT II). - Umwelt und Raum Bd. 7, 368 S., Institut für Umweltplanung, Hannover. [2] Cooper, B. A., Day R. H., Ritchie R. J., Cranor, C. L. (1991). An Improved Marine Radar System for Studies of Bird Migration. Journal of Field Ornithology: 367-377. [3] Flir Systems Inc. (2013). Commercial Maritime Brochure

Acknowledgement:

The authors would like to thank Helge Schritt, Lukas Schmitz-Beuting and Thies Linger for their commitment and their constructive contributions to the success of radar adjustment and optimization.